Official Journal of the European Communities

Volume 16 No C 67

17 August 1973

English Edition

Information and Notices

Contents

(continued overleaf)

Contents (continued)

Contents (continued)

(Continued overleaf)

Contents (continued)

Contents (continued)

Contents (continued)

I

(Information)

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

WRITTEN QUESTION No 198/72

by Mr Springorum

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 July 1972)

Subject: Community energy supplies

Community electricity suppliers are referring increasingly to the bottlenecks in power supplies that are likely to occur from 1976/77 onwards. The expected difficulties are ascribed to the increasing amount of time required to build nuclear power stations in particular and to other obstacles to the accelerated expansion of nuclear power plant capacity.

The Commission is therefore asked to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent will power plant capacity have to be expanded over the next ten years to prevent the occurrence of bottlenecks in supplies and what will be the share of nuclear power stations in overall capacity?

2. What does the Commission consider to be a reasonable lapse of time for setting up a nuclear power station from the beginning of the planning stage until it becomes operative, including the time needed to deal with objections and complaints?

3. Does the Commission take seriously the growing opposition — in part ideologically motivated — to the construction of nuclear power stations on the grounds of possible hazards to the environment or does it consider it to be of no consequence?

4. The US Governements's communication to Congress and other recent developments clearly indicate that the USA and the USSR intend buying increasing amounts of petroleum from the Middle East over the years ahead. The estimated future import requirements of these two countries are far in excess even of present oil output in that area. Under these circumstances is the Commission convinced that the Community need for cheap petroleum can be met from this area in the long term?

5. Is it true that annual production from the Groningen natural gas field is substantially below previous estimates and that, consequently, Dutch natural gas will only be available to new industries and, in particular, new power stations in limited quantities, if at all, which means that it will not be able to make its expected contribution to future electricity production?

6. Does the Commission think that the efforts to make at least some of the Ekofisk reservoirs available for the Community natural gas market have any chance of success? If so, can it indicate whether and to what extent this will result in an increase in the present price of natural gas?

7. One Member State has pointed out to the Council of Ministers that there is a danger in that

country of nuclear power stations under construction or in the planning stage not being able to rely on secure supplies of enriched uranium. Does the Commission think that supplies from the USA will be sufficient to meet long-term requirements or is it of the opinion that uranium enrichment plants can be set up in the Community early enough to prevent a break in supplies?

8. When, at the latest, ought Community uranium enrichment facilities to be available?

9. Is it true that American authorities have rejected the principle of non-discrimination against European consumers of enriched uranium?

10. Investigations by the US Atomic Energy Commission are said to have revealed that there would be no absolute guarantee that ground water would not penetrate into the former salt mine near Lyons (Kansas) in which it is planned to dispose of radio-active waste. Is this a special case or can the disposal of atomic waste in salt formations always be expected to be a safety risk?

11. What importance does the Commission attach to the report that a British Government commission has asked for the suspension of the construction of nuclear power stations until a means of destroying atomic waste has been found?

12. There is increasing concern that a new world-wide boom would make the supply of primary and secondary energy to the Community more difficult than was the case in 1969/70. Has the Commission prepared procurement plans for this eventuality or does it consider such plans unnecessary?

13. Does the Commission feel that further closures of coal mines are justifiable on the sole grounds that coal is at present more expensive than other primary energy sources?

14. Is it true that the Australian Utah Development Co has concluded long-term contracts with Italian, French, Dutch and British and other overseas buyers for the supply of large quantities of coking coal, and can the Commission indicate how much cheaper this coal cif Community port is than Community coal?

15. The Federation of Italian Coke Producers (COMIKOKE) has forwarded to the Commission a plan for a long-term Community solution aimed at satisfying the coking coal requirements of European consumers predominantly from Community production. How does the Commission view this suggestion, and is it prepared to take it into account in its discussions on energy policy?

16. Can the Commission indicate what importance it attaches, within the framework of its energy policy, to security of energy supplies in the future?

17. Does the Commission give priority to the principle of market economy in the area of energy supplies or does it endorse the findings of the study by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on the irresponsible wastage of raw materials?

Answer

(10 April 1973)

The fundamental object of concern to emerge from the papers which the Commission forwarded to the Council, the other institutions and bodies of the European Communities and to interested sectors of public opinion in October 1972 was the necessity of ensuring satisfaction of the Community's requirements in the field of energy supply. The Honorable Member has no doubt found that these papers go a long way towards answering his questions about this supply, the satisfactory growth of which during the coming ten or fifteen years depends on the realism and imagination of all concerned. In this general context the questions put by the Honorable Member invite the following details:

1. In the electricity sector an average growth rate of 7·5 % per annum in gross consumption can be expected for the period from 1970 to 1985. Taking account of the balance of trade in energy products this implies a growth in gross production of 7·6 % per annum and a corresponding development in installed capacity increasing from 144 GW in 1970 to 204 GW in 1975, 294 GW in 1980 and 417 GW in 1985.

Nuclear power station capacity should increase in the same period from 3·4 at least 100 GW in 1985, or about 25 % of the Community's total installed capacity and should account for about 33 % of gross electrical energy production.

2. In view of the rate of changeover to nuclear energy, the Commission is directing its attention to the lag that exists between the time a decision to build a nuclear power station is made and the time it comes into operation.

Various non-technical factors, especially those referred to by the Honorable Member when he alludes to the elimination of various forms of opposition, make a precise reckoning of construction time difficult. The Commission considers that on present indications approximately fifty-five months would be the minimum time needed between the planning of a nuclear power station and its taking into operating; in some cases this period could be considerably longer, even coming to almost nine years.

3. The Commission's interest in environmental problems and in improving the quality of life is well known and it takes a serious view of all arguments opposing the construction of nuclear power stations. As it pointed out in the paper 'The necessary progress in the Community's energy policy' the Commission considers that nuclear energy must be used more extensively. That this view is in no way inconsistent with the desire to protect workers and citizens and preserve the natural environment can be seen when present day technology and safety measures are taken into account. However, the Commission considers that, although nuclear energy stands well in this regard, all possible ways of improving operating conditions in nuclear stations and other installations for production of transformation of energy must be actively sought out.

4. It is likely that the USSR will draw on petroleum supplies in the Middle East during the next ten years, although it will continue to export on other markets. Unfortunately, no detailed information on this point exists.

The situation in America is clearer, although the Administration has not yet drawn up a policy for dealing with a petroleum shortage which could reach 600 millions metric tons by 1980 and amount to 50 % of national consumption.

Since over the same period the enlarged Community will need to import 1 000 million metric tons of petroleum and Japan nearly 500 million it is clear that serious problems exist, but the Commission believes that, taking into account the extent of known and probable reserves in the main exporting areas, the Community should not run short of supplies provided everything is done to ensure that the investments necessary for this increased production especially in the Middle East, are made. However, it is certain that the new market conditions will have an effect on the cost of petroleum supplies.

5. The Commission has made a detailed examination of the situation concerning the market for natural gas and its growth in the paper 'Medium-term estimates and guidelines for the gas sector in the Community'. According to present estimates, annual production from the natural gas deposit at Groningen will in 1975 reach three times the level attained in 1970, which corresponds approximately with the earlier estimates.

According to the information at the Commission's disposal, the quantities already contracted for he supply of new industries and especially electricity power stations already operating, under construction or planned, will be delivered in full. However, it appears that the Dutch producers of natural gas do not at present think that they will be able to conclude supply contracts for new installations.

The part to be played by natural gas in supplying the needs of industry, especially electricity power stations, will depend not only on the availability of Dutch natural gas supplies but on the quantities that can be obtained in the North Sea or from outside countries (for example, USSR and Algeria).

6. At the moment it is not possible to say to what extent and on what terms natural gas from the Ekofisk deposit will be available to Community countries. From a general point of view it seems that a certain rise in the supply costs of natural gas must be expected, considering the strong demand in relation to the amounts available on both the Community and world markets.

7 and 8. The Commission considers that in fact the supply of enriched uranium from the United States may be insufficient after 1980 con-

sidering both world needs (1) and the capacity of American plants.

In this connection the Commission calls to mind its proposal to the Council of 23 June 1972 for the creation of a Community uranium enrichment capacity. This would enable the Community to engage in isotope seperation early in the next decade and to supply a substantial and growing part of its requirements in the field of enriched uranium.

9. When an amendment was being negotiated to the Cooperation Agreement between Euratom and the United States, signed in Washington by the Commission and the American Government on 20 September 1972, and which should be ratified by the United States Congress in the near future, the American authorities refused to insert in the text of the Agreement the principle of non-discrimination between European and American consumers. On the other hand, they gave an assurance, in an exchange of letters, that the Community would obtain the material and enrichment services on terms as favourable as those given to other clients outside the United States.

10. The storage of atomic waste in adequate saline deposits is now considered by experts as offering good prospects of security. A study of this is, therefore, being carried out by the USAEC and within the Community. The Lyons site referred to by the Honorable Member is a case in point. The area where a test was being carried out prior to storage of radioactive waste has had to be relinquished because a company nearby is engaged in salt mining using pressurized water injection and because throughout the storage area itself disused oil and gas wells exist.

11. The statement referred to by the Honorable Member no doubt grew out of the report drawn up by a working party of the United Kingdom Department of the Environment under the direction of the Chairman of the 'Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution'.

To the Commission's knowledge, this report which does not reflect a governmental position, appears satisfied with stressing the importance of the problem of waste and examining possible solution.

The Commission is also very conscious of this problem and keeps itself informed of all opinions expressed on it. It has dealt with it within the framework of the multi-annual Euratom research programmes and in March 1972 brought the matter before the Council as part of its proposal for a programme on the environment.

12. In its paper 'The necessary progress in the Community's energy policy' the Commission points out that the energy market, Community as well as global, will, over the next ten or fifteen years, show greater uncertainties than in the past, and that the comfortable supply situation of the 1960's is unlikely to continue. This applies irrespective of fluctuations in the economic situation which should approximately cancel each other out from one cycle to the next and may be omitted when drawing up estimates of the Community's energy requirements. The Honorable Member's concern is therefore fully shared by the Commission.

13. Supply policy must aim at satisfying Community energy requirements under the best conditions of cost and security of supplies. The contribution to be made by the coal industry must therefore be at acceptable cost and under satisfactory social conditions. Coal mined in the Community is expensive compared with other sources of energy. It must be expected that the grants made to the coal industry will remain necessary in the future and that, therefore, the total economic cost per ton produced in the Community will remain higher than the supply cost of other sources of energy.

It must also be expected that the demand for coal will continue to decline in several consumer sectors because of efforts to rationalize or to substitute other sources of energy for coal. Noticeable changes are also taking place in the structure of demand for coking coal and steam coals to the detriment of Community coal. This trend implies that coal mining must be adapted to meet the conditions of the energy market. In order to avoid serious problems in the economic and social situation of the mining regions in the Community, the Commission took Decision 3/71/ECSC of 22 December 1970. Meanwhile, certain producer countries have fixed production targets to be met by their coal industries in the middle of this decade in order that the need for public funds may be kept within reasonable limits. For all these reasons fresh colliery shutdowns appear inevitable.

(1) Except USSR, Eastern countries and China.

14. The Commission is closely following the trend in the world market for coking coal and is paying particular attention to the development of new sources of this type of coal and to relations between the principal consumers and producers throughout the world.

In accordance with Decision No 70/1/ECSC [1], relating to coking coal and coke, Community undertakings must inform the Commission of purchases of coking coal from outside countries. In 1972 purchases in Australia were for only very limited tonnages and the corresponding prices cannot be used as a reference. The Commission understands, however, that Australian producers are at present negotiating long-term contracts with Community consumers, but since the bulk of the deliveries is not due to begin until 1973, and to expand only in 1974, the Commission has not yet been notified of the terms of supply and purchase.

15. The proposal submitted to the Commission by the Comitato Produttori Coke recommends the setting up of a Community security nucleus of coking coal to which the Community would allocate part of its own resources. This proposal must be seen only as a long term solution. Faced with the necessity of replacing Decision No 70/1/ECSC, which expired on 31 December 1972, the Commission, taking into consideration the ideas contained in the COMIKOKE proposal, submitted a new Community-aid system for coking coal and coke for use in the iron and steel industry based on Article 95 of the ECSC Treaty. In accordance with that Article this proposal has now been submitted to the Council for its assent and to the ECSC Consultative Committee for consultation. It is the subject of a report by the European Parliament.

16. The long-term security of energy supplies to the Community is a matter of ever-present concern to the Commission.

A striking characteristic of energy supply is its dependency on outside sources, which between now and 1985 should remain at a level of no less than 65 % of total needs. In the light of this fact, and to ensure security of supplies in both the medium and the longer term, two objectives are aimed at, a minimization of the possible effects of such dependency, and a reduction in its extent.

The first of these objectives is of fundamental importance for petroleum. Besides the steps that have already been taken (for example, the measure requiring that stocks for sixty-five days' and, shortly, ninety days' consumption be kept at hand) this objective calls for other measures that are at present under examination by the Council (for example, harmonized Community Regulations to apply in the event of a supply crisis and a system of liberalized imports).

The second objective, a reduction in the importance of the Community's dependency in the field of energy, implies a highly diversified plan of action for developing proven deposits of oil and natural gas (in the North Sea, for example), for leaving a suitable place for Community coal and, especially, for ensuring the rapid development of nuclear energy.

In this way, therefore, the Community's policy on energy must as a whole correspond to the objective of ensuring certainty of supply both for the present and the future.

17. As is pointed out both in 1968 in the 'First guidelines for a Community energy policy' and in October 1972 in 'The necessary progress in Community energy policy', the Commission is not calling the principles of the market economy into question. However, in recognizing that the degree of influence exerted by the public authorities over the Community's energy market must for various reasons be strengthened, though not to the extent of damaging market unity, the Commission concedes that limitations to these principles do exist. Without wishing to infringe on the consumer's right to obtain energy of the amount and kind he needs, the Commission intends to take various measures for promoting a more rational utilization of energy including, where necessary, steps towards combating certain wastages which are sometimes dangerous to the environment and in any event likely to aggravate supply problems.

[1] OJ No L 2, 6. 1. 1970, p. 10.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 220/72 [1]

by Mr Jahn

to the Commission of the European Communities

(21 July 1972)

Subject: Legal consequences for the Commission resulting from rulings of principle by the Court of Justice on the continuation of payment of the expatriation allowance to female officials after marriage

The Court of Justice of the European Communities recognized on 7 June 1972 in two rulings of principle (cases 20/71 and 32/71) that, among other things, Article 4 (3) of Annex VII to the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Communities does in fact provide for different treatment of male and female officials, in so far as the payment of the expatriation allowance to female officials who marry is contingent on the official assuming the role of head of household within the terms of the Regulations. As a result of the finding that arbitrary discrimination between officials did exist, and in accordance with the plea of the plaintiffs, the Regulation in question was declared unlawful and the provisions denying the plaintiffs their expatriation allowances were declared null and void.

I am induced by these rulings, which are fully in accordance with the principle laid down in Article 119 of the EEC Treaty of equal pay for men and women, to request the Commission to answer the following questions:

1. When does the Commission intend to draw the legal consequences from these rulings by submitting a proposal for the amendment of the rule in the Staff Regulations which has been declared unlawful?

2. Is the Commission prepared to review the Staff Regulations as a whole to see whether and to what extent they contain further discriminatory rules of this nature, and if need be, to propose the necessary amendments?

3. Will the Commission act on the aforementioned rulings by reimbursing the unpaid expariation allowances not only to the successful plaintiffs, but also to *all* other female officials in a similar position, or does the Commission expect those concerned to make new application to the Court of Justice to press their claims in this matter?

4. Will the Commission, bearing in mind that the claims of the officials concerned are in some cases several years old, ensure that the payment of arrears due will be made before the summer holidays?

5. Even though not specifically bound by the ruling of 7 June 1972 to do so, is the Commission nevertheless prepared, on grounds of fairness, to pay the officials in question appropriate interest on their allowances which have been withheld for so long?

---

[1] A temporary answer to this question was already given on 12 October 1972 (OJ No C 115, 4. 11. 1972, p. 7).

Supplementary Answer

(21 May 1973)

1. On 6 November 1972 the Commission forwarded to the Council a proposed Regulation amending certain Articles of the Staff Regulations of officials of the European Communities and conditions of employment of other servants which were published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* No C 122 of 24 November 1972, p. 52.

2. Yes. As the Honourable Member can see, the proposal from the Commission goes much further than deleting paragraph 3 of Article 4 of Annex VII of the Staff Regulations, which was the main subject of the judgments made by the Court of Justice concerning the cases 20/71 and 32/71.

The aim of the proposed amendments — apart from one which concerns the repayment of expenditure incurred through illness — is to grant married female officials of the European Communities benefits which until now have been reserved for their colleagues who have the status of 'head of household' as defined in the Staff Regulations.

3 and 4.In the law of Member States and in Community Law the legal effects of an annulment judgment involve only the litigant parties and persons directly affected by the act which has been declared void.

The Commission, therefore, paid the arrears of the expatriation allowance to the claimant in the case 32/71, as from the date of her marriage. It also maintained the expatriation allowance for those whose appeals had been lodged within the time limits laid down in Articles 90 and 91 of the Staff Regulations. On the other hand, it refused to pay arrears to officials who were no longer entitled to take legal action against the abolition of the expatriation allowance. Moreover, one of the people concerned instituted proceedings before the Court of Justice, which handed down an unfavourable ruling in its judgment of 8 February 1973.

5. No, there is no legal basis to warrant the payment of interest on overdue payments.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 290/72

by Mr Oele

to the Commission of the European Communities

(30 August 1972)

Subject: Staggered holidays

1. Is the Commission aware of the survey carried out by the Netherlands Statistical Office on trends over the last few years in regard to the staggering of holidays, showing that there has been no marked improvement in this field?

2. Have the other Member States made similar surveys on the number of people going on holiday and the distribution of their holidays over the summer months?

What conclusions can be drawn from the findings as regards the necessity of staggering holidays?

3. Is it correct to assume that the school vacation period is a determining factor in staggering holidays? Does the Commission see any possibility of working together with Member States' governments towards achieving a better distribution of annual leave periods by staggering school holidays?

Answer

(26 March 1973)

The Commission received with interest the results of the studies made by the 'Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek' on the recent trend towards staggered holidays.

Similar studies are being carried out in other Member States, including France, Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany (1).

---

(1) *Germany* (Fed. Rep.): Statistisches Bundesamt—Wirtschaft und Statistik, No 7/72 'Uralubs- und Erholungsreisen 1971' pp. 398-402. In addition the interested Ministers of the Länder meet each year to coordinate the staggering of the end of school courses for the following year throughout the Federal territory.

France: INSEE
1. Economie et Statistique No 1 (May 1969) pp. 67-68: 'Les vacances d'été: étalement où concentration?'
2. Economie et Statistique No 4 (September 1969) pp. 19-26: 'Les vacances se concentrent dans les régions côtières.'
3. La collection de l'INSEE, Series M, No 2/1970, pp. 63-79: 'Les vacances d'été en 1969'.

Further information is put out at regular intervals by the annual review: 'Attitudes et intentions d'achats des particuliers'.

Italy: ISTAT: Note re relazioni, No 43 (December 1969): 'Indagine speciale sulle vacanze degli Italiani nel 1968'.

These show that there has been no real improvement as regards staggered holidays.

The Commission would like at the same time to inform the Honourable Member that it has taken steps to harmonize statistics on tourism. These statistics will provide the necessary information for thorough study of this question of staggered holidays.

The Commision also points out that the fixing of the dates of school holidays is the responsibility of the Ministers of Education, therefore it lies primarily with Governments to find a solution to this problem.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 323/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 September 1972)

Subject: Paragraph 3 of the Protocol to the EEC Treaty on German internal trade and connected problems

To the question whether the Federal Republic had ever invoked paragraph 3 of the Protocol to the EEC Treaty on German internal trade and connected problems, the Commission replied 'not to the Commission's knowledge ([1])'.

Are we to understand from the reservation 'not to the Commission's knowledge' that the Federal Republic is under no obligation to inform the Commission when it invokes this Protocol, which is an integral part of the EEC Treaty?

Is the Federal Republic required to notify the Council and/or other Member States?

([1]) See point 5 of the reply to Written Question No 468/70, OJ No C 30, 31. 3. 1971, p. 8.

Answer

(30 March 1973)

The Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the Council's reply to Written Question No 107/71 ([1]) on the same subject. According to the provisions of the Protocol on domestic German trade and allied problems, Member States are under no obligation to notify the Commission, the Council and/or other Member States in cases where they invoke paragraph 3 of the said Protocol.

([1]) OJ No C 101, 13. 10. 1971.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 337/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 September 1972)

Subject: Grain exports to the USSR

1. What quantities of wheat and other cereals has Russia undertaken to buy from the Community?

2. Has a price been agreed for these quantities? Has the Commission taken this as its basis for fixing special export refunds for deliveries to Russia?

3. How does the purchase price agreed to by Russia for Community wheat compare with the price levels stipulated in its contracts with the United States, Canada, Australia and Sweden?

Answer

(27 March 1973)

1. According to information in the Commission's possession, the Soviet Union intends to purchase 500 000 tons of soft wheat and 500 000 tons of barley from France.

2. No price was fixed for these quantities. After a favourable Opinion had been rendered by the Management Committee on Cereals, on 17 August 1972 the Commission fixed the differentiated refunds shown in the Annex hereto for soft wheat and barley. The rate of the refunds took into account the world market situation and the specific requirements of the markets in question.

3. The purchase price of the cereals was negotiated jointly by the Community exporters and the Soviet purchasing agency. As far as the Commission knows, the purchase price is US $ 60 per ton, which corresponds to the prices charged at that period by the Community's competitors on the world market.

Refunds fixed on 17 August 1972 [1]	u.a./ton
Soft wheat and meslin	
— For exports to:	
— Zones V, IV (b), I (a) and Yugoslavia	52·00
— The United Kingdom, Ireland Denmark and Norway	48·00
— Austria, Liechtenstein and Switzerland	44·00
— The USSR (Baltic ports)	54·00
— The USSR (Black Sea ports)	55·50
— Other non-Member countries	37·00
Barley	
— For exports to:	
— The USSR (Baltic ports)	45·00
— The USSR (Black Sea ports)	46·50
— Hungary, Zone IV, Zone I (a), the Iberian peninsula, Yugoslavia, Poland, Malta, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark and Norway	43·00
— Austria, Liechtenstein and Switzerland	38·00
— Other non-Member countries	40·00

[1] OJ No L 188, 18. 8. 1972, p. 7.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 343/72 [1]

by Mr Glinne

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 September 1972)

Subject: Retirement pension rates for wage earners in Member States

The reforms recently announced by the French Government, aimed at bringing French retirement provision more closely into line with the apparently higher level prevailing in the other Member States, have prompted some rather contradictory remarks about comparative benefits in this field within the Community.

May I ask the Commission to provide as up-to-date a comparison as possible of retirement provision in the six Member States and the four candidate countries. This should show absolute and average amounts, the rates for different occupations and any benefits in kind, and should take account of the likely incidence of the French Government measures.

---

[1] A temporary answer to this question was already given on 17 October 1972 (OJ No C 115, 4. 11. 1972, p. 10).

Supplementary Answer

(10 April 1973)

The situation regarding statistics on amounts of pension can be summarized as follows:

1. There are no absolute or relative figures for the Community comparing pension amounts. Such a comparison — at least in the case of average amounts — cannot be envisaged until the completion of the work currently being carried out by the Statistical Office of the Communities to list the number of people benefiting under the various schemes.

2. In many cases even national figures giving a breakdown of retirement pensions according to their amount are not available, either because such statistics do not exist, or because the existing statistics aggregate the figures for several categories (invalidity and age principally).

3. In those countries which have statistics on retirement pension amounts — as is the case for France — it is impossible to make up-to-date comparisons because the statistics are based on past financial years. As far as the question put concerns the situation in France, the Honourable Member will find the latest breakdown of pension scheme amounts, as of 1 July 1971, in the 'Bulletin de Statistiques du Ministère de la Santé Publique et de la Sécurité Sociale', No 2, 1972.

4. Naturally there is no problem in producing pension amounts for those countries like Denmark and the Netherlands, where these amounts are fixed at a flat rate. But these are exceptions. Even in the United Kingdom the amount fixed is valid only for the basic pension. Very generally therefore the pension is calculated on the basis of the length of the periods of insurance and the salary level attained individually by each worker. In addition, the comparison must take into consideration the conditions of granting, particularly the age at which a normal pension may be claimed.

In view of these facts, and lack of any comparative Community statistics, the only useful information on the level of general schemes of

social security pensions can be found in the 'Tableaux comparatifs de Sécurité Sociale' (7th Edition, 1 July 1972, at present being printed) and in the 'Indicateurs de Sécurité sociale', published by the Commission. Comparative tables on the new acceding States will, however, be available shortly. And on the question of special wage-earners' schemes, information assembled during the study devoted to these schemes will be issued in the near future.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 362/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 September 1972)

Subject: Agreement between Iceland and Belgium on a 50-mile fishing limit

1. Can the Commission indicate the content of the Agreement concluded between Iceland and Belgium on the 50-mile fishing limit fixed unilaterally by Iceland?

2. Is Belgium acting in accordance with the letter and spirit of Community fishing policy in concluding this Agreement?

3. What does the (enlarged) Community feel about this extension of Iceland's fishing limit?

Answer

(30 March 1973)

1. According to the information at the Commission's disposal, the Icelandic and Belgian Governments have agreed on a practical arrangement, valid until 1 June 1974, which is entirely without prejudice to the standpoint adopted by the two governments with regard to the general problem of the extension of fishing limits by a coastal State.

The arrangement authorizes certain Belgian fishing vessels, designated by name, to fish for demersal species [1] in certain waters surrounding Iceland on condition that they comply with the relevant Icelandic laws and submit to any inspection or request for information which may be deemed necessary.

2. Although it considers that difficulties of the type which led to this practical arrangement must in future be solved on a Community basis, the Commission is of the opinion that, with Community Regulations in the fisheries sector as they now stand, there was nothing to prevent Belgium from concluding with Iceland the arrangement referred to in paragraph 1 above.

3. The Community's attitude with regard to the limit referred to by the Honourable Member is that expressed in Article 2 of Protocol No 6 of the Agreement between the Community and Iceland, whereby the Community reserves the right not to apply the provisions of the said Protocol if the economic problems resulting from measures adopted by Iceland in the field of fishing rights have not been solved to the satisfaction of the Member States and Iceland.

---

[1] Mainly cod.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 365/72

by Mr Glinne

to the Commission of the European Communities

(26 September 1972)

Subject: Consumer protection

Issue No 74 in the series 'Internal Information on Agriculture', published by the Commission of the Communities, contains a report on research into additives which can be used to detect the presence of butter fat. The following passage appears on page 17:

> 'In an industrial deodorizing installation of 10 000 litres capacity, fats heated by a steam flow of approximately 175 kg/hour at a pressure of 10 mm can be treated at 200 °C, corresponding to an output about 50% lower for a pressure of 5 to 6 mm. Deodorization, correctly carried out, eliminates practically all volatile substances in fats, including sesamol and vanillin.'

On page 18 of the same document, we read:

> 'The elimination of sesamol and vanillin by 'stripping' at 200 °C and a pressure of 6 mm is a simple, fast, effective and relatively inexpensive operation, even allowing for the capital investment required to apply this process.'

The author of this study is thus claiming that an industrial deodorizing unit can completely eliminate any sesamol and vanillin which may be present in fats.

As this opinion has been contested, notably by leading analytical chemists in cooperative laboratories, I should like to know:

1. If the author has, to the Commission's knowledge, taken the trouble to verify his statement concerning fats treated in an industrial deodorizing plant?

2. If not, is he aware of the findings obtained in experiments with industrial deodorizing systems?

Answer

(27 March 1973)

The text quoted by the Honourable Member is a summary of the findings of investigations by competent scientific bodies. As far as the Commission is aware, nothing in these findings is disputed on scientific grounds. Furthermore, in accordance with the contract for the execution of the said study, the body responsible for carrying out the research has consulted experts and scientific laboratories with a specialized knowledge of the problems unter investigation.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 371/72 [1]

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 September 1972)

Subject: Motor vehicles used for private purposes in the Netherlands and for business purposes in the Federal Republic

1. Is the Commission familiar with the following view advanced by the Federal Minister for Economics and Finance in a notification dated 22 June 1971, No F S/III B2 Z 1470 — 11/71 to the main customs office in the Federal Republic:

> 'In communications with the Netherlands difficulties have hitherto arisen when a passenger car is used for private purposes in the owner's country of residence, but mainly for business purposes in the other country. To eliminate these difficulties, I have come to the following arrangement with the Dutch customs authorities whereby the levying of tax in both countries can be avoided:
>
> 1. Where a passenger car is used in country A (the country in which the owner is resident) for private purposes only, but in country B mainly for professional purposes or for journeys in connection with the car owner's business in that country the vehicle shall be deemed to be run for business professional purposes, in this case the vehicle stationed in country B may for the time being be used tax free in the owner's country of residence.'

2. Is the Commission aware that the Dutch Ministry of Finance is of the opinion that the above applies only to persons having their own businesses or exercising a profession in 'country B' (in this case the Federal Republic), and not to wage-earners?

3. Is the Commission aware that wage-earners in the situation described above have been allowed by the Dutch Ministry of Finance to affix to their cars a Dutch licence plate alongside the German licence plate 'provided that the latter is not visible while the vehicle is being used in the Netherlands, this being achieved, for example, by putting a cover over it'.

4. Can the Commission regard this official solution as anything other than too absurd for words?

5. Does the Commission find the distinction made by the Dutch authorities in this connection between persons having their own business or exercising a profession on the one hand and wage-earners on the other relevant, just and in keeping with the spirit of existing EEC provisions?

6. Do the German authorities make a similar distinction and if not, is this not a case of discrimination against persons of Dutch nationality as compared with German citizens in the same position, *mutatis mutandis*?

7. Does the Commission intend using its influence to have these Dutch provisions withdrawn on the grounds that they smack of discrimination against wage-earners?

---

[1] A temporary answer to this question was already given on 23 November 1972 (OJ No C 132, 22. 12. 1972, p. 20).

Supplementary Answer

(10 April 1973)

1. On the basis of the information made available by the German authorities, the Commission is able to confirm the terms of the arrangement concluded between the German and Dutch authorities.

2 to 7. On the basis of the information provided by the Dutch authorities, the Commission is unable to confirm that the Regulations in question have been enacted exclusively in favour of persons owning a company in Germany or engaging in a professional occupation in that country.

According to the same authorities, the arrangements in question are extended to cover all employed persons, at whose disposal an employer has placed a motor vehicle.

Be that as it may, the rules governing the pratical application of this German-Dutch arrangement do in fact appear to be out of line with intra-Community traffic requirements.

The Commission is currently seeking a generalized solution of the simplest possible kind so as to avoid double taxation on vehicles whose owners, whether they are employed or not, are required for occupational reasons to reside either temporarily or for longer periods in a Member State other than that in which they have their private address.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 375/72

by Mr Glinne

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 October 1972)

Subject: Application by Rumania for membership of the World Bank and the IMF

Rumania, a member State of COMECON, has recently applied for membership of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Could the Commission state its view on this request and indicate what steps have been taken to ensure that the Six and the Ten adopt a coordinated position on this matter?

Answer

(27 March 1973)

Rumania's initiative is likely to help in strengthening the economic ties between Rumania and the other member countries of the International Monetary Fund.

Under Articles II and XII of the Statutes of the International Monetary Fund, the Decision to admit a country is taken by a majority vote of the Board of Governors. The countries of the enlarged Community have about 30 % of the votes in this international organization.

The procedure leading to the Decision to admit Rumania to the International Monetary Fund was completed on 28 November 1972 by an almost unamimous favourable vote by the member countries of the Fund. Rumania will therefore automatically become a member of this international organization as soon as it has paid its share.

The Member States of the Community usually adopt a consistent position with regard to the problems which occur in the International Monetary Fund.

According to the information received by the Commission, all the Member States of the enlarged Community voted in favour of the Accession of Rumania to the International Monetary Fund.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 390/72 [1]

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 October 1972)

Subject: Aid to Sicily after the earthquake disaster in 1968

Can the Commission indicate, in connection with its supplementary answer to Written Question No 103/70 [2] on aid to Sicily after the earthquake disaster in 1968, what progress has been made in the affected area in the following respects:

(a) housing for the victims of the disaster? How many people are still living in huts?

(b) the regional plan for the province of Agrigento and its implementation?

(c) the preparation of industrial investment programmes in the affected region and their implementation?

---

[1] A temporary answer to this question was already given on 7 December 1972 (OJ No C 138, 31. 12. 1972, p. 74).
[2] OJ No C 39, 24. 4. 1971, p. 1.

Supplementary Answer

(15 May 1973)

As stated in its answer of 6 December 1972, the Commission asked the Italian Government to supply further particulars of the progress of the aid operations referred to by the Honourable Member. On the basis of those particulars it is able to add the following points to its reply of 6 April 1971.

(a) 27 dwellings have been completed in the Province of Agrigento. The other dwellings in that province are under construction and completion is expected this year.

In the Province of Trapani 768 dwellings are under construction and are on average 30% complete; the constuction of another 236 dwellings has been contracted out but has not yet begun.

About 43 000 persons are still living in hutments.

(b) Measures relating to the zone plan for the Province of Agrigento are still being formulated.

(c) The Sicilian authorities are at present examining the feasibility of setting up a cement works and a building-materials plant in the Province of Palermo.

An investment programme, drawn up by the 'Comitato Interministeriale per la Programmazione Economica' (CIPE) calls for:

— the construction, in the disaster area, of an electric smelting complex with fixed investments amounting to Lit 320 000 million and providing 4 000 jobs;

— in the Province of Palermo, the construction of a factory to produce telephone equipment, with investments of Lit 4 900 million and employing about 1 000 personnel.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 412/72

by Mr Glinne

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 October 1972)

Subject: Co-production agreements between private companies in the EEC and Eastern European undertakings

More and more frequently, private companies in the EEC are concluding co-production agreements with undertakings in Eastern Europe, with the consent of their national governments. Eastern European manufacturing enterprises are thus able to combine the advantages of access to Western planning, know-how and, frequently, capital with those accruing from their own lower payroll costs and, in many instances, cheaper raw materials. Consequently, despite its being subject to a 10% or 20% levy, part of Eastern Europe's industrial output finds its way onto the EEC market where it undermines Community production and, in some cases, employment.

Bearing in mind that in East-West relations an armistice is of course preferable to a 'cold war', can the Commission answer the following questions on certain aspects of this new type of economic co-operation?

1. Does co-production have to result in the promotion of Eastern European exports to the EEC to the detriment of Community industry and employment? Could the marketing of products manufactured under co-production agreements not be confined to Eastern Europe?
2. How many co-production agreements between EEC and Eastern European companies at present exist, to the Commission's knowledge? If accurate figures are not available, is it possible to indicate the increase in the number of co-production agreements with Eastern Europe over the last few years?
3. Should the Member States and applicant States not harmonize their positions so as to prevent, in particular, the import into the EEC of products manufactured in Eastern Europe under co-production agreements?
4. What, in the Commission's view, are the advantages of such agreements for the Eastern European companies concerned? How, in the long term, could a balance of mutual advantage for both partners be achieved?

Answer

(16 April 1973)

1. The Commission would remind the Honourable Member that, as a rule, co-production arrangements between Community firms and foreign firms are quite permissible, provided they do not entail state intervention and provided Community rules on competition are observed. The situation is different when these contracts entail state intervention in the form of governmental cooperation agreements. It is moreover perfectly natural that such agreements should also have the aim of increasing exports from the socialist countries to the West, since the limited markets open to these countries can not bring in the foreign currency they need to import capital goods from the West.

Should industrial cooperation prejudice the legitimate interests of owners and workers in the Community, measures under the common commercial policy should be considered.

2. The Commission does not have sufficiently detailed statistics, since companies do not notify it of their private contracts. But all the available information suggests that economic relations of this kind are constantly expanding, even if certain projects, owing to their ambitions programmes, are still at the exploratory or launching stage. It should be stressed, moreover, that while the European firms may have been pioneers in this field, they now face very serious competition from Japanese and US firms.

3. Quite clearly, co-production arrangements between private companies in the Community and state-owned undertakings in the socialist countries

often have commercial aims and may affect the proper functioning of the common market.

The adoption of a common position by the Member States is therefore becoming a matter of inceasing urgency and the Commission intends to submit appropriate proposals to the Council in the course of 1973.

4. The Commission attaches great importance to cooperation and regards co-production as merely one of several forms which it may take. Cooperation has become an increasingly important factor in the promotion of economic and commercial relations between the different economic systems of East and West.

Thus, cooperation should give both the socialist countries and the Community the benefits of greater international division of labour. It will also help in restructuring the supply situation in the socialist countries, thus increasing their revenue and creating improved opportunities for Western firms to increase their exports to the East. The resultant industrial and technological dovetailing will further economic relations beween the Community and the socialist states, and thus certainly play an important part in reducing political tension.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 417/72

by Mr Glinne

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 October 1972)

Subject: Industrial role of public authorities and terms of reference of a European regional development company

In the course of a discussion broadcast by the French language network of Belgian television on 3 September 1972, Mr P. Defragne, a member of Commissioner Coppé's personal staff, confirmed the various articles and reports that have appeared in the press on the main features of the Commission's policy proposals. As regards the plan to set up a European regional development company, the terms of reference envisaged for this body, apart from those allowing it to provide some measure of technical assistance and to look for and inform potential investors, are markedly more limited than those of, say, the IRI in Italy: the European RDC could take tideover holdings in Community enterprises.

Could the Commission please explain why in its outline proposal it has apparently limited the role of the European public authorities to a salvaging function subordinated to private interest? Why could European RDC holdings not be subject to rules similar to those obtaining for the Italian IRI?

Answer

(26 March 1973)

The Commission expressed its point of view on the subject of setting up a European Regional Development Company within the framework of Community regional policy in its memorandum to the Council of 19 June 1972 and the accompanying Draft Resolution [1]; the European Parliament was consulted on these texts.

---

[1] OJ No C 103, 5. 10. 1972.

The Commission considers that since small and medium-sized enterpises have limited access to the capital market the possibility of obtaining temporary, minority participation could induce those in charge of such enterprises to make investments which they would hesitate to undertake, particularly if they had to resort to the permanent participation of more powerful groups likely to call their independence into question. Moreover, a supplementary participation might encourage a start being made on the implementation of projects which investors would be willing to finance immediately but only in part. Furthermore, the size of certain projects may be beyond the means of some regional finance companies.

The interests which the European Regional Development Company would be likely to acquire must be minority ones, since it would not be desirable for this Company to assume responsibility for administering the small and medium-sized enterprises and the regional development companies it supported in the Member States.

In order to help other enterprises to establish themselves or to expand in the priority regions, the European Regional Development Company must moreover be able to bring its partnership to an end by transferring its shares to the promoters as soon as the latter are able to take them back.

It is for this reason that the Company's participation must be temporary.

The role of the European Regional Development Company must not be to rescue enterprises in difficulties. It is designed to supplement the measures already proposed by the Commission for the benefit of economically sound activities.

The Commission does not rule out the possibility of the tasks of the Regional Development Company outlined in its communication being extended.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 419/72

by Mr Riedel

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 October 1972)

Subject: Communities' own resources and the European system of integrated national accounts

In accordance with the Council Decision [1] of 21 April 1970 on the replacement of financial contributions from Member States by the Communities' own resources — Article 4 (1) — the Community budget will be entirely financed from Community resources with effect from 1 January 1975. Under certain circumstances, which the Decision specifies, each Member State will be called upon to make a contribution to the Communities' budget based on its share of the sum total of the gross national products of the Member States at market prices.

I should therefore like to ask the Commission:

1. To what extent is the 'European system of integrated national accounts', as defined by the Statistical Office of the European Communities in cooperation with Member States, applied in calculating gross national products?

2. Is the application of this system sufficiently advanced for gross national products to be calculated up to the year 1975 on the basis of uniform criteria, without significant variations occurring at any stage?

3. What steps has the Commission taken to ensure that Member States apply the system consistently and promptly, so that integrated statements can be published without the usual delays? This is important, since the figures used in devising a GNP scale for the purposes of determining contributions to the Community budget must be as up-to-date as possible.

---

[1] OJ No L 94, 28. 4. 1970, p. 19.

Answer

(26 March 1973)

1. The European system of integrated economic accounts is currently being put into practical application. The national statistical offices of the Six have undertaken to supply the first data compiled under the European Integrated Accounts System (EIAS) for 1970 and 1971 by the end of 1972.

2. The Commission considers that enough progress has been made, or will be made during next year, in the use of the new system to enable the gross national product to be calculated from 1975 onwards according to uniform definitions, without the occurence of further appreciable differences.

3. For the purpose of applying the EIAS, the Commission ensured that a precise timetable was adopted by the Conference of Directors-General of the National Statistics Institutes. According to the agreed timetables, the first figures for gross national product at market prices, compiled on the basis of EIAS definitions, will be supplied by the Member States nine months after the end of the past year.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 440/72

by Mr Vandewiele, Mr Schuyt and Mr Girardin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1972)

Subject: Language discrimination in connection with internal competitions COM/A/264 to COM/A/268

1. Is it true that both in the course of the preparations for the abovementioned competitions and during the actual examinations themselves the languages of the Community were not treated on an equal footing?

— The Selection Board is said to have referred candidates to internal documents in only one or two of the Community languages for the preparation of their examinations.

— At the written examination, a certain language group is said to have received the text to be summarized half an hour earlier than other groups, which also meant that the said language group had one fifth more than the scheduled time in which to complete the examination.

— English is said to have been arbitrarily accepted as the language of the Community, as in the case of one selection board, candidates were able to improve their marks by demonstrating their knowledge of English, while another board did not take English as such into account when awarding marks.

2. If these are the true facts, does the Commission not think that the internal competitions in question should be declared null and void?

Answer

(10 April 1973)

1. The Selection Boards of the competitions COM/A/264 to COM/A/268 have, generally speaking, advised candidates preparing to sit these competitions to refer to official texts, such as Treaties and Regulations, which are available in the four languages of the Community, to authors whose works are available in several languages, or to separate authors for each of the Community's languages.

In some cases, and at the request of the persons concerned, some internal documents which are available in only two of the Community's languages were recommended without giving rise to any comment before the end of the competition; the importance of those documents was so small in comparison to the general documentation material as a whole that this fact could not have led to any kind of discrimination between candidates, all of whom have been in the service of the European Communities for a more or less long period.

2. As for the written paper, the text to be summarized was handed out simultaneously to the candidates of the four language groups. After the distribution of the subjects and before the tests began all candidates had half an hour in which to examine these texts.

3. The language test, according to the notice of competition, consisted of:

(a) a précis written in the candidate's language of a text written in another language of the Community at the candidate's choice; or

(b) a conversation with members of the Selection Board to assess the candidate's knowledge of languages.

The criteria adopted by the Selection Boards to assess the candidate's knowledge of languages have been applied without distiniction to all candidates following the same rules. No discrimination could have occurred among candidates taking part in the same competition.

4. In the circumstances, the Commission can see no reason for cancelling the open competitions concerned; competitions from which candidates in all the languages of the Community emerged with brillance.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 441/72

by Mr Seefeld

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1972)

Subject: Progress in producing Community transport statistics

In view of the slow progress in compiling Community transport statistics — particularly at the Communities' Statistical Office (SOEC) — which is holding up the establishment of an adequate statistical basis for the common transport policy, I would ask the Commission the following questions:

1. Is is true that for some years now two Member States have been refusing to cooperate with the Statistical Office in providing statistics on sea transport, as referred to in Article 84 (2) of the EEC Treaty?

2. In view of the importance of sea transport for the nine Member States and for the Community as a whole, what provisions has the Commission made to obtain adequate statistical information?

3. Is it true that certain Member States take part occasionally, or less and less frequently, in the random checks carried out in connection with road haulage surveys?

Can the Commission state the latest position in regard to the Draft Directive of September 1970 on this question?

4. What progress has been made in the harmonization of traffic accident statistics (definition of deaths resulting from traffic accidents, causes etc)?

Is it true that one Member State is refusing to cooperate with the departments of the Commission?

Answer

(27 March 1973)

1. It is true that two Member States are refusing to cooperate in adjusting and developing the statistics on maritime transport, since they consider, on the basis of Article 84 (2) of the EEC Treaty, that it is a matter which does not yet come within the Community's field of competence.

2. The Commission is aware of the importance of maritime transport for the new Member States and it requested the Statistical Office to carry out two studies on maritime transport which are now available to the Parliamentary Transport Committee. During the next meeting of the Committee for the Coordination of Transport Statistics consisting of repesentatives of the national Statistical Offices, the Statistical Office will endeavour to obtain a Decision regarding the setting up of an *ad hoc* Working Party on maritime transport statistics.

3. It is true that only some Member States have taken part regularly in the sampling surveys on the transport of goods by road in each country.

It is for this reason that in 1970 a proposal for a Directive providing for the annual carrying out of these surveys was submitted to the Council, which is still considering it. The adoption of this Directive is linked with the adoption in the budget of the general programme for statistics which the Commission submitted to the Council in March 1971.

4. The Commission set up in 1971 an *ad hoc* Working Party, consisting of statisticians from the Member States, with the task of gradually harmonizing road accident statistics.

It is true that one Member State expressed a reservation in principle as regards its contribution to this work, since it considered that the Council should first of all state its views on the matter.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 442/72

by Mr Springorum

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1972)

Subject: Credit applications conforming to Article 54 of the ECSC Treaty

1. Is the Commission aware that coal, iron and and steel undertakings in the Federal Republic of Germany have been complaining for some time of delays in dealing with applications for credit on the basis of Article 54 of the ECSC Treaty, and of the unnecessary formalities involved?

2. Is it true that the majority of German coal, iron and steel undertakings applying for credit between 1970 and 1972 have still not received any payment, while the remainder have only been paid in part?

3. Is the Commission aware that the main reason for the delay in handling of credit applications from German coal, iron and steel undertakings is the attempt by the Commission's departments to introduce new guarantee arrangements which differ from former practice and severely restrict the scope for borrowing? Does the Commission realise that this procedure is putting up credit costs and thereby sub-

stantially reducing the former advantages of an ECSC loan?

4. Is the Commission prepared to take the necessary steps to ensure that future applications from German coal, iron and steel undertakings will be dealt with promptly and that guarantee arrangements will be reasonable and comply with normal practice in the Federal Republic, as has always been the case in the past?

Answer

(30 March 1973)

1. It is true that iron, steel and coal undertakings in West Germany have expressed the desire for speedier examination of requests for loans submitted in accordance with Article 54 of the ECSC Treaty.

2. It is true that iron, steel and coal undertakings in West Germany have benefited less from ECSC loans during 1970 and 1971 than in the period from 1954 to 1969.

This situation has, however, improved appreciably in the course of 1972 (and the first weeks of 1973).

This can be seen from the following figures (the original amounts have been converted into units of accounts in accordance with the official rated of exchange).

yearly average	in millions of u.a.	
	ECSC total	amount to German iron, steel and coal undertakings (including conversion and workers' housing programmes)
1954/1969	65·6	28·4
1970	31·7	4·5
1971	112·2	16·2
1972	188·5	62·4

It has none the less been possible up to the end of 1972 to give a favourable reply to 12 of the 20 German iron, steel and coal undertakings (including three undertakings specializing in the construction of workers housing) which submitted applications between 1970 and 1972. In general, the Commission was able to grant to these 12 undertakings the loans they needed to finance their programmes, which were deemed to be of prior importance in the light of the general objectives of the Community energy policy. In view of the size of the lending resources at present available or about to become available, it may well be possible in the next few weeks to agree to further large loans for the financing of programmes deemed to be of prior importance.

3. The Commission does not think that the examination of requests for loans from German iron, steel and coal undertakings can have been delayed by the search for new guarantee arrangements departing from previous practice. The Commission examines each request separately and in accordance with the usual banking criteria. In practice the form of collateral most frequently accepted remains property securities.

As stated above, since 1970 the ECSC has granted one or more loans to 12 German iron, steel and coal undertakings (including three undertakings specializing in the construction of worker's housing). In eight of these cases the Commission accepted the sureties customary in Germany which were offered to it (property securities or sureties from the parent companies). It required a bank guarantee in only four cases, in two of these cases at the suggestion of the borrower himself. Generally speaking the loan guarantee costs were small.

When it became apparent in 1970 that very high rates were to be expected on the long-term capital market, the Commission decided to limit its lending, as can be seen from the table in paragraph 1). The rates of 7·50% for normal ECSC loans and 4·50% for discount loans, which have been in force since 1 July 1972, are considerably lower than the customary rates for long term credits in the nine Member States.

4. The Commission will naturally continue to accept for its loans the securities customary in West Germany. It will also endeavour to speed up the processing of loan applications, as it has already done in 1972.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 443/72

by Mr Berkhouwer

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 November 1972)

Subject: Duties levied by the Nederlandse Produktschap voor Vee en Vlees (Dutch Cattle and Meat Board) on live cattle, pigs, sheep and horses exported to countries other than Belgium and Luxembourg

1. Has the Commission noted that under a Regulation published in the 'Nederlandse Verordeningenblad Bedrijfsorganisatie' of 14 August 1972, No 31, the Nederlandse Produktschap voor Vee en Vlees introduced on 1 July 1972 duties on cattle, pigs, sheep and horses exported from the Netherlands to countries other than Belgium and Luxembourg?

2. Does the Commission consider the levying of such duties to be in conformity with Articles 9 and 16 of the EEC Treaty?

3. Can it be considered to be in accordance with the EEC Treaty to thus give Belgian and Luxembourg buyers on the Dutch market an advantage over buyers from other EEC Member States?

4. If the Commission's answers to questions 2 and/or 3 are in the affirmative, how does it justify its conclusion that the levying of such duties is not in contravention of the EEC Treaty?

5. If the Commission's answer to either question 2 or 3 is in the negative, does it intend, in view of the provisions laid down in the EEC Treaty on the violation of the Treaty by Member States, to take the appropriate measures?

Answer

(10 April 1973)

1. The answer to the Honourable Member's question is in the affirmative.

2 to 5. At the present time the Commission is examining whether the application of the levies in question is compatible with Community law. As soon as the Commission has decided on its position it will inform the Honourable Member accordingly.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 463/72

by Mr Oele

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 November 1972)

Subject: Studded tyres

1. Could the Commission draw up a summary of the widely varying Regulations in force in Member States prohibiting the use of studded tyres?

2. How does the Commission explain the fact that in spite of numerous contacts between the ministers responsible in the ECE, the ECMT and the EEC, there are still such surprisingly wide disparities between national Regulations in this field?

3. Is the Commission prepared to submit a proposal in the near future for bringing the existing provisions more closely into line so that during the winter months, the European motorist may travel more easily and safely within the Community?

Answer

(27 March 1973)

1. The Commission hereby communicates directly to the Honourable Member the list of the provisions in force in the Member States relative to the use of studded tyres.

2. The differences which the Honourable Member raised are probably a result, on the one hand of the varied climatic conditions in the different European regions, and on the other of the comparatively recent introduction of this type of tyre, which has not allowed adequate experience to be gained of its advantages and disadvantages when used in different possible situations.

3. The Commission is aware of the importance of standardizing the relevant Regulations, both from the point of view of road safety and from that of wear and tear of the road surface.

There are two aspects to the problem raised by the Honourable Member; the manufacture of the said tyres, and their use. The manufacturing aspect will be examined in the context of studies currently in progress towards the harmonization of the legisaltion of the Member States, under the general heading 'tyres'. As far as the second aspect 'use' — inseparable from the first — is concerned, and active solution is only to be reached, on the one hand by harmonizing the manufacturing features of studded tyres, and on the other by sufficiently long experience of their use. In the meantime, the Commission will examine, within the limits of the means at its disposal, whether and to what extent it is possible to reduce the present divergences noted by the Honourable Member.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 465/72

by Mr Noè

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 November 1972)

Subject: Carriage of goods by road

In view of the fact that at its last part-session the European Parliament endorsed the EEC Commission's proposal to prorogue until 31 December 1974 Regulation (EEC) No 1174/68 of 30 July 1968.

Considering that by this Regulation the carriage of goods by road between Member States of the Community was subjected for an experimental period of three years to a system of compulsory bracket tariffs, ie a system of base-rates varying around 10%.

Stressing that, by way of derogation from these tariffs, the EEC Regualtion envisaged, for a tonnage of not less than 500 tons in three months, the conclusion of *special contracts* between the carrier and the other party to the contract, involving the application of special rates outside the tariff bracket.

The Commission is asked:

1. If it does not consider it contrary to the spirit of the Treaty of Rome that the Italian Cabinet, at its meeting of 30 September 1972, approved a package of three draft laws on the carriage of

goods by road, one of which — that on the setting up of a system of compulsory national tariffs for road transport of goods on behalf of third parties — as distinct from the Regulation in force for intra-Community road transport, does not include provision for special contracts?

2. If it intends to approach the Italian Government to ask that, in keeping with current Community legislation on the matter, it put forward an amendment designed to reintroduce special contracts into the draft law on tariffs?

3. Whether it had been previously informed by the Italian Government of this entire package of three draft laws and if so, what Opinion it had delivered on them?

Answer

(30 March 1973)

The three bills referred to by the Honourable Member were communicated to the Commission on 18 January 1973 by the Italian Government, pursuant to the Council Decision of 21 March 1962 [1] establishing a procedure for prior examination and consultation in respect of certain laws, Regulations or administrative provisions envisaged by the Member States in the transport field.

The Commission is at present examining these bills. The Opinion or recommandation which it will formulate as part of the said procedure will be published in the Official Journal.

---

[1] OJ No 23, 3. 4. 1962, p. 720.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 475/72

by Mr Spénale

to the Commission of the European Communities

(16 November 1972)

Subject: Currency parity trends in the Community

Can the Commission state what have been the parities of the various European currencies since 1958, and draw up a table of these changes of parity, with dates, for the currency of each Member State?

Does the Commission not think that a general table of these changes could usefully be included in the basic statistics of the Community?

Answer

(26 March 1973)

The Tables attached provide the detailed answer to the question raised by the Honorable Member of Parliament on the development of the relationships between the parities of Member States' currencies since 1958.

In so far as the past is concerned, the Commission has furnished at regular intervals in certain publications of the Statistical Office (in particular the Bulletin mensuel de statistiques générales, Annuaire des balances de paiements, Annuaire des comptes nationaux, Faits économiques en quelques chiffres), information on the development of the parities of Member States' currencies in relation to the 'EUR', the distinguishing abbreviation for the European unit of account as defined by a weight of 0·888671 grammes of fine gold. Some of this information covers exchange relationships since 1955.

As for the future, a table to be published in the journal 'Statistiques de base de la Communauté', will provide, for all the countries of the enlarged Community, the historical series on parities (or central rates) in relation to the EUR.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE RATES OF EXHANGE OF THE CURRENCIES OF THE EEC COUNTRIES SINCE 1958

(calculated on the basis of parities by adopting, in accordance with IMF practice, 6 significant rounded off figures)

Six periods stand out:

(a) from 1 January 1958 to 28 December 1958:	until the date of the devaluation of the French Franc
(b) from 29 December 1958 to 5 March 1961:	from the entry into force of the new parity of the French Franc to the date of the revaluation of the DM
(c) from 6 March 1961 to 10 August 1969:	from the entry into force of the new parity of the DM to the date of the devaluation of the French Franc (the Guilder itself being revalued on 6 March with effect from 7 March)
(d) from 11 August 1969 to 26 October 1969:	from the entry into force of the new parity of the French Franc to the date of revaluation of the DM
(e) from 27 October 1969 to 20 December 1971:	from the entry into force of the new parity of the DM to the monetary realignment decided on in Washington
(f) as from 21 December 1971:	date of entry into force of the central rates adopted in Washington on 18 December 1971.

GERMANY (Federal Republic of)

1 DM =	FF	Lit	Fl	Bfrs
from 1 January 1958 to 28 December 1958	100·000 (1) (2)	148·810 (1)	0·904760	11·9048
from 29 December 1958 to 5 March 1961	117·549 (2) 1·17549 (2)	▽	▽	▽
from 6 March 1961 to 10 August 1969 (3)	1·23427	156·251	0·905002	12·5000
from 11 August 1969 to 26 October 1969 (4)	1·38855	▽	▽	▽
from 27 October 1969 to 20 December 1971 (4)	1·51754	170·765	0·989071	13·6612
as from 21 December 1971 (5)	1·58749	180·450	1·00689	13·9072

FRANCE

FF 1 =	DM	Lit	Fl	Bfrs
from 1 January 1958 to 28 December 1958 (1)	0·0100000	1·48810 (1)	0·00904760	0·119048
from 29 December 1958 to 5 March 1961 (2)	0·00850710 0·850710	1·26594 (1) 126·594 (1)	0·00769688 0·769688	0·101275 10·1275
from 6 March 1961 to 10 August 1969 (3)	0·810198	▽	0·733230	▽
from 11 August 1969 to 26 October 1969 (4)	0·720176	112·528	0·651760	9·00222
from 27 October 1969 to 20 December 1971 (4)	0·658962	▽	▽	▽
as from 21 December 1971 (5)	0·629924	113·667	0·634263	8·76046

ITALY

Lit 100 =	DM	FF	FL	Bfrs
from 1 January 1958 to 28 December 1958 (1)	0·671999	67·1999 (1)(2)	0·607998	7·99999
from 29 December 1958 to 5 March 1961 (1)	▽	78·9928 (2) 0·789928 (2)	▽	▽
from 6 March 1961 to 10 August 1969 (3)	0·639998	▽	0·579199	▽
from 11 August 1969 to 26 October 1969 (4)	▽	0·888669	▽	▽
from 27 October 1969 to 20 December 1971 (4)	0·585599	▽	▽	▽
as from 21 December 1971 (5)	0·554170	0·879742	0·557990	7·70694

NETHERLANDS

Fl 1 =	DM	FF	Lit	Bfrs
from 1 January 1958 to 28 December 1958	1·10527	110·527 (1) (2)	164·474 (1)	13·1579
from 29 December 1958 to 5 March 1961		129·923 (2) 1·29923 (2)		
from 6 March 1961 to 10 August 1969 (3)	1·10497	1·3683	172·652	13·8122
from 11 August 1969 to 26 October 1969 (4)		1·53431		
from 27 October 1969 to 20 December 1971 (4)	1·01105			
as from 21 December 1971 (5)	0·993158	1·57663	179·215	13·8120

BELGIUM

Bfrs 1 =	DM	FF	Fl	Lit
from 1 January 1958 to 28 December 1958	0·0840000	8·40000 (1) (2)	0·0760000	12·5000 (1)
from 29 December 1958 to 5 March 1961		9·87411 (2) 0·0987411 (2)		
from 6 March 1961 to 10 August 1969 (3)	0·0799998		0·0724000	
from 11 August 1969 to 26 October 1969 (4)		0·111084		
from 27 October 1969 to 20 December 1971 (4)	0·0732000			
as from 21 December 1971 (5)	0·0719052	0·114149	0·0724006	12·9753

(1) (a) France did not notify any official parity to the IMF during the period between 28 January 1948 and 28 December 1958.
(b) Italy declared an official parity to the IMF on 30 March 1960. For the periods referred to under headings (a) and (b), the rates of exchange are calculated on the basis of the official rate of exchange applied by the respective central banks.

(2) Old Francs up to 31 December 1959. New Francs as from 1 January 1960.

(3) The parity of the Guilder was amended on 7 March 1961.

(4) The rates of exchange are calculated on the basis of official parities even during periods of floating of some currencies.
These periods were:
for the DM: from 30 September 1969 to 26 October 1969 and from 8 May 1971 to 20 December 1971.
for the Fl: from 8 May 1971 to 20 Secmber 1971.
for Bfrs and the Lit: from 22 August 1971 to 20 December 1971.

(5) Rates of exchange (calculated on the basis of central rates, save for the French Franc, the parity of which has been maintained) applied by the central banks within the context of the narrowing of margins.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 486/72

by Mr Martens

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1972)

Subject: Price quotations for Gouda and Edam cheese in Leeuwarden

In the Dutch version of its letter of 10 October 1972 in answer to my Written Question No 184/72 [1] of 22 June 1972 the Commission made the point that the price of Fl 3·70 quoted for two-week-old Gouda cheese was slightly above the support price of butter and milk powder, whereas the texts in the other languages say that it was slightly below the support price.

The Commission's answer also stated that this low quotation following the increase in the price of milk as from 1 April 1972 would only be of short duration as it was merely a seasonal phenomenon.

With effect from 15 September 1972, the market price of milk was increased as a result of the rise in the price of butter by 0·06 unit of account per kg. Consequently, the cost of Gouda cheese naturally rose by about 0·024 unit of account per kg, whereas the Leeuwarden quotation is still Fl 3·70. It can be assumed that inflation has also led to increases in other cost price factors.

Finally, I should like to refer to market information supplied by the AEI (Agro-Economic Institute). In October 1971 and October 1972, the recommended producer prices for milk were Fl 0·45 and Fl 0·44 per kg respectively (excluding VAT). The prices quoted in Leeuwarden in the same two months for 2-week-old Gouda cheese were Fl 4·12 and Fl 3·70 per kg respectively.

I would therefore ask the Commission:

1. Is the Dutch version of the abovementioned answer correct or not?

2. What is meant by the expression 'equilibrium will be restored shortly'? Does it mean a few weeks, several months or even longer?

3. What explanation can it give for prices quoted in Leeuwarden remaining unchanged although cost prices have increased?

4. Have the lower cheese prices, which remain below the peak market price for milk had an adverse effect on the income of milk producers?

5. Does it still view the Leeuwarden cheese quotations as a sound and reliable indication of normal, free price movements?

   If so why?

[1] OJ No C 108, 14. 10. 1972, p. 4.

Answer

(30 March 1973)

1. The Dutch text is correct; the price of Fl 3·70 quoted at Leeuwarden for Gouda corresponded to a fixed price for milk slightly above the support price.

2 and 3. As pointed out in the reply to Written Question No 184/72, prices usually stabilize again with the seasonal drop in production. This has happened in previous years.

The recent appreciable increase in milk production in the Community has nevertheless led to a rise in production not only of butter but also of cheese.

Although selling prospects have improved on the Dutch internal and export markets the existing stocks in the trade still exceed those of the previous year by some thousand of tons. In these circumstances, the normal autumn and winter price increases have not yet occurred.

4. Apart from the special situation mentioned in the previous point, the Commission does not consider that cheese prices in general are too low. This may be true of certain enterprises which, because of their returns and their costs, find themselves unfavourably placed. But for the rest, including some Dutch fac-

tories, such problems do not arise. However, if the present situation were to persist, the milk made into Gouda and Edam cheese in the Netherlands would yield an income which, in contrast to the previous year, would not reach the target price but a price nearer in value to the support prices estimated for butter and milk powder.

5. In the Commission's opinion, the Leeuwarden quotations must still be considered as reliable and sound data.

They have been established in accordance with the law of supply and demand, and provide a basis for transactions effected in the Netherlands.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 489/72

by Mr Martens

to the Commission of the European Communities

(24 November 1972)

Subject: Shortage of beef and veal

The shortage of beef and veal is attributed by some to a reduction in livestock (as a result of dairy cows being sold off and cattle diseases combated), by others to the build-up of herds in view of favourable market prospects.

1. Can the Commission establish with the aid of the two most recent sets of statistics produced in the Member States what the trend is with regard to livestock? Can the same be done for the new Member States?

2. Is it correct to say that there was a considerable decrease in both the number of cattle slaughtered and the weight of meat produced in 1972 as compared with 1971? Was the decrease practically the same for all types of beef cattle, ie cows, heifers, bullocks, bulls and calves?

3. What quantities of the following did the Community import and export in 1971/72:
   - — fresh meat (live animals and chilled meat),
   - — deep-frozen meat,
   - — animals for the meat processing industry,
   - — meat preparations and canned meat?

4. The meat shortage in the Community is estimated at about 700 000 tons. What portion of this is fresh meat and what it its equivalent in head of live cattle?

Answer

(11 April 1973)

The Commission requests the Honourable Member to find below the statistical data desired.

1. Changes in the cattle population in thousands of heads:

	1971	1972	± % 1972/71
(1) *Germany* (June census)			
— total	14 497·4	14 121·5	— 2·6
— including cows	5 501·0	5 361·3	— 2·5
(2) *France* (December census)			
— total	21 736·7 (1)	21 802·9 (2)	+ 0·3 (3)
— including cows	9 450·9 (1)	9 415·1 (2)	— 0·4 (3)
(3) *Italy* (December census)			
— total	8 775·9 (1)	8 669·0 (2)	— 1·2 (3)
— including cows	4 059·7 (1)	3 957·0 (2)	— 2·5 (3)
(4) *Netherlands* (4) (May census)			
— total	4 200·6	4 305·7	+ 2·5
— including cows	1 911·5	1 976·8	+ 3·4
(5) *Belgium* (census of 15 May)			
— total	2 839·8	2 825·1	— 0·5
— including cows	1 015·7	1 010·2	— 0·4
(6) *Luxembourg* (census of 15 May)			
— total	192·2	191·8	— 0·2
— including cows	62·4	63·4	+ 1·6
(7) *Denmark* (June census)			
— total	2 842·0 (1)	2 723·0 (2)	— 4·2 (3)
— including cows	1 153·0 (1)	1 105·0 (2)	— 4·2 (3)
(8) *Ireland* (January census)			
— total	5 405·0	5 515·9	+ 2·1
— including cows	1 651·9	1 721·2	+ 4·2
(9) *United Kingdom* (June census)			
— total	12 804·0	13 485·0	+ 5·3
— including cows	4 611·0	4 793·0	+ 3·9

(1) 1970.
(2) 1971.
(3) ± % 1971/70.
(4) Excluding farms with fewer than 10 SAU's.

2. Trend of slaughtering in the Member States:

I. Number slaughtered in thousands of heads:

(1) Total mature cattle EEC

	Germany	France	Italy	Nether-lands	Belgium	Luxem-bourg	EEC
January—June 1971	2 277·1	1 972·0	1 522·7	451·1	388·1	16·3	6 627·3
January—June 1972	2 073·5	1 855·9	1 542·1	345·0	380·6 (1)	15·1	6 212·2
± % 1972/1971	— 8·9	— 5·9	+ 1·3	— 23·5	— 1·9	— 7·4	— 6·3

(2) Total calves EEC

	Germany	France	Italy	Nether-lands	Belgium	Luxem-bourg	EEC
January—June 1971	546·6	1 982·3	493·7	475·5	144·1	1·0	3 643·2
January—June 1972	498·8	1 802·4	427·4	452·6	142·2 (1)	0·6	3 324·0
± % 1972/1971	— 8·7	— 9·1	— 13·4	— 4·8	— 1·3	(*)	— 8·8

(3) Number slaughtered by category in the Member States

(a) *Germany*

	Bullocks	Bulls	Cows	Heifers	Total adult cattle	Calves
January—August 1971	22·6	1 359·2	1 020·1	608·3	3 010·2	721·9
January—August 1972	29·5	1 337·7	854·7	463·3	2 685·2	647·6
± % 1972/1971	+ 30·5	— 1·6	— 16·2	— 23·8	— 10·8	— 10·3

(b) *France*

	Bullocks	Bulls	Cows and heifers	Total adult cattle	Calves
January—July 1971	506·8	228·2	1 559·8	2 294·8	2 352·7
January—July 1972	494·9	247·5	1 378·7	2 121·1	2 108·6
± % 1972/1971	— 2·4	+ 8·5	— 11·6	— 7·6	— 10·4

(1) From 1 April 1972, estimate by the statistical office of the European Communuties.
(*) Not calculated.

(c) *Italy*

	Bullocks and heifers	Bulls	Cows and heifers	Total adult cattle	Calves
January—July 1971	1 023·6	168·2	330·9	1 522·7	493·7
January—July 1972	1 041·4	178·6	322·0	1 542·1	427·4
± % 1972/1971	+ 1·7	+ 6·2	— 2·7	+ 1·3	— 13·4

(d) *Netherlands*

	Bullocks	Bulls	Cows	Heifers	Total adult cattle	Calves
January—July 1971	14·6	65·0	323·2	112·1	514·9	601·6
January—July 1972	17·9	53·4	246·4	73·5	391·2	542·4
± % 1972/1971	+ 22·6	— 17·9	— 23·8	— 34·4	— 24·0	— 9·8

(e) *Belgium* (from 1 April 1972, estimate by the SOEC)

	Bullocks	Bulls	Cows	Heifers	Total adult cattle	Calves
January—July 1971	54·9	129·2	148·0	111·4	443·5	165·6
January—July 1972	70·6	129·7	130·0	105·1	435·4	163·7
± % 1972/1971	+ 28·6	+ 0·4	— 12·2	— 5·7	— 1·8	— 1·2

(f) *Luxembourg*

	Bullocks	Bulls	Cows	Heifers	Total adult cattle	Calves
January—July 1971	...	...	...	...	19·1	1·2
January—July 1972	...	...	...	...	17·7	0·7
± % 1972/1971	...	...	...	...	— 7·3	(*)

(*) Not calculated.

I. Meat production slaughtering weight in in thousands of metric tons:

(1) Total adult cattle EEC

	Germany	France	Italy	Nether-lands	Belgium	Luxem-bourg	EEC
January—June 1971	638·25	588·75	356·18	122·74	116·84	4·38	1 827·14
January—June 1972	584·53	565·14	357·83	97·01	117·86(1)	4·11	1 726·48
± % 1972/1971	— 8·4	— 4·0	+ 0·5	— 21·0	+ 0·9	— 6·2	— 5·5

(2) Total calves EEC

	Germany	France	Italy	Nether-lands	Belgium	Luxem-bourg	EEC
January—June 1971	41·56	172·38	45·39	48·41	13·80	0·10	321·64
January—June 1972	39·45	161·92	39·51	47·84	13·98(1)	0·06	302·76
± % 1972/1971	— 5·1	— 6·1	— 13·0	— 1·2	+ 1·3	(*)	— 5·9

1) From 1 April 1972, estimate by the statistical office of the European Communities.
*) Not calculated.

3. EEC imports and exports from July 1971 and June 1972:

	Importations	Exportations
— Live animals and fresh or or chilled meat excluding cows for meat processing	407 461 metric tons of meat, unboned	11 444 metric tons of meat, unboned
— Frozen Meat	251 360 ,,	41 873 ,,
— Cows for processing (1)	10 497 ,,	—
— Mealt salted or in brine, dried or smoked	104 ,,	504 ,,
— Total live animals + meat	669 422 metric tons	53 821 metric tons
— Preserves	30 360 ,,	12 880 ,,

(1) It has been assumed that all imported cows for slaughtering go to meat processing.

4. The deficit of live animals or fresh and chilled meat on the net balance of imports in 1971/72 (615 601 tons of unboned meat) is 396 017 metric tons of unboned meat or 1 584 000 live adult cattle (1) or about 64% of net imports.

(1) 1 ton of unboned meat + 4 adult cattle.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 491/72

by Mr Cousté

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 November 1972)

Subject: Analytical standards for wines

Could the Commission of the European Communities please inform me:

1. Whether French table wines or quality wines psr (quality wines produced in specified regions) exported to an EEC Member State or to a third country have to conform to the requirements of the importing country as regards analytical standards other than those laid down in the Community Regulations?

2. Whether the analytical standards for table wines or quality wines psr originating in EEC Member States and exported to third countries have to conform to the requirements of the producing country or to those of the importing country?

3. Whether wines imported to the EEC from third countries have to conform at present to the requirements of the country of origin or to those of the importing country as regards analytical standards other than those laid down in Community Regulations?

Answer

(30 March 1973)

1. In intra-Community trade a French wine must comply, not only with Community rules, but also with any relevant rules of the Member State of destination. Separate rules can continue to apply in Member States either by virtue of Community law itself or in fields not yet dealt with by Community law, provided in the latter case that these separate rules comply with the prohibition of any quantitative restriction or measure having equivalent effect (cf Article 30 and following of the EEC Treaty and Article 31 (1) of Regulation (EEC) No 816/70 [1]; cf also the reply to Written Question No 187/72 [2]).

1 and 2. Community wines exported to third countries must first of all comply with Community rules, which refer in certain cases to the rules laid down by the producer Member States. The rules of these Member States may also lay down conditions in fields not yet dealt with by Community law, provided that there is compliance with the prohibition of any quantitative restriction or measure having equivalent effect set out in Article 12 (2) (b) of Regulation (EEC) No 816/70. It should also be pointed out that the third country of destination may require for the importation of Community wines additional or different conditions, provided, of course, that they comply with international agreements.

3. Without prejudice — as just stated in the preceding point — to the rules of the third country of origin, the wines of third countries imported into the Community must at the present time comply not only with Community rules but also with any relevant rules of the Member State of destination. Separate rules can continue to apply in Member States either by virtue of Community law itself or in fields not yet dealt with by Community law, provided in the latter case that these separate rules comply with the prohibition of any quantitative restriction or measure having equilvalent effect (cf Article 12 (2) (b) mentioned above).

Regulation (EEC) No 1599/71 [3] will apply as from 1 April 1973 and this Regulation provides in Article 2 (1) that 'imported wine shall satisfy the provisions

[1] OJ No L 99, 5. 5. 1970, p. 1.
[2] OJ No C 115, 4. 11. 1972, p. 4.
[3] OJ No L 168, 27. 7. 1971, p. 3.

governing production and release for direct human consumption in the third country in which it originates'. Thus as of that time, under Community law itself, the imported wine will have also to comply with the rules of the country of origin. It should be added however that the provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 1599/71 do not lay down conditions for the importation of wines from third countries but for the release for direct human consumption in the Community.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 492/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(27 November 1972)

Subject: Food aid for the Republic of Indonesia

Further to its answer to Written Question No 172/72 [1] concerning food aid for the Republic of Indonesia, can the Commission disclose when and how it received Indonesia's request that the names of the Member States of the European Communities should be printed on the flour sacks?

---

[1] OJ No C 106, 11. 10. 1972, p. 6.

Answer

(30 March 1973)

The Indonesian request, that the names of the Member States of the European Economic Community be stated on sacks of flour was made during the negotiations on the Agreement concluded for the financial year 1969/70.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 493/72

by Miss Lulling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(29 November 1972)

Subject: Consequences of the judgments by the Court of Justice on 7 June 1972 on cases 20/71 [1] and 32/71 [2]

In the above judgments, the Court found that Article 4 (3) of the Staff Regulations of officials of the European Communities discriminates between male and female officials in that the payment of expatriation allowances to female officials in the case of marriage is conditional upon their acquiring the title of head of family as defined by the Regulations:

1. As the Institutions have now paid expatriation allowances to the two plaintiffs, what is the Commission's view of the decision by the Community authorities to pay this allowance to other female officials in a similar position to the plaintiffs in Cases 20/71 and 32/71 only as from 1 July 1972, and their consequent refusal to pay any arrears beyond this date?

2. What is the Commission's opinion of the resulting discrimination between the two plaintiffs and all the other female officials in a similar position, some of whom have been corresponding at length with their authorities on this matter, whilst many of them submitted new applications for the allowances before the proceedings were instituted, in about November 1970?

3. Is the Commission aware that, before the Executives were merged, only the Euratom authorities interpreted the provisions under discussion in Cases 20/71 and 32/71 in such a way that female officials of that Institution received an expatriation allowance up till June 1968, irrespective of whether they were married?

4. In view of the changed situation resulting from judgments 20/71 and 32/71, how can the Commission remedy this discrimination between the female officials of the former Euratom Commission and those employed by the other Institutions, other than by paying the arrears in full?

---

[1] OJ No C 49, 18. 5. 1971, p. 3.
[2] OJ No C 76, 27. 7. 1971, p. 15.

Answer

(10 April 1973)

1. The Honourable Member's question is identical to an earlier question by Mr Jahr (see Written Question No 220/72, sub-section 3). Having replied provisionally [1] to Mr Jahn's original question, the Commission is currently formulating a definitive reply.

The Commission's attitude is based on the following considerations: Under the laws of the Member States and under Community law, a Community judgement shall have legal effect only in respect of the litigants and those parties directly affected by the rescinded instrument. Arrears have therefore been paid to the two officials who were parties to the case referred to, similar provision having been made for other cases where, at the time the Court made its ruling, the period during which an appeal could be lodged had not expired. On the other hand, payment of arrears has been witheld from those officials who have forfeited their right of appeal.

Thus in its ruling of 8 February 1973 (Case 56/72), the Court of Justice has just rejected an appeal by one such person in this position.

---

[1] OJ No C 115, 4. 11. 1972, p. 7.

2. There has been no legal discrimination: the difference between the effects of the Court judgements with regard to the two plaintiffs, on the one hand, and other interested parties, on the other, are attributable to the general principle of law set out in (1) above and having universal applicability.

3. Yes. It must be stressed, however, that these judgements in no way imply any attempt on the part of the Court to call into question the Commission's interpretation of the specific Regulation at issue. The Court's objections are based solely on the discriminatory nature of the Regulation itself.

4. It does not appear possible to draw any conclusions from a situation created by a past interpretation by a former Executive, prior to the merger. Despite any similarity in terms of practical implications, this interpretation has had no influence whatsoever on the Court of Justice's ruling.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 496/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 December 1972)

Subject: Arrangements for imports of wine from Greece

1. Is it true that the Commission would like to replace existing arrangements for imports of wine from Greece by a system more closely in line with the common organization of the market in wine?

2. Is it also true that the Greek Government is against such a move?

3. If so, will the Commission take the necessary steps to have the wine import arrangement provided for in the Athens Agreement rescinded?

Answer

(30 March 1973)

1. Following its enlargement the Community is currently negotiating an additional protocol with Greece pursuant to Article 64 (3) of the Athens Agreement. These negotiations are also concerned with the arrangements relating to the importation of Greek wines into the Community. The objective is to adapt these arrangements to the new situation created by the enlargement of the Community and the implementation of the common organization of the market in wine.

2 and 3. The negotiations in question are in progress. The Commission hopes that they will be successfully completed in the course of the next few weeks.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 498/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 December 1972)

Subject: Aide-mémoire on economic relations between South Africa and the enlarged EEC

1. Has the South African government also forwarded to the Commission an *aide-mémoire* concerning economic relations between South Africa and the enlarged EEC and expressing the hope that these relations will be strengthened as far as possible (1)?

2. If so, has the Commission already adopted a position on this *aide-mémoire*? What is its position?

3. In adopting its position did, or will, the Commission take account of the views of such bodies as the United Nations and the World Council of Churches which are certainly not in favour of strengthening economic relations with South Africa?

---

(1) See also Mr Voogd's written question to the Dutch Second Chamber and the Dutch Government's answer (Annex to the record of the debats of the Second Chamber 1972 session, p. 683).

Answer

(30 March 1973)

The South African Government has also handed to the Commission a memorandum on economic relations between the Republic of South Africa and the enlarged EEC, expressing the hope that they will continue and be intensified in the future.

The Commission has not yet defined its point of view on this memorandum. The Comt mission gives its assurance, however, that when it does so it will certainly take into accoun all the aspects of this problem, including those mentioned by the Honourable Member.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 499/72 (1)

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 December 1972)

Subject: Compensatory measures for agriculture in the Netherlands in connection with changes in VAT rates

1. Is the Commission aware that the present Dutch Government has decided, with effect from 1 January 1973, to raise the normal VAT rate from 14 % to 16 % and to keep the low rate, which applies to agricultural products, at 4%?

2. Does the Commission recognize that this decision implies that farmers will have to be compensated?

3. Does the Commission think that in such cases Member States are free to decide for themselves what compensatory measures should be taken?

4. Is the Commission aware of the (proposed) arrangement in the Netherlands to compensate the agricultural industry for the disadvantage arising out of the increase of the normal VAT rate and the maintenance of the low rate at its present level?

5. Is it correct to say that the compensation for this disadvantage will, in fact, be for the Dutch Government's account?

6. Is the payment of such compensation from national public funds compatible with the EEC provisions?

7. Can the Commission specify whether there are any cases of similar compensatory measures being adopted in other Member States?

(1) A temporary answer to this question was already given on 6 January 1973 (OJ No C 138, 31. 12. 1972, p. 95).

Supplementary Answer

(16 April 1973)

1 to 4. The Commission has taken note of the Dutch law of 29 November 1972 (Staatsblad No 690) in accordance with which the normal VAT rate of 14 % has been raised to 16 % with effect from 1 January 1973; whereas the rate of 4% imposed on most agricultural produce and other commodities has not been amended at all.

The consequences of this would be financially detrimental for farmers to whom a particular VAT system applies, in that the obtainment of goods and services used in farming activities is taxed at the normal rate of 16%. In order to avoid this — and there is nothing at the present time to prevent the Member States from doing so independently, subject to compliance with Community provisions — the above law incorporates the two following provisions. The first aims at reducing the tax burden on farmers by dropping the VAT rates on the supplying and hiring of agricultural machinery from 16% to 4%. In principle, the second provision enables farmers to increase their prices in the event of the fixed reduction available to their regular buyers increasing from the four hundred and fourth part of the buying prices (which amounts to 3·85 %) to 4·25 % of this price.

In these circumstances and in the opinion of the Dutch Government expressed in the discussion in Parliament, total compensation would be established for the VAT burden on agriculture taken as a whole.

If the farmer considers that this system does not guarantee him total compensation, he is entitled to request inclusion in the normal VAT system, so that he can deduct the taxes imposed on his purchases from the amount of tax that he owes on his sales.

5 and 6. The common VAT system is based on the principle of imposing on goods and services a general tax on their final consumption exactly proportional to their price. If collection is parcelled out along the

entire process of production and distribution, it must still have the same effect as a single tax levied at the final stage. For this reason the VAT system is provided with a mechanism enabling every client to deduct the amount of VAT imposed directly on the cost of the various components of the price.

Consequently the VAT burden ultimately borne by a product is equivalent to the rate applicable to the final stage of marketing, regardless of the rates applied at previous stages.

As a rule, the special systems for farmers implemented in several Member States are aimed at producing the same result, in spite of their structural differences.

Hence, the countervailing measures in question would not have any effect on the Dutch budget revenues.

7. The Commission is aware only of the measures taken as regards VAT in the Federal Republic of Germany to compensate for the effects of the revaluation of the Deutschmark on agriculture. These measures came into effect as from 1 January 1970, after the Council had enacted Regulation (EEC) No 2764/69 [1] of 9 December 1969 concerning measures to be taken in this field. This Regulation has enabled this Member State to use the VAT mechanism as a means of aid.

It is anticipated that the aid measures taken in Germany will be in no way analogous to the Dutch countervailing fiscal measures outlined above.

---

[1] OJ No L 312, 12. 12. 1969, p 4

WRITTEN QUESTION No 501/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 December 1972)

Subject: Restriction of Community exports of steel and steel products to the United States

1. Further to its answer to Written Question No 192/72 [1] concerning the restriction of exports of steel and steel products from the Community to the United States, can the Commission indicate whether is has also informed the Council, and possibly the Member States of the Community, of its views on the assurances given by Community steel producers to the American Government in respect of their exports to the United States?

2. Does the Commission have the support of the Council and the Member States for its view that action of the kind taken by the steel producers comes under commercial policy and is therefore a matter for the public authorities? Has the Commission officially notified the Council and/or Member States of its views on this subject? If not, why not? If so, what was their reaction?

---

[1] OJ No C 122, 24. 11. 1972, p. 6.

Answer

(19 April 1973)

1. The Commission did not inform the Council nor the Governments of the Member States of specific cases in connection with voluntary limitation agreements.

2. However, the Commission did send the Council a memorandum on the problem of the voluntary limitation agreements, in which it expressed its position. The Council has meanwhile made a start with the study of the questions raised in the memorandum.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 502/72 [1]

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 December 1972)

Subject: Fraud in the common market

1. Has the Commission taken note of the article in the October 1972 edition of 'Jeunes agriculteurs' entitled 'Le marché commun de la fraude'?

2. Has the Commission, in particular, taken note of the following frauds and abuses referred to in this article:

(a) a butter mafia imported butter into Italy on small boats which usually went from Genoa to a small port in Southern Italy. While under way, the cargo consisting of soap or dietetic products, was thrown overboard. The boats then went to a foreign port where butter was loaded, with the same packing and the same labels, with a country outside the Community as its destination. Actually, this butter was sent to a port in Southern Italy, from where it was sent back to Northern Italy. As a result the EAGGF was FF 4 300 000 lighter;

(b) the meat market in Italy is in the grip of five clans comprising a score of importers who have split the country into zones of influence. These 'beefsteak kingdoms' bring an average profit of FF 15 000 000 for each importer as a result of the fact they have a monopoly;

(c) at the frontier station of Fortezza on the Italo-Austrian border there are an average of 150 trucks, transporting meat from Germany every day. Italian customers like lean meat. So the animals are left to starve until they reach the desired weight. This situation has been going on for years.

3. Has it been possible for the Commission to check the accuracy of these reports? If so, what are its conclusions?

4. Does the Commission agree that people from other Member States are often implicated in these frauds which have come to light in Italy so that the impression that also stems from written questions in Parliament such as this one, to the effect that only the Italians engage in swindles, is a completely false one?

---

[1] A temporary answer to this question was already given on 12 February 1973, (OJ No C 17 of 4. 4. 1973, p. 7)

Supplementary Answer

(2 July 1973)

1. Yes.

2. Yes:

(a) To judge from this article and from the text of the question put by the Honourable Member, the frauds in question are committed both on the export of the goods from a Member State and on their import into Italy.

From the point of view of Community law, fraud consists in the illegal grant of a refund and in certain cases the non-payment of the reimport levy at the moment the butter enters Italian territory. As regards a fraudulent importation as described in the article in question, it should be noted that according to Article 1 of Council Regulation (EEC, Euratom, ECSC) No 2/71 of 5 January 1971, relating to the enforcement of the Decision of 21 April 1970 [1] on the replacement of the financial contributions of the Member States by the Community's own resources, the Member States must establish these 'own resources' (among which are the farming levies), and must not only check the customs clearance of the goods but also take administrative and legal action in the event of irregularities.

The powers granted to the Commission by Article 14 (2) of Regulation (EEC, Euratom, ECSC) No 2/71 consist in the right to request the Italian Government to carry out additional control measures, and the right to be associated with these measures, in order to ascertain whether there has been a finding on the quantities of butter imported from a foreign port. Meanwhile, under the terms of the collaboration envisaged in the same Regulation, the Commission will certainly ask for supplementary information in order better to judge the matters reported by the press.

As regards the illegal grant of refunds, Regulation (EEC) No 283/72 [2] concerning irregularities and the recovery of uncalled-for payments made under the Common Agricultural Policy, together with the organization of an information system about these matters, envisages in Articles 3 and 5 periodic communications concerning the irregularities found. Up to the present Italy has not sent any communication on this subject. The Commission will of course press the Italian authorities to inform it about the matter as soon as possible.

(b) The Commission is studying this matter in relation to the Treaty provisions.

(c) A request for information has been addressed to the Italian authorities.

The Commission will be unable to form conclusions on the three previous points before receiving information from the Italian authorities.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

---

[1] OJ No L 3, 5. 1. 1971, p. 1.

[2] OJ No L 36, 10. 2. 1972, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 503/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 December 1972)

Subject: Stability of the French economy

1. Does the Commission recall that in accordance with the Council Directive of 20 July 1968 [1] on mutual assistance the French Government on the one hand and the other Member States on the other took coordinated action towards restoring as quickly as possible the stability of the French economy, which was in a precarious state at the time?

2. Does the Commission also recall that by its Decision of 23 July 1968 [2] it authorized France, pursuant to Article 108 (3) of the EEC Treaty, to adopt over a strictly limited period of time certain safeguard measures, essentially in relation to foreign exchange controls, which were out of line with the normal functioning of the common market?

3. Does the Commission further recall that in its Decision of 4 December 1968 [3] it had to amend its Decision of 23 July 1968 concerning movements of foreign exchange so as to authorize France to continue applying certain restrictions and controls on movements of capital in view of the fact that, although France had discontinued its safeguard measures in September 1968, it had then found it necessary to immediately reintroduce and even tighten its foreign exchange restrictions because of a subsequent serious deterioration in its overall balance of payments suddenly aggravated by a wave of speculation and resulting in a massive flight of capital?

4. Has the Commission since taken advantage of its right, as set forth in Article 2 of its abovementioned Decision of 4 December 1968, to withdraw or modify the authorization given to France as soon as there is satisfactory evidence that financial relations are returning to normal, particularly as it remarked as long ago as 4 March 1969 [4] that there was talk of there being some improvement in offical net foreign exchange reserves, although this improvement was not, in its opinion, such that the authorization could be modified or withdrawn? If not, why not?

[1] OJ No L 189, 1. 8. 1968, p. 13.
[2] OJ No L 178, 25. 7. 1968, p. 15.
[3] OJ No L 295, 7. 12. 1968, p. 10.

[4] See the Commission's answer to Written Question No 279/68 (OJ No C 37, 20. 3. 1969, p. 5).

Answer

(9 April 1973)

1 to 3. The Commission can only confirm the facts mentioned by the Honourable Member.

4. The Commission has constantly kept under review the economic and monetary situation in France and has noted the substantial recovery in that country's balance of payments, as evidenced in particular by an appreciable increase in the official exchange reserves, the level of which has equalled and then exceeded the level for December 1967 (regarded as sastifactory at the time),

Nevertheless, the world monetary situation remains unstable and periodic crises are sparked off chiefly as a result of sudden speculative movements of capital. Consequently, there has been a general tendency to intensify and establish exchange controls or, alternatively, to introduce other instruments to regulate movements of capital. Under such conditions, the Commission does not consider it advisable to put forward proposals modifying the implementing arrangements laid down in Article 108 (3) of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community with a view to abolishung the restrictions currently in force.

However, in the event of a return to greater stability in international monetary relations and should the situation in France call for such action, the Commission would introduce the measures necessary to bring to an end the use of the safeguard clause.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 504/72

by Mr Oele

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 December 1972)

Subject: Coordination of cancer research in the Community

1. Is the Commission aware of the relatively unsuccessful attempts by the European Organization for Research on Treatment of Cancer to make a joint European contribution to the recently intensified American cancer research programme?

2. Can the Commission indicate what links exist between the international cancer research organizations (WHO in Geneva, the International Centre for Cancer Research in Lyon, the EMBO (1) and the EORTO (2)) and the Community institutions?

3. Does the Commission share the opinion that there is a risk that this highly important research will lag increasingly behind projects in the area of technology which are certainly more generously financed even if not better coordinated, and is it prepared to examine how this position can best be remedied?

---

(1) European Molecular Biology Organization.
(2) European Organization for Research on Treatment of Cancer.

Answer

(30 March 1973)

1. Yes.

2. Regular liaison takes place between international organizations for cancer research and the Commission.

A senior official of the Commission has been acting as the executive secretary of the European Molecular Biology Organization for several years and the Commission has long-standing contractual relations with the European Organization for Reserach on Treatment of Cancer.

3. The Commission believes that research carried out under the said organizations is of the greatest value in human, social and financial terms.

However, given the constraints of present programmes and budgets, the Commission can see no way of increasing its support for them.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 509/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 December 1972)

Subject: Quinine cartel

1. Is it true that the Dutch company 'ACF Chemiefarma' was convicted of taking part in a quinine cartel three years ago, but that it was found last spring that the firm had still not paid the fine for this offence?

2. Is it also true that since that time some doubt has arisen as to whether the company has paid the fine or not?

3. Is it not reasonable to assume that, if the company could prove that it has paid the fine, the amount paid (200 000 dollars) should appear in the Community's accounts?

4. If the answer to all the above questions is in the negative, can it be inferred that the press report (1) from which this information was taken was incorrect?

---

(1) See the 'Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung', 27 November 1972.

Answer

(27 March 1973)

1 to 4. The Commission has always been aware that the Dutch firm 'ACF Chemiefarma NV' did not respond to the requests addressed to the firms of the quinine cartel to pay the fines imposed by the Decision of 16 July 1969.

In order to have all the necessary instruments at its disposal for enforcement, the Commission notified this firm of a further Decision establishing *inter alia* the reduction of the fine (from 210 000 to 200 000 units of account) by virtue of a ruling of the Court of Justice on 15 July 1970, and converting it into guilders.

The firm paid the amount of the fine after being given formal notice to do so on pain of seizure.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 510/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 December 1972)

Subject: Monetary Agreement for the French franc area

How does the recent Monetary Agreement on the French franc area affect the EEC and the European Development Fund?

Answer

(26 March 1973)

The only recent Monetary Agreement concerning the French franc area of the which the Commission is aware is that concluded as a result of the meetings held in Brazzaville between the Finance Ministers of the United Cameroon Republic, the Central African Republic, the Congo People's Republic, the Republic of Gabon, the Republic of Chad and the French Republic on 22 and 23 November 1972.

This Agreement concerns the reform of the Articles of the Central Bank, which will cease to be the Central Bank of the Equatorial African States and Cameroon, becoming the Bank of the Central African States, and will have no consequences for the EEC and the European Development Fund.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 511/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 December 1972)

Subject: Community tariff quotas for newsprint and frozen beef and veal

1. Has the Commission taken note of the Council's answer to Written Question No 231/72 [1] regarding Community tariff quotas for newsprint and frozen beef and veal?

2. Does the Commission agree with the Council 's arguments? On what points, if any, does it disagree with the Council?

---

[1] OJ No C 132, 22. 12. 1972, p. 6.

Answer

(27 March 1973)

1. The Commission has taken note of the Council's answer to Written Question No 231/72.

2. As the Commission has already had occasion to point out, in particular in its reply to the Honourable Member's Written Question No 153/65 (1), a Community tariff quota is correctly applied only if it causes no interruption in any of the imports of the goods in question in any of the Member States until the quota is entirely used up.

The Commission has therefore only proposed a final allocation of shares among the Member States in those rare cases when the Community tariff quotas were so small in comparison with the Community's import requirements that it seemed inevitable that the shares allocated would be used up rapidly and on similar lines in each Member State.

The quota opened for newsprint, particularly for 1973, covers virtually all the foreseeable needs of the Community, and so a rapid and parallel exhaustion of the shares allocated to the Member States is out of the question.

The quota for frozen beef and veal is actually small in comparison with the needs of the Community, but nothing gives reason to expect that the satisfaction of demand in the Member States will lead to a rapid and parallel exhaustion of the shares allocated.

Under these circumstances the Commission considers that for these two Community tariff quotas the setting up of Community reserves was as advisable as in most of the other cases when the Council adopted proposals for such reserves placed before it by the Commission.

(1) OJ No 95, 1. 6. 1965, p. 1627/65.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 513/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 December 1972)

Subject: 'Produktschap Pluimvee en Eieren' (Association of Poultry and Egg Producers)

1. Further to its answer to Written Question No 152/72 (1) regarding exports of eggs and egg products from the German Democratic Republic to the Federal Republic of Germany, in which it stated that it was not in a position to confirm the statistics quoted in paragraph 2 of the question, could the Commission indicate whether the following statistics (which it is obviously unable or unwilling to provide itself) are correct?

The following information on exports of eggs and egg products from the German Democratic Republic to the Federal Republic of Germany is taken from the official monthly publications of the 'Statistisches Bundesamt' in Wiesbaden ('Groß- und Einzelhandel, Gastgewerbe Fremdenverkehr', series 6, 'Warenverkehr mit der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik und Berlin (Ost)'.

011921 Hens' eggs, fresh + 011931 Egg yolks

	kg	DM
1972 January	—	—
February	621 500	1 129 000
March	640 400	1 027 000
April	746 800	1 337 000
May	615 900	1 053 000
June	490 200	726 000
July	—	—
August	886 600	1 101 000
1972 January-August	4 001 400	6 373 000
1971 Total for the year	6 689 100	11 367 000
1970 Total for the year	5 983 000	8 301 000

2. Has the Commission heard, directly or indirectly, that for some time now eggs from the German De-

(1) OJ No C 111, 21. 10. 1972, p. 4.

mocratic Republic have been imported into West Berlin without a stamp showing their provenance or place of origin, packed in unmarked boxes, and subsequently, after being repacked, have been marketed under a German label, without payment of the levy on goods from third countries?

3. Is it true that the offer prices for egg products (principally whole products) from the German Democratic Republic on sale in West Germany are an important factor in determining the price of the same products from EEC Member States on the West German market?

Answer

(27 March 1973)

1. The Commission possesses no statistics other than those quoted by the Honourable Member of Parliament and taken from the 'Statistisches Bundesamt'.

2. The Commission again refers the Honourable Member of Parliament to the Protocol relating to internal German trade and connected problems, according to which no levy is imposed on imports from East Germany, within the purview and under the conditions of the West German agreement on internal German trade.

3. It is possible in theory that imports into West Germany from East Germany should influence price formations. However, West Germany watches these imports, in particular as regards quantity and prices, so that any great influence should be out of the question.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 514/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(20 December 1972)

Subject: Suspension of exports of well-known Dutch cigarette brands

1. Has the Commission noted the answer given by the Dutch Government to a written question tabled in the Second Chamber with regard to the suspension of exports by Dutch cigarette manufacturers of well-known brands of cigarettes [1]?

2. Has the Commission taken note of the fact that the Dutch Government admits, in so many words, that it has encouraged a 'reticent' policy (this euphemism was coined by the Dutch Secretary of State for Finance) on the part of Dutch cigarette manufacturers in the marketing of well-known brands of cigarettes abroad?

3. Does the Commission share the view held by the abovementioned Secretary of State that it is wrong to refer to such conduct as 'praktijken', a word which in Dutch is somewhat pejorative, although the Commission uses it in its answer to Written Question No 21/72 [2]?

4. Now that it has been established that the course of action adopted by the Dutch cigarette manufacturers was prompted by a suggestion made by the Dutch Government, thus implying in the Commission's own view, to judge by its answer to Written Question No 21/72, a State measure which, because it amounts to a quantitative restriction on exports to the other Member States, contravenes the provisions of Article 34 (1) of the EEC Treaty, has the Commission taken immediate steps to rectify the situation?

5. If so, when did it take these steps and what was the Dutch Government's reaction?

---

[1] Annex to the Proceedings of the Second Chamber, 1971/72 session, p. 735.

[2] OJ No C 78, 19. 7. 1972, p. 4.

Answer

(17 April 1973)

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. The Commission did not mean to use the word 'pratices' in any pejorative sense. This word was intended purely as a means of describing the behaviour of the manufacturers in question.

4 and 5. The Commission felt justified in regarding this as a measure attributable to the State which measure, being in effect tantamount to a quantitative restriction on exports to other Member States, therefore contravened the Regulations of Article 34 (1) of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community. Accordingly, the Commission brought the matter to the attention of the Netherlands Government which replied by giving assurances that it would in future refain from any attempt to influence cigarette manufacturers in the Netherlands.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 519/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 December 1972)

Subject: Compensation for losses suffered as a result of the contravention of Articles 85 and 86 of the EEC Treaty

1. Does the Commission share the Dutch Government's view [1] that consumers should be able to claim compensation in certain cases for losses suffered as a result of the contravention by undertakings of Articles 85 and 86 of the EEC Treaty?

2. Does the Commission know if any claims of this kind already have been made? If so, can it give some idea of the rulings of the Court of Justice on the subject?

3. Does the Commission consider it desirable that Member States adopt a coordinated approach in this connection even if such claims have not as yet been made? If so, what contribution can it make?

---

[1] See item 5 of the Dutch Government's answer to written questions raised on this subject in the Second Chamber, Annex to the record of the debates of the Second Chamber, 1971/72, session, p. 711.

Answer

(10 April 1973)

1. The Commission considers that actions for damages brought by injured consumers against firms that have violated Articles 85 and 86 of the EEC Treaty could provide useful support for its own measures to combat such infringements.

In this connection it points out that civil consequences, other than nullity, ensuing from an infringement of Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty are generally considered as being governed by the national law of the Member States.

At the Commission's behest, this question was studied by a number of European university teachers, who in 1966 published their conclusions in the 'Competition' series, under the title 'Compensation for the harmful consequences of an infringement of Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty establishing the EEC [1]'. They concluded at the time that infringements of the rules of competition laid down by the Treaty entitled injured parties to take legal action in their own countries to obtain the various remedies available to them under national law, viz., compensation, proceedings for termination of the infringement, periodic penalty payments, publication of court judgements.

The procedures for application of this principle, however, vary from one Member State to another. In Germany and the Netherlands, for instance, the particular view taken as regards the legal protection of private persons — which makes a distinction according to whether the laws protect private interests or solely the public interest — may to some extent restrict the possibilities of recovering damages.

2. The Commission has no knowledge, of any legal actions brought with a view to recovering damages as a result of an infringement of Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty.

3. From the point of view of consumer protection, which in the Commission's Opinion is the standpoint from which the problem raised by the Honourable Member should be considered, the first thing to be done is to make consumers aware of the means of redress already available to them under national law.

Such an approach will also enable an assessment to be made of the effectiveness of the existing remedies. This effectiveness may depend partly on whether or not consumer associations are allowed to bring an action on behalf of their members. Other major problems relate to the proof of prejudice suffered and the determination of its extent.

The Commission therefore proposes to give greater publicity to the study published in 1966 and to supplement it, notably as regards the means of redress available under the national laws of the three new Member States.

[1] Published by the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 523/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 December 1972)

Subject: Butter fraud in the port of Hamburg

Now that it has received the information promised by the Federal Republic on the irregularities in respect of butter in the port of Hamburg, does the Commission intend giving an answer to point 4 of written Question No 274/72 [1]?

[1] OJ No C 132, 22. 12. 1972, p. 11.

Answer

(25 April 1973)

As shown in its reply to Written Question No 274/72, this irregularity was communicated to the Commission as part of the information provided for by Articles 3 and 5 of the Council Regulation (EEC) No 283/72 [1] of 7 February 1972 on irregularities and the recovery of uncalled for payments made in connection with the financing of the common agricultural policy, and also the organization of an information system in this field.

According to this information, a fraud is being carried out with the help of false invoices and certificates and by deception of the control services when presenting the goods. These facts do not seem such as to necessitate an alteration or reinforcement of the present provisions covering export operations.

---

[1] OJ No L 36, 10. 2. 1972, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 528/72

by Mr Oele

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 December 1972)

Subject: Strengthening the position of policy holders in relation to life assurance companies in the common market

1. Is the Commission aware of the initial findings of the 'ombudsman' appointed by Dutch life assurance companies, who, as a result of the complaints voiced by policy holders, will make a series of concrete proposals in the interests of policy holders, aimed particularly at providing better information and obtaining better conditions for redeeming life assurance policies?

2. Does the Commission agree with the view expressed by the 'Nederlandse Consumentenbond' (Netherlands Consumers' Association) in its bulletin for December 1972 that the high prices and relatively unattractive terms offered in life assurance are a direct result of the lack of competition between insurance companies?

3. Is the Commission prepared to investigate how far the complaints voiced in the Netherlands apply in other Member States of the Community, and to submit its findings to Parliament?

4. When does the Commission expect to be able to submit proposals for harmonizing the conditions under which companies from any given Member State may operate on the life assurance market of another Member State, thus promoting a greater measure of competition in the interests of the consumer.

Answer

(26 March 1973)

1. Yes.

2. The Commission has taken note of the survey published by the 'Nederlandse Consumentenbond' in December 1972, which describes several aspects of the position of insurance policy-holders. This position, referred to by the Honourable Member, can be improved by means of purely national measures. The Commission will be interested to have details of the measures now being prepared in the Netherlands.

3. The Commission does not consider it necessary to conduct the survey suggested by the Honourable Member, because the work referred to under point 4 below may well produce the desired result for improving the position of the policy-holders.

4. The general programme for abolishing restrictions on freedom of establishment, adopted by the Council on 18 December 1961 [1], provides that the harmonization of conditions governing access to and pursuit of insurance activities and the abolition of restrictions on freedom of establishment must be achieved first in fields other than life assurance and then in the latter field.

Two proposals for Directives on indemnity insurance had been the subject of a common approach in the Council of the Six in July 1972 and are now up for discussion before the Council of the Nine. The Commission should shortly be able to submit corresponding proposals for Directives in the field of life assurance.

It is to be expected that the introduction of freedom of establishment in life assurance and the harmonization of the conditions governing access to and pursuit of activities in this field, particularly the essential financial guarantees to be furnished by life assurance firms will have a favourable effect on competition and improve the position of policy-holders.

[1] OJ No 2, 15. 1. 1962.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 529/72

by Mr Oele

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 December 1972)

Subject: Infringements of social welfare legislation by labour contractors

1. Has the Commission any means of putting a stop to infringements of social welfare legislation by labour contractors who recruit commuting frontier workers and offer their labour to undertakings in the adjacent Member State without meeting the requirements of social security legislation?

2. What is the Commission's view on a proposal for a Directive prohibiting employers from taking on labour through intermediaries (whether labour contractors or employment agencies) unless the latter meet certain requirements as regards their good faith, and if necessary assume responsibility for social security contributions on behalf of the workers they have recruited?

In the border region of the Dutch province of Limburg alone, illegal earnings by labour contractors are estimated at Fl 25 000 000 per year. In the Netherlands a law has been in force since 1964 banning employment agencies which fail to prove their good faith.

Answer

(27 March 1973)

1. With regard to social security, the attachment of temporary workers put at the disposal of a third party utilizer in the territory of another Member State complies with the rules laid down by Council Regulation (EEC) No 1408/71 [1] of 14 June 1971 relative to the implementation of social security arrangements for wage-earners and their families moving within the Community. It is a matter for the social security institution of the Member States to check whether employers' and workers' obligations relative to the registration of the latter and to the payment of contributions, and which are provided for by the legislation applicable to the worker under these rules, are fulfilled. The Administrative Commission for the social security of migrant workers is currently researching possible ways of putting a stop to the abuses mentioned by the Honourable Member, particularly as regards the conditions under which it is possible for workers who are temporarily seconded to one Member State to remain subject to the legislation of the Member State which sent them, taking into account the ruling of the Court of Justice on 17 December 1970 in case 35/70 (Manpower) [2].

2. At the moment the activities of temporary employment agencies are regulated by the national legislation of the Member States and, where appropriate, by their private international law. Thus in the Netherlands, Germany and France recent ministerial laws and orders have been aimed at controlling the activities of these undertakings and protecting the labour they employ.

In Belgium, where a Bill is at present being drafted, the Ministry of Employment can intervene, if necessary, under the royal decree of 10 April 1954 which prohibits the placement of labour against payment. In Italy, the hiring-out of labour is prohibited in all its forms by Law No 1369 of 23 October 1960.

In Luxembourg, an agreement has been signed between the National Labour Office and the only Luxembourg undertaking engaged in these activities. The Commission, aware of the problems by these undertakings when they move temporary workers from one Member State to another, is currently preparing a draft Directive aimed at bringing this type of activity under stricter control, and at ensuring better social protection for temporary workers sent abroad.

---

[1] OJ No L 149, 5. 4. 1971.
[2] OJ No C 17, 20. 2. 1971.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 531/72

by Mr Seefeld

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 December 1972)

Subject: European cooperation for the improvement of motor vehicle safety

1. Is the Commission aware that seven European motor vehicle manufacturers (British Leyland, Citroën, Daimler-Benz, Fiat, Peugeot, Renault, Volkswagen) recently set up a joint ogranization — the 'Committee of common market motor vehicle manufacturers (CCMC)' — the declared aim of which, among other things, is the exchange and evaluation of conclusions reached by the individual manufacturers on scientific and technical possibilities for improving motor vehicle safety?

2. In what way have the Commission and this new organization agreed to cooperate to speed up work on the development and production of a European safety car?

Answer

(16 May 1973)

1. The Commission has been informed of the creation of the 'Common Market Automobile Constructors Committee' (CCMC) by its Chairman, who also made known the main object of the statute of the new association, namely, the improvement of the safety of European automobiles and the reduction of the pollution they cause.

2. The Commission is at present examining the proposals and the statute of the CCMC in the light of the provisions of the EEC Treaty, and is studying possible methods of cooperation between the Commission and this new association.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 534/72

by Mr Seefeld

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 January 1973)

Subject: Provisions governing the use of spiked tyres in the Community

Is the Commission aware that provisions governing the use of spiked tyres differ in various Member States and that this causes certain difficulties for motorists at frontier crossings?

Does the Commission intend to take steps to standardize the use of spiked tyres?

Answer

(27 March 1973)

The Commission requests the Honorable Member of Parliament to refer to the answer given to the Written Question No 463/72 [1] by Mr Oele, which dealt with the same subject.

---

[1] See p. 27 of this Official Journal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 563/72

by Mr Laudrin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(18 January 1973)

Subject: Price of milk on the Netherlands market

In its reply in French to Written Question No 184/72 [1] by Mr Martens on the officially quoted prices for Gouda and Edam cheeses, the Commission confirms: 'that the fixing of the price of milk at Fl 3·70 per kilo, which was quoted in Leeuwarden in May and June 1972, is slightly below the support price calculated on the basis of the intervention prices for butter and skimmed-milk powder'.

Further on, the Commission specifies that such an occurrence is of short duration and that, in general, the balance of prices is re-established with the seasonal fall in production.

In conclusion, the Commission 'considers that the situation is not caused by artificial factors nor in conflict with Community rules'.

Furthermore, there is a discrepancy between the text of the reply in the Dutch language edition of the Official Journal and that given in the French edition. In the Dutch text the words 'slightly below the support price' are replaced by 'just above the guarantee price' ('juist boven de garantieprijs').

This is still a matter of concern, for it would seem that:

(i) the prices quoted for cheeses in Leeuwarden have not risen for nine months;

(ii) the Dutch are putting goods on Community markets at less than FF 1 per kilo.

Will the Commission therefore clarify the following:

1. What does it mean by 'occurrence of short duration'?

2. Does it consider that the quotation of cheese prices at a lower level than the support price for butter and milk powder for such a long period is compatible with Community rules?

3. If not, what measures does it intend to take to avoid any distortion of competition?

4. If so, how is the support price defined and at what level should prices for products other than butter and milk powder be fixed in relation to the support price?

5. How does it explain the substantive discrepancy between the Dutch and French texts of its reply to Written Question No 184/72 by Mr Martens?

[1] OJ No C 108, 14. 10. 1972, p. 4.

Answer

(16 April 1973)

1 to 4. The Commission requests the Honorable Member to refer to the reply to Written Question No 486/72 [1] from Mr Martens. It would also point out that the price quoted for Gouda and Edam in Leeuwarden has risen since then by Fl 15 per 100 kg.

5. This was due to an error in translation.

[1] See p. 33 of this Official Journal.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 589/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(31 January 1973)

Subject: Internal levies on grain in France

1. Further to its reply to Written Question No 382/72 [1] concerning internal levies on grain in France, can the Commission indicate the reason for the excessively long duration of its study of the compatibility of levies of this kind with the rules of the common market?

2. Is there a direct or indirect relationship between the general attitude of the Member State concerned to the European Communities and the possible hesitation of the Commission or one or more of its departments to consider this matter with the same vigour as it has approached, eg the rules on competition laid down in the EEC Treaty?

---

[1] OJ No C 138, 31. 12. 1972, p. 69.

Answer

(19 July 1973)

1 and 2. As the Commission, when examining the activities of the Mutual Aid Fund of cereal growers and stock rearers in France, was faced with complex problems, it was obliged to carry out a detailed study. This, together with the acute shortage of personnel within the services responsible for examining the aids granted, was the reason for the delay in this aid case. The Commission will not fail to make known its position regarding the activities of the Fund and hopes, moreover, to be able shortly to make up for the lack of staff by assigning additional qualified personnel to the services concerned.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 668/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 February 1973)

Subject: Inquiry into Dutch measures in the shrimp fishery sector

In its answer of 7 July 1971 to Written Question No 62/71 [1] on the Dutch measures in the shrimp fishery sector, the Commission stated that it was studying these measures and would inform the questioner of its findings.

Now that 18 months have elapsed, can't this statement now be expected soon?

---

[1] OJ No C 74, 24. 7. 1971, p. 10.

Answer

(12 July 1973)

The first of the two measures in aid of the shrimp-fishing industry instituted by the Netherlands led to the procedure provided for in Article 93 (2) of the EEC Treaty being initiated: it was shelved, however, on 21 February 1973, in view of the undertaking given by the Netherlands Government not to extend the period of the said aid.

As regards the second measure, the Commission has called the attention of the Netherlands authorities to the fact that, subject to observation of Community quality standards, the aids in question could, in the absence of any specific Community rules, be provisionally based on the provisions of Articles 9 and 10 of Council Regulation (EEC) 2141/70 [1] of 20 October 1970 laying down a common structural policy for the fishing industry.

---

[1] OJ No L 236, 27. 10. 1970, p. 1.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 710/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 March 1973)

Subject: Enquiry into marketing agreements between producers in Europe, Japan and America

Further to its answer to Written Question No 387/72 [1] concerning marketing agreements between producers in Europe, Japan and America, can the Commission state how far it has progressed with its enquiry into these agreements and what conclusions it has reached?

---

[1] OJ No C 138, 31. 12. 1972, p. 68.

Answer

(12 July 1973)

As the Commission stated in its answer to Written Question No 378/72, enquiries have been made in various sectors in order to check whether marketing agreements have in fact been made between European, Japanese and, possibly, American producers.

Although these checks have still not been completed and therefore the Commission cannot give its conclusions, the following details can now be given:

(a) *as regards synthetic fibres*, there was a marketing agreement between Japanese and European producers. It was prohibited by the Japanese Government on 27 December 1972.

(b) *as regards black and white television sets*, the Japanese industry has applied a certain degree of self-control by fixing minimum prices for exports to Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom; these measures do not apply to Germany, nor to France, where Japanese imports are still subject to a quota system.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 714/72

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(15 March 1973)

Subject: Irradiated foodstuffs

1. Does the Commission share the view of Dr D. de Zeeuw, Director of the Dutch ITAL (Institute for the Use of Atomic Energy in Agriculture) in Wageningen, that studies of the permissibility of irradiating foodstuffs should not be conducted in the same way as research into other methods of increasing the keeping qualities of foodstuffs, such as chemical additions, super-heating or smoking, considering that in the case of radiation the whole process should be investigated, so that the admissibility of irradiated products no longer need be made dependent on an investigation into the individual product [1]?

2. If the Commission shares this view, or regards it as of sufficient importance to be further looked into, how does it intend to encourage the coordination of this method of investigation with the Community?

---

[1] See article 'Proefbedrijf Voedselbestraling, een nieuw ontwikkelingsstadium' in the Dutch journal 'Atoomenergie en haar toepassingen', February 1973, p. 47.

Answer

(12 July 1973)

1. The Commission recognizes that the research route advocated by Dr D. de Zeeuw for examining irradiated products could be used to provide proof of the edibility and innoxious nature of irradiated foodstuffs, and to examine their acceptability.

The Commission considers, however, that as knowledge of the edibility and innoxious nature of irradiated foodstuffs now stands, it would be premature to pursue only this approach.

In the consumer's interests, therefore, it has reservations about a radical change in authorization procedures, which at present consist of specifying treatment limits for each product (eg absorbed doses).

2. The Commission, in close conjunction with the IAEA-NEA (OECD) International Project, with which the majority of the Member States and the Commission are associated observers (the latter with status), is participating in a research programme on this subject under the Euratom-Ital Association, of which Dr D. de Zeeuw is Director.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 12/73

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 March 1973)

Subject: Draft recommendation of certain measures concerning ownership of real estate

What has happened to the Commission's draft recommendation of certain measures concerning the ownership of real estate, which the Commission considers necessary for a succesful reform of agricultural structures? The Commission announced this draft recommendation for the first time in its answer on 5 October 1971 to Written Question No 116/71 [1], and referred to it again in its answer to Written Questions Nos 406/71 [2] and 552/71 [3] (the last question was put by Mr Biaggi and Mr Hougardy).

---

[1] OJ No C 108, 26. 10. 1971, p. 2.
[2] OJ No C 21, 3. 3. 1972, p. 7.
[3] OJ No C 73, 7. 7. 1972, p. 1.

Answer

(12 July 1973)

The Commission hopes to submit to the Council as soon as possible a draft recommendation not on land ownership but on long-term leases. The Commission remains of the opinion that, in many regions of the Community, the possibility of having recourse to this form of farming will become very valuable if not essential if the agricultural sector is to bring the process of the modernization of the structures to a successful conclusion.

Before drawing up such a draft, the Commission considers it necessary to acquire further knowledge of the situation regarding the tenure of agricultural land in the new Member States of the Community.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 14/73

by Mr Noè

to the Commission of the European Communities

(23 March 1973)

Subject: Rice supplies to the countries in the north of the Community

The Commission is requested to give a written answer to the following questions:

1. Why does the bulk of the supply of rice to the northern countries of the Community come from non-member States and not from Italy, the Community's principal rice producer?
2. To what extent is the importation of rice from non-Member States based on considerations of quality and to what extent on other grounds?
3. Does the Commission not feel that the Community preference for rice should be improved?

Answer

(19 July 1973)

As far as rice supplies to the northern countries of the Community are concerned, a distinction must be made between imported round-grained and long-grained rice.

The bulk of the supply of round-grained rice to the northern countries of the Community comes from Italy, which accounts for 80 to 90% of requirements, depending on the size of the harvest. Round-grained Italian rice can be classed among the most highly regarded types in the World.

However, the long-grained rice grown in Italy does not seem to be to the taste of consumers in the north of the Community, who prefer the so-called 'hard-cooking' rice grown in sub-tropical regions (USA, Thailand and Madagascar).

The research carried out in France and Italy into producing a rice possessing the characteristics sought after by the consumer has yielded encouraging results. However, the quantities currently produced ('Delta' rice in France, 'Italpatna' in Italy, and several varieties still at the experimental stage in Italy) are as yet insufficient to make any noticeable difference to supplies on the markets in question. Imports of long-grained rice from non-member countries into the north of the Community thus seem to be conditioned by criteria relating to quality.

The amount of preference currently accorded is considered sufficient at the moment.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 23/73

by Mr Cousté

to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 March 1973)

Subject: Difficulties in agricultural policy caused by floating currencies

As a result of the series of international currency crises and of the fact that three Community currencies are now floating, the countervailing currency measures decreed on an administrative basis by the agricultural departments of the European Commission have become extremely complex owing to the number of combinations that can be formed with the unit of account and the current value of each of the seven currencies in the nine Member States.

International and intra-Community trade in agricultural products is threatened with paralysis because this monetary insecurity and complexity creates risks hardly compatible with normal trading conditions.

Under theses circumstances, I would ask the Commission if the time has not come to recognize that the common agricultural policy is heading for increasing difficulties, if not a breakdown, unless the currency obstacles are removed immediately.

Surely the solution would be to put into circulation a genuine European currency made convertible for this purpose into gold at a suitable rate?

Answer

(19 July 1973)

The Commission does indeed consider that the series of events in the monetary sphere in recent times has endangered the common market in the agricultural sector. Compensatory machinery has been set up, and, while it is not possible to say that this compensatory machinery means the 'breakdown' of the common agricultural policy, it must still be recognized that this system is complex and does create considerable problems.

Thus, following the Decision on the joint float of the currencies of the majority of the Member States, a positive step on the road to economic and monetary union, the Commission sought for means of improving the situation on the agricultural market and presented relevant proposals to the Council. The Council took specific decisions in this field permitting a simplification of the system and, in certain cases, a reduction of compensation at the frontiers. The Commission does not, however, consider it advisable to introduce a monetary reform of the kind proposed by the Honourable Member solely to alleviate the difficulties inherent in the common agricultural policy. The preparation of a reform of this nature presupposes that certain conditions are fulfilled, which, at the present time, is not the case, and the consequences of its implementation would go far beyond the agricultural sector. Lastly, it is not certain that a reform of this nature would be the best solution to current problems, whether in this sector or in the other sectors of economic activity.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 29/73

by Mr Girardin and Mr Pisoni

to the Commission of the European Communities

(28 March 1973)

Subject: Emigrants' rights

Article 8 (i) of Council Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 [1] of 15 October 1968 on freedom of movement of workers within the Community lays down that migrants shall enjoy, amongst other things, equality of treatment as regards membership of trade unions and the exercise of rights attaching thereto, including the right to vote, and the right of eligibility for workers' representative bodies in the undertaking. They may, however, be excluded from taking part in the management of bodies governed by public law and from holding an office governed by public law.

The second paragraph of the same Article provides that the Commission shall, within not more than two years, submit proposals to the Council for a review of Article 8.

As more than four years have passed since Council Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68 came into force, would the Commission say what experience has so far been gained in applying Article 8, and why it has not considered it opportune to submit proposals for reviewing and supplementing this Article?

[1] OJ No L 257, 19. 10. 1968, p. 2.

Answer

(12 July 1973)

In replying to the Honourable Members' question, it is necessary to distinguish between the legal and actual positions.

The Commission does not know of any discrimination in the laws of the Member States, in view of the present wording of Article 8 of Regulation (EEC) No 1612/68, which provides for restrictions on participation in the management of bodies and tenure of offices governed by public law.

As regards the actual position, the Commission does not at present have enough information on which to base an Opinion. The enquiry into the living and working conditions of migrant workers decided upon at the Council meeting on 9 November 1972 should provide information on which to base a reply on this subject.

The Council has decided to revise Article 8 of the above Regulation with a view to removing the said restrictions, but the enquiry carried out by the Commission in this field in the last few years has shown that the large number and very varied nature of the bodies governed by public law, in each Member State, on which workers' representatives sit, raise exceptionally complex problems not confined to legal matters alone.

Furthermore, the recent accession to the Community of the three new Member States makes it necessary to widen the scope of that enquiry before the Commission can make any proposal to the Council for the revision of Article 8.

The Commission, therefore, plans to give the Honourable Members further information when this further enquiry is completed.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 44/73

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(5 April 1973)

Subject: Veterinary agreement between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia

1. Has the Commission taken note of the letter and accompanying explanatory note from the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs to the President of the Dutch Second Chamber concerning the veterinary Agreement concluded on 4 July 1972 in Prague between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia (Parliamentary record 12310, No 1)?

2. Can the Commission fully endorse the Dutch Government's statement concerning the EEC aspects of this Agreement?

3. Did the Commission take note of the Dutch Government's statement that the EEC member France had already concluded a similar agreement with Czechoslovakia and that this Agreement in fact served as a model for the Dutch-Czech Agreement?

4. Does the Commission not feel that it would be more logical and more in the Community spirit if it were to draw up the blueprint for such agreements itself or at least make certain recommendations?

Answer

(19 July 1973)

1. Yes.

2 to 4. A number of agreements on health questions have been concluded in the past between Member States and other countries. Under Article 34 of the Council Directive [1] of 12 December 1972 on health and veterinary inspection problems upon importation of bovine animals and swine and fresh meat from third countries (72/462/EEC), this Directive shall not affect the rights and obligations resulting from health agreements concluded between one or more Member States and one or more non-Member States before the date on which this Directive is adopted. To the extent that these agreements are not compatible with this Directive, the Member State or States concerned shall avail themselves of all appropriate means to remove the incompatibilities noted.

The agreement concluded between the Netherlands and Czechoslovakia, similarly to that concluded between Czechoslovakia and France, and all other arrangements of this kind, stem from this provision, implementation of which will in due course lead to any incompatibilities being tracked down and eliminated.

On the expiry of the deadlines prescribed in Articles 32 and 33 of the Directive for its implementation, imports of bovine animals and swine and fresh meat from third countries will be subject to Community health Regulations.

---

[1] OJ No L 302, 31. 12. 1972, p. 28.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 53/73

by Lord O'Hagan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 April 1973)

Subject: Pollution on beaches

What plans have the Commission to reduce pollution on the beaches of the maritime member countries of the Community?

Answer

(12 July 1973)

The fight against pollution on beaches is primarily a task for the competent authorities of the Member States and those who discharge sewage, who are responsible for its treatment.

The measures to be taken on a Community level in this field are to a large extent akin to those relating to the pollution of fresh waters.

The Commission therefore, in its Action Programme for the environment forwarded to the Council on 17 April 1973, proposed to the Council:

(a) to assess the risks incurred by the marine environment through the presence of certain pollutants;

(b) to draw up common methods to enable quality objectives to be defined regarding these pollutants in relation to certain specific uses of seawater;

(c) to establish hygiene standards and minimum ecological standards for pollutants of the sea and thence to decide on the measures to be taken as regards the discharge of these pollutants into the sea;

(d) to implement a research programme, taking into account work carried out elsewhere.

The Commission has proposed to the Council a study of the measures to be taken with a view to supervising the disposal of industrial waste that is discharged directly into the sea. This work involves:

(a) collecting information on the nature, control and surveillance of this type of pollution;

(b) listing and carrying out a critical comparative study of the legal provisions in force or envisaged in this field, with a view to their harmonization, and if necessary, the preparation of Community measures;

(c) studying the particular problems posed by the handling of toxic substances along the coasts.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 5573

by Mr Cousté

to the Commission of the European Communities

(12 April 1973)

Subject: Progress with consultations on tax measures applied in the United States

Could the Council state what progress has been made with the consultations which, pursuant to Article XXIII, Section 2 of GATT, have been entered into on the subject of certain tax measures applied by the United States (DISC — Domestic International Sales Corporation)?

Answer

(18 July 1973)

The Council would remind the Honourable Member that following the Council Decision to hold consultations, it is up to the Commission to take the necessary steps to set the GATT multilateral consultation procedure in motion.

As far as the Council is aware, the Commission, on 24 April 1973, sent the GATT authorities notification to set this procedure in motion. It is then the responsibility of these authorities to settle the details in accordance with the provisions of Article XXIII (2) of the General Agreement.

The Council is able to state that this matter was the subject of a preliminary discussion during the GATT Council meeting of 29 May 1973. It is expected to continue this discussion at the next GATT Council meeting.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 58/73

by Mr Lefèbvre

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1973)

Subject: Implementation of Regulation (EEC) No 458/73 on the provisions applicable to sugar produced in excess of the maximum quota

Commission Regulation (EEC) No 458/73 [1] of 2 February 1973 amends certain provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 2645/70 [2], with retroactive effect from 1 January 1971.

The recitals of Regulation (EEC) No 458/73 include the statement that the provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 2645/70 have proved 'too strict and have imposed unforeseeable constraints on certain sugar producers'.

Can the Commission indicate:

— What the constraints referred to above in fact are, and in what way and to whom they were 'unforeseeable'?

— The reasons for:

(a) a two-year delay between the promulgation of Regulation (EEC) No 2645/70 and its amendment by Regulation (EEC) No 458/73?

(b) the implementation of Regulation (EEC) No 458/73 with 25 months' retroactive effect?

— What amounts should have been collected pursuant to Regulation (EEC) No 2645/70 for the period from 1 January 1971 to 31 December 1972?

— How these amounts were distributed for each of the enterprises concerned?

— Whether the amounts collected in this manner should have been deducted from the Community sugar marketing charges or the production levy paid by all sugar producers in the EEC?

— Whether it considers that such ill-conceived legislation could be avoided in the future by sufficiently extensive prior consultation of the professional organizations concerned?

[1] OJ No L 53, 26. 2. 1973, p. 16.
[2] OJ No L 283, 29. 12. 1970, p. 48.

Answer

(12 July 1973)

Regulation (EEC) No 2645/70 sets out the provisions applicable to sugar produced in excess of the maximum quota which, in accordance with Article 25 of Regulation No 1009/67/EEC [1] must be exported in the natural state without refund not later than 1 January following the end of the relevant sugar marketing year, except where the said quota is carried over to the next marketing year.

Regulation (EEC) No 2645/70 included in particular, provisions requiring that proof be furnished that the sugar in question had been exported, subject to the requirements stipulated, one of which was that the exported sugar must have been produced by the manufacturer concerned. In the absence of proof to this effect, the Regulation required the payment of a charge equal to the highest levy plus 1 unit of account. The amount payable in the event of non-exportation was fixed at a level which, in the event of actual disposal on the Community market, raised the price of the product to a level comparable to that of sugar imported from third countries.

The Commission became aware of a case involving some 20 000 metric tons, which occurred during the period immediately following the entry into force of the aforementioned Regulation (EEC) No 2645/70 in which a Community undertaking failed to comply with the requirement that exported sugar be from its own production, and exported to third countries sugar produced by another manufacturer, without any refund or other Community intervention. Needless-to-say, the sum to be paid, which amounted to

[1] OJ No 308, 18. 12. 1967, p. 1.

some 17·5 units of account per 100 kg was excessive in the case in point, although it would have been warranted in a case involving disposal on the Community market. In view of this, the Commission has attempted to find a solution by restoring to all concerned the right to substitute sugar produced by another manufacturer for their own, upon payment of a flat-rate amount not less than the profits likely to accrue from such substitution.

At all events, the amending of Regulation (EEC) No 2645/70, and the consequent waiving of the collection of the sums originally provided for, have in no way affected the calculation of the production levy paid by the manufacturers of sugar produced within the basic quota and maximum quota bracket.

For the reasons set out above the Commission considers that the regulations referred to by the Honourable Member were not erratic. It takes the view, moreover, that consultations with professional circles are conducted in a satisfactory manner, notably within the Advisory Committee on Sugar.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 62/73

by Mr Jahn

to the Commission of the European Communities

(17 April 1973)

Subject: Supply of information to the European Parliament on a comparative study of the laws governing water supplies

On 19 November 1970, Commissioner Spinelli, speaking in a debate on the protection of water resources, made the following statement (1):

> 'The Commission takes note of Parliament's understandable wish to be informed about the comparative study of the laws governing water supplies in the Member States and the possibility of coordinating them, undertaken by Professor Jürgen Salzwedel, Director of the Institut für das Recht der Wasserwirtschaft at Bonn University. It has not been possible as yet to issue a statement on this matter, since the Commission itself has not formed a clear opinion of the content and conclusions of this study. A number of legal questions remain to be examined, and the Commission has asked for further elucidation. However, I am able to inform Parliament that a first meeting with experts from the countries concerned is to be held in the very near future with a view to considering the conclusions drawn from this study and working out a programme of action. The Commission will of course keep Parliament informed of further developments.'

On the same subject, the Commission gave the following reply to Written Question No 17/71 (2) by Mr Boersma on 9 July 1971:

> 'As explained by the Commission's representative during the debate in the plenary session of the European Parliament on 19 November 1970, further elucidation proved necessary, because a number of legal points still had to be examined. Consequently it has not yet been possible to submit the study in question either to the Community bodies or to experts from the Member States.'

Since a further two years have now elapsed without the Commission's responding to Parliament's legitimate wish to be informed, I would ask the Commission to answer the following questions:

1. In what way has Parliament been kept informed in the meantime of developments in this area?

2. What was the outcome of the joint examination by the Commission and experts from the Member States of the conclusions of this study?

3. How does the Commission explain the contradiction between Mr Spinelli's statement about a joint examination of the conclusions drawn from this study, by the Commission and experts from the Member States, and the reply given by the Commission six months later, to the effect that 'it has not yet been possible to submit the study in question either to the Community bodies or to experts from the Member States'?

4. What, in the Commission's view, are the obstacles that continue to prevent Professor Salzwedel's study from being submitted to the European Parliament?

5. When does the Commission think it will be able to meet its promise, given two years ago, to inform Parliament about the study?

(1) Debates of the European Parliament, No 130 of November 1970, p. 169.
(2) OJ No C 74, 24. 7. 1971, p. 3.

Answer

(12 July 1973)

1 to 5. Since a number of problems had not been dealt with in sufficient depth in Professor Salzwedel's first study, he forwarded to the Commission in December 1972 a provisional version of his supplementary report, and proposed to supply the final version of his study within a very short time.

Therefore the Commission has not yet forwarded this study to the Community Institutions nor to the experts from the Member States, but is fully prepared to discuss the problems in question with the European Parliament's competent Committee.

3. The Commission sees no contradiction between its answer to Written Question No 17/71 and Mr Spinelli's statement, as Mr Spinelli referred to a meeting with experts from countries concerned which was to take place when Professor Slazwedel's study was completed.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 79/73

by Mr Vredeling

to the Council of the European Communities

(25 April 1973)

Subject: Administration of Community tariff quotas

Further to its answer to Written Question No 282/71 [1], concerning divergent references to Treaty Articles in texts of Regulations relating to the administration of Community tariff quotas, can the Council indicate whether it has decided on a policy in respect of problems connected with the delimitation of the area of application of various Articles of the EEC Treaty (Articles 28, 43, 113 and 235) as the legal basis for the opening and administration of Community tariff quotas?

---

[1] OJ No C 123, 15. 12. 1971, p. 3.

Answer

(18 July 1973)

The Council is awaiting the Opinion of the European Parliament on the proposal for a Regulation on the procedure for the alteration and suspension of customs duties in respect of agricultural products subject to the common organization of the markets, which it requested on 29 February 1972.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 80/73

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 April 1973)

Subject: Agreement of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States

1. Why is it explicitly stated in the Agreement [1] of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting in Council, of 5 March 1973, on information for the Commission and for the Member States with a view to possible harmonization throughout the Communities of urgent measures concerning the protection of the environment, that this Agreement is a gentlemen's agreement?

2. Why is this not explicitly stated in the Agreement [2] of 5 March 1973 amending the Agreement of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting in Council, of 28 May 1968 concerning standstill and information for the Commission?

3. Why is the content of this type of Agreement not established by the Council on the basis of Article 235 of the EEC Treaty, as was agreed at the Paris Summit Conference?

---

[1] OJ No C 9, 15. 3. 1973, p. 1.
[2] Idem, p. 3.

Answer

(19 July 1973)

1 and 2. The Agreement [1] of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting in the Council of 28 May 1969 concerning standstill and information for the Commission stipulates, in a footnote to page 9 of Official Journal No C 76 of 17 June 1969, that it is a 'gentlemen's agreement'. It is for reasons of consistency therewith that the Agreement of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting in the Council of 5 March 1973 on information for the Commission and for the Member States with a view to possible harmonization throughout the Communities of urgent measures concerning the protection of the environment is also stated to be a 'gentlemen's agreement'.

3. On 5 March 1973, the Council settled provisionally upon the legal form of an Agreement of the Governments of the Member States meeting in the Council, on the understanding that the definitive legal form is to be fixed when the Council adopts the Communities' programme of action in the environmental field. In its proposed programme forwarded to the Council on 17 April 1973, the Commission proposed that the Council should give the Agreement of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States meeting in the Council, of 5 March 1973, the form of a Council Decision, basing the latter proposal on Article 235 of the EEC Treaty in particular.

---

[1] OJ No C 76, 17. 6. 1969, p. 9.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 82/73

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(3 May 1973)

Subject: United Nations Conference on olive oil

1. What results were achieved at the United Nations Conference on olive oil held in Geneva from 19 to 23 March 1973?

2. What positions were adopted by the various producer countries and by the participating consumer countries, among them (the Member States of) the EEC?

Answer

(19 July 1973)

1. The UN Conference on olive oil concluded its business on 23 March 1973 with the adoption of a Protocol of the same date renewing the 1963 International Olive Oil Agreement, with amendments, for a further five-year period commencing 1 January 1974.

2. All States party to the International Olive Oil Agreement were in favour of renewing the 1963 Agreement, with amendments to the text.

As far as the Community is concerned, its representative restricted himself, in the main, to a request for a new general objective to be incorporated into the 1963 Agreement, for the purpose of preventing any unfair competition in the international olive-oil trade.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 86/73

by Lord O'Hagan

to the Council of the European Communities

(3 May 1973)

Subject: Delays in replies to written questions

The Council is asked whether they will publish the following information about replies to written questions:

1. What has been the average length of time, for each of the past five years, between the tabling of a written question and the publishing of the reply to it?

2. What has been the longest period between tabling and reply in each of the five years.

3. What steps the Council is taking to speed up replies?

4. Which five questions tabled in 1972/73 have remained longest without a reply, and how long the delay has been in each case?

Answer

(18 July 1973)

1, 2 and 4. It is not possible for the Council to give the Honourable Member the detailed information requested.

The Council can say, however, that as regards the 1972/73 parliamentary year, its replies to written questions from members of the European Parliament involved, on average, a period of some three and a half months.

3. The Council would ask the Honourable Member to refer to the reply which it made o Written Question No 150/73 [1] in which it stated that it is at present studying the possibility of improving the existing procedure for replying to written questions.

---

[1] OJ No C 64, 6. 8. 1973, p. 25.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 87/73

by Lord O'Hagan

to the Council of the European Communities

(3 May 1973)

Subject: Delegation of Ministers of European Affairs to attend meetings of committees of the European Parliament

To what extent could the Council regularly delegate ministers, state secretaries or under-secretaries of state specializing in the European affairs of the Member States to attend meetings of the committees of the European Parliament at which basic questions of European integration are discussed?

Answer

(18 July 1973)

The Council reminds the Honourable Member that since 1964 it has been taking part in the proceedings of a number of parliamentary committees whenever matters of particular interest are discussed and it has been invited to do so.

With this in mind, and with due regard for the large number of commitments its members have, the Council is always ready to reply to invitations from the European Parliament.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 106/73

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 May 1973)

Subject: Relations between the Community and Greenland and the Faroe Islands

Can the Commission indicate how present and future relations between the Community on the one hand and Greenland and the Faroe Islands on the other hand are or will be regulated?

Answer

(19 July 1973)

The Commission draws the attention of the Honourable Member to Articles 25 to 27 of the Act concerning the Conditions of Accession and the Adjustments to the Treaties and to Protocols Nos 2 and 4 to that Act.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 107/73

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 May 1973)

Subject: Preliminary drafts of a statute for European cooperative undertakings

1. Can the Commission confirm that it has received from Cogeca (General Committee for Agricultural Cooperation within the EEC) and the Euro/Coop preliminary drafts of a statute for European cooperative undertakings [1]?

2. What use does the Commission intend to make of these preliminary drafts?

---

[1] See also the Netherlands Government's answer to the written questions on this subject in the Second Chamber of the States General. Annex to the Proceedings of the Second Chamber, 1971/72 Session, p. 2283.

Answer

(19 July 1973)

1. The Commission can confirm that both of the bodies mentioned by the Honourable Member presented a draft statute for European Cooperatives.

Subsequently, these bodies and the UGAL (Union des groupements d'achat d'alimentation de la CEE/Union of EEC food purchasing groups) informed the Commission of their wish to present a new draft statute combining the two previous versions.

This draft has not been forwarded to the Commission.

2. The Commission intends, first of all, to undertake an evaluation of the economic and legal factors necessitating the creation of a European statute for cooperatives, and with this in mind, is having talks with the business circles involved.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 110/73

by Mr Vredeling

to the Commission of the European Communities

(14 May 1973)

Subject: Community tariff quotas for newsprint and frozen beef

Further to the information given in its answer to Written Question No 511/72 [1] on Community tariff quotas for newsprint and frozen beef, is the Commission prepared to advise the responsible committee(s) of Parliament in good time when the question of these Tariff quotas comes up for discussion again in the Council?

---

[1] See p. 51 of this Official Journal.

Answer

(12 July 1973)

The Commission reminds the Honourable Member that it is always prepared to answer questions raised within Parliamentary Committees about the state of progress of matters before the Council.

The Commission believes that the Council will examine the proposals for regulations on the opening, allocation and administration of these tariff quotas which are to be opened on 1 January 1974, some time during the last quarter of the current year.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 138/73

by Lord O'Hagan and Mr Dich

to the Commission of the European Communities

(25 May 1973)

Subject: Harmonization of dog licences

The Commission is asked when they intend to harmonize dog licences; and if not, why not?

Answer

(19 July 1973)

The Commission does not intend to propose the harmonization of dog licences, which exist in most of the Member States, usually in the form of a local tax.

Under Articles 99 and 100 of the EEC Treaty, the fiscal legislation of Member States has to be harmonized only insofar as this is necessary to ensure the smooth running of the Common Market. This does not appear to be the case here, since these taxes are normally levied on dog owners and thus create no obstacles to free movement of goods or distortion of competition in trade in goods between Member States.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 151/73

by Mr Eisma

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 June 1973)

Subject: Granting of subsidies and imposition of taxes on circuses in Member States

1. Can the Commission give an overall picture of the taxes imposed on, and subsidies granted to, circuses in the various Member States?

2. What steps have already been taken to harmonize these taxes and subsidies in order to guarantee here the free movement of goods, persons, and in this case animals, within the Community?

3. Is the Commission prepared to take further steps to achieve this harmonization as quickly as possible? If so, what are these steps and what is the deadline for taking them?

Answer

(17 July 1973)

The matters raised by the Honourable Member are at present being examined. The Commission will inform the Honourable Member of the results of this examination.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 156/73

by Mr Cousté

to the Commission of the European Communities

(7 June 1973)

Subject: Numbers of customs officials employed in each member country of the Community

Can the Commission state the number of customs officials employed in each of the member countries of the Community?

Can it also state how these numbers have changed since the application of the Treaty of Rome?

Answer

(12 July 1973)

The Commission is at present conducting a survey of the numbers of staff employed in the Member States' customs departments on order to reply to Written Question No 527/72 [1] from Mr Vredeling.

The Commission will certainly reply to this further question on the same subject as soon as it has received the necessary information.

---

[1] OJ No C 17, 4. 4. 1973, p. 8.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 161/73

by Mrs Carettoni Romagnoli

to the Council of the European Communities

(14 June 1973)

Subject: Procedure for answering written questions

Could the Council answer the following questions:

1. Does it have a specialized department in its secretariat for answering written questions from parliamentarians?
2. What is the normal answering procedure?
3. Are questions of a political nature or those considered to be of particular importance drawn to the attention of members of the Council, and, if so, in what manner?
4. Has the Council ever placed any written question which it considered important on its agenda?
5. Is the Council, or at least its president, informed of the answers to written questions before their publication, or can it be assumed that the answers are published independently of the Council?

Answer

(18 July 1973)

1. Yes.

2 to 5. The replies to be given to the written questions put to the Council are prepared by the Council bodies and submitted to the Council for approval.

All questions are included in the agenda of the Council. The Members of the Council take note of the question and the draft reply which is submitted to them.

The reply adopted is then conveyed to the European Parliament, which is responsible for publishing it in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*.

WRITTEN QUESTION No 167/73

by Mr Girardin, Mr Bersani, Mr Noè, Mr Galli and Mr Pisoni

to the Commission of the European Communities

(19 June 1973)

Subject: Publication by a high official of the Commission

1. Is the Commission aware that a book entitled 'Da un Europa all'altra' and written by a high official of the Commission of the European Communities has been published in Italy, and deals above all with the positions Italy is supposed to have adopted in regard to European unification?

2. Did the Commission authorize the official in question to publish a work of this kind?

3. Does the Commission share the views put forward in this book which are, objectively speaking, injurious to one of the Member States.

4. What position has the Commission adopted, or what position does it intend to adopt, now that the publication in question has been brought to its attention?

Answer

(18 July 1973)

1. Yes.

2. The President of the Commission, who in a case such as this is the competent authority, in accordance with the Commission Decision of 26 February 1971 on the exercise of the powers vested by the Staff Regulations of Officials in the appointing authority, authorized the publication of this book on 21 December 1972.

3 and 4. The opinions or information contained in the work in question were given on the sole responsibility of the author and are in no way binding on the Commission; this is expressly stated by the author at the end of the preface (p. 23 of the book).
