

# Official Journal

## of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6986

C 327

Volume 25

13 December 1982

English edition

## Information and Notices

---

### Contents

### I Information

#### European Parliament

##### *Written Questions with answer*

No 565/82 by Mr Van Miert to the Commission Subject: Indexing wages and salaries .....	1
No 820/82 by Mr Moreland, Mr Turner and Mr Howell to the Commission Subject: Port State legislation .....	2
No 857/82 by Mr Mertens to the Commission Subject: Burning of waste oil .....	3
No 883/82 by Mr Damette to the Commission Subject: Net transfers from Member States to the Community budget (net balance of contributions and payments received) .....	3
No 884/82 by Mr Key to the Commission Subject: Environmental health — Food hygiene and inspection .....	4
No 914/82 by Mrs Théobald-Paoli to the Commission Subject: Vein-mining in the Community .....	5
No 926/82 by Mr Key to the Commission Subject: Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats .....	5
No 931/82 by Mr Schmid to the Commission Subject: Factors limiting investment by households and small consumers in the rational use of energy .....	6
No 946/82 by Mr Galland to the Commission Subject: Coordination of energy policy with economic and social policies .....	7
No 967/82 by Sir John Stewart-Clark to the Commission Subject: Aid for fish-farming in the Community .....	7

## Contents (continued)

No 987/82 by Mr Cousté to the Commission	
Subject: New approach to the negotiation of Lomé III .....	8
No 1007/82 by Mr Kirk to the Commission	
Subject: Hearing of local authorities on applications for Community aid .....	8
No 1009/82 by Mrs Van Hemeldonck to the Commission	
Subject: Protection of woodcock .....	9
No 1010/82 by Mr Provan to the Commission	
Subject: Copper in animal feedingstuffs .....	9
No 1021/82 by Mr Eisma to the Commission	
Subject: International Rhine Commission .....	10
No 1024/82 by Mr Michel to the Commission	
Subject: Dangerous cosmetics .....	10
No 1031/82 by Mrs Hoffmann to the Commission	
Subject: Balance between supply and demand in iron and steel products in each country in 1980 and 1985 .....	12
No 1034/82 by Mr Glinne to the Commission	
Subject: Vaccination against poliomyelitis .....	13
No 1053/82 by Mrs Hoffmann to the Commission	
Subject: Loans to the steel industry .....	13
No 1069/82 to Mrs Rabbethge to the Commission	
Subject: Development aid budgets of the Member States .....	15
No 1092/82 by Mr Bord to the Commission	
Subject: Development of the internal market .....	16
No 1094/82 by Mr Rogalla to the Commission	
Subject: EEC driving licence .....	16
No 1098/82 by Mr Welsh to the Commission	
Subject: Rates of VAT on tourist services .....	16
No 1099/82 by Mr Provan to the Commission	
Subject: Notices of contracts published in the Official Journal in accordance with Direc- tive 80/767/EEC .....	17
No 1122/82 by Mr Seefeld to the Commission	
Subject: Railway policy in Belgium .....	18
No 1124/82 by Mr Penders to the Commission	
Subject: Aid to Lebanon .....	19
No 1140/82 by Mr Bonde to the Commission	
Subject: Purchases of meat in Sweden by Danish housewives .....	19
No 1147/82 by Mr Bonde to the Commission	
Subject: Limits on the amount of sugar travellers may bring into Denmark duty-free .....	19

Contents (continued)		
No 1151/82 by Mr Bonde to the Commission		
Subject: The training of rangers and bird-counting in Denmark .....		20
No 1158/82 by Mr Boyes to the Commission		
Subject: Chicken debeaking .....		20
No 1159/82 by Mr Cluskey to the Commission		
Subject: Sources of beef provided in Commission's staff canteen .....		20
No 1161/82 by Mr Wettig to the Commission		
Subject: Use of fruit and vegetables purchased by intervention agencies .....		21
No 1170/82 by Mr Beyer de Ryke to the Council		
Subject: Creation of a European Court for terrorists .....		21
No 1171/82 by Mr Cousté to the Commission		
Subject: The use of the term 'blend' in the description 'blend of wines from different countries of the European Community' for table wines resulting from coupage of products originating in more than one Member State of the Community .....		22
No 1181/82 by Mr Bonde to the Commission		
Subject: External negotiating powers .....		23
No 1201/82 by Mr Bonde to the Commission		
Subject: Article 235 of the Treaty of Rome .....		23
No 1225/82 by Mrs Maij-Weggen to the Commission		
Subject: Unemployment statistics .....		24
No 1254/82 by Mr Diana to the Commission		
Subject: European Council's mandate to the Commission on national aids to agriculture ..		25
No 1258/82 by Mrs van den Heuvel to the Commission		
Subject: Proceedings against Miss Lehmann in the Federal Republic of Germany .....		25
No 1264/82 by Mr Almirante to the Commission		
Subject: Directive on the education of the children of migrant workers .....		25
No 1265/82 by Mr Almirante to the Commission		
Subject: Participation by migrants in the next European elections .....		26
No 1291/82 by Mr Galland to the Commission		
Subject: Siberian gas .....		26
No 1309/82 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission		
Subject: Proceedings against pulp producers .....		26
No 1339/82 by Mr Cousté to the Commission		
Subject: Commission answers to members of the European Parliament .....		27

## I

*(Information)*

## EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

## WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 565/82****by Mr Van Miert****to the Commission of the European Communities***(1 June 1982)**Subject: Indexing wages and salaries*

The Finance Ministers instructed the Commission at the end of April to pursue its studies into the automatic linking of wages and salaries to consumer prices. It was to make all the 'necessary contacts' and take account of what had been done in the Member States since the recommendation issued last year and, in the case of Belgium, since 22 July 1981.

1. What does the Commission understand by 'necessary contacts'?
2. Will the Commission actually consult the two sides of industry and all appropriate bodies before presenting specific proposals to the Council in connection with indexation as its spokesman declared on 10 September 1981?
3. What are the Commission's views on the way in which the Belgian Government has implemented its communication to the Council on the principles of indexation in the Community, given that the spokesman also stated on 10 September 1981 that this was merely intended to promote discussion?
4. What steps does the Commission propose to take to intensify the dialogue between the two sides of industry as announced by the President of the Council in his action programme for the first six months of 1982?
5. Will the Commission also answer properly all the points raised in my Written Questions

No 865/81 <sup>(1)</sup> concerning sacrifices by members of the Commission and No 866/81 <sup>(2)</sup> concerning the recommendation to Belgium, as requested yet again in my Written Question No 50/82 <sup>(3)</sup>?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 309, 30. 11. 1981, p. 17.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 323, 10. 12. 1981, p. 6.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No C 167, 5. 7. 1982, p. 16.

**Answer given by Mr Ortoli  
on behalf of the Commission***(12 November 1982)*

1. By 'necessary contacts' the Commission understands all contacts that might usefully contribute to the work which the Council at its meeting on 26 April 1982 asked the Commission to continue, in due course, on all the problems raised in the communication of 23 July 1981 on the principles of indexation in the Community <sup>(1)</sup>.
2. The Commission reaffirms its belief that consultations with the two sides of industry are necessary if any action on indexation is to succeed. It therefore proposes, before continuing its work in this area, to carry out such consultations, within the appropriate Community bodies or thorough bilateral contacts.
3. The Commission considers that the recovery measures taken by the Belgian Government at the beginning of 1982, in connection with the devaluation of the Belgian franc within the EMS, are in line with the principles set out in its communication of 23 July 1981 on indexation and included in the recommendation which it had sent the previous day

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. COM(81) 457 final.

to the Kingdom of Belgium<sup>(2)</sup> pursuant to Article 11 of the Council Decision of 18 February 1974<sup>(3)</sup>.

More generally, the Commission considers that continued discussion on the principles of indexation (discussion which has got under way since July 1981 and which was the main purpose of the communication) is not affected by the developments which have since occurred in this area in the Member States.

4. The Commission intends, by all the means at its disposal, to continue to promote the dialogue between the two sides of industry and to improve its own contacts with them. However, it is ready to examine any suggestion on ways and means of intensifying such dialogue and such contacts.

The Commission would remind the Honourable Member that, in order to ensure thorough preparation, the next joint Council meeting (Economic and Social Affairs) will be preceded by a meeting of the Standing Committee on Employment, which will thus be able to discuss the various questions on the Council's agenda.

5. The Commission answered the Honourable Member's Written Question No 50/82 on 1 June 1982.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No. L 228, 13. 8. 1981, p. 29.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No L 63, 5. 3. 1974, p. 16.

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 820/82**

**by Mr Moreland, Mr Turner and Mr Howell**  
to the Commission of the European Communities  
(5 July 1982)

*Subject:* Port State legislation

On 26 January 1982, various European maritime states, (including all the Community Member States except Luxembourg), signed a Memorandum of Agreement on port State enforcement.

1. Has, as a consequence of this action, the Commission shelved its proposed Port State Directive and, if so, for what reasons?
2. Is the Commission concerned that Member States may have taken matters into their own hands and restricted Community involvement in this area of sea transport policy?
3. Does the Commission agree that any action taken by the European maritime States should conform with Community law? Has this been

discussed with Member States? Does it consider the action to be in conformity?

4. Will the Commission consider asking the Court of Justice for an opinion under Article 228 of the EEC Treaty as to whether the Memorandum of Agreement (whose contents will perhaps be transformed into a more formal agreement envisaged in 1984) is compatible with EEC law? If not, why not?

#### **Answer given by Mr Contogeorgis on behalf of the Commission**

(9 November 1982)

1. Although the Commission's proposal for a Port State Control Directive<sup>(1)</sup> still formally exists, it has for practical purposes been shelved. Many of its suggestions were in fact incorporated into the Memorandum of Understanding. It should also be noted that the Ministers of the 14 States, when signing the Final Declaration of the Conference on Maritime Safety on 26 January 1982, committed themselves, in the light of the experience gained, to examining 'the benefit of transforming the Memorandum into another form of Agreement established in an appropriate frame'.

2. The purpose of the proposal was to ensure that the Community made a useful contribution to the effective enforcement of international shipping safety and pollution prevention standards in Europe. The Community and the Commission took a significant part in the negotiations and the Commission will participate in the supervisory committee set up under Article 6 of the Memorandum of Understanding. The problem of preventing pollution does not end at the Community frontiers and Community participation in the wider body is in its view a sensible way of dealing with the problem. It is to be noted moreover that, in its resolution of 15 December 1981, the Council indicated that in the light of the decisions taken at the second regional conference it would wish to consider what, if any, further measures may be required within the Community. The Commission would certainly see merit, when the arrangements for implementing the Memorandum of Understanding have been fully elaborated, in translating the obligations of the memorandum into Community law.

3. Yes. Given the special circumstances of maritime transport under the EEC Treaty, the action of Member States in establishing the Memorandum of Agreement, does not appear to be in breach of the Treaty.

4. No.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 192, 30. 7. 1980, p. 8.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 857/82****by Mr Mertens****to the Commission of the European Communities***(8 July 1982)**Subject: Burning of waste oil*

In certain Member States of the European Community and in the Commission, measures are being considered to regulate the burning of waste oil. In at least one Community Member State this has already proved to be a very acceptable option, given the possibility of using specifically designed furnaces, in particular for use where waste oil had accumulated, for example in vehicle repair shops. The benefits are twofold: firstly, the burning of the waste oil provides a means of heating the repair shops, thereby saving energy, and secondly, it is possible to dispose of the waste oil without detriment to the environment.

However, particular difficulties arise in collecting the relatively small amounts of waste oil in predominantly small workshop or garages.

1. Can the Commission say what plans it has to solve the problem of waste oil disposal within the Communities?
2. Is it true that the Commission intends to ban the burning of waste oil at European level?
3. If so, can the Commission state why it wishes to exclude such a non-polluting and energy-saving option?
4. Does the Commission know whether the furnaces specifically manufactured so far to burn waste oil take sufficient account of environmental aspects or whether there is room for further improvement in this respect?

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

*(10 November 1982)*

1. The Community's policy in respect of the disposal and utilization of waste oils is based on Directive 75/439/EEC of 16 June 1975 <sup>(1)</sup>.

2 and 3. A total ban on burning waste oils is not envisaged.

The Commission is simply examining whether further Community rules are needed to prevent air pollution from the burning of waste oils without pre-treatment in non-approved furnaces and to ensure that the toxic residues produced when this method of disposal is used are disposed of as special wastes.

4. Two Member States of the Community completely ban the burning of waste oils. One further Member State has forbidden the burning of waste oils in special furnaces as from 1 October 1981 because they have proved to be unsatisfactory from the environmental viewpoint.

The information available to the Commission suggests that to date no satisfactory solution has been found to the environmental problems which arise particularly as a result of the direct combustion of mixtures of waste oils in small special furnaces.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 883/82****by Mr Damette****to the Commission of the European Communities***(12 July 1982)*

*Subject: Net transfers from Member States to the Community budget (net balance of contributions and payments received)*

Can the Commission give a precise table of these transfers broken down into budgetary chapters?

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

*(9 November 1982)*

With regard to the general question of 'net budget contributions', the Commission would refer the Honourable Member to the answer to Written Question No 1260/81 by Mr Rogalla and Mr Seeler <sup>(1)</sup>. The Commission does not have a table of the kind requested by the Honourable Member in his question and one could not be prepared simply by breaking down the data available. Such a table would have to be based on estimates using predetermined criteria and the results would, by definition, be only approximate. On this point the Honourable Member is referred to the answer to Written Question

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 194, 16. 6. 1975.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 47, 22. 2. 1982.

tion No 1427/81 by Mr Schieler <sup>(2)</sup>. Financing the budget is only one aspect of Community membership; other factors such as the advantages of a single market, public and private capital flows within the Community and the common commercial policy are more difficult to quantify but are even more fundamental to membership.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 138, 1. 6. 1982.

# **WRITTEN QUESTION No 884/82**

**by Mr Key**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(20 July 1982)*

*Subject:* Environmental health — Food hygiene and inspection

1. Given that there is total agreement in all Member countries that food hygiene and inspection should be under the control of a suitably trained and competent officer (in some countries this may be the veterinarian in other countries it will be another officer), is the objective of the Commission to improve food hygiene and not purely to support the claims of one profession over another?

2. In view of the fact that the training and expertise of the environmental health officer has already been recognized by the World Health Organization European office, who recommend that other countries should follow the lead of the United Kingdom by appointing professional advisers who embrace the whole environmental health function (in fact by broadening the base from which expertise is obtained an even greater improvement in hygienic food production is likely to be established), is it not essential to make immediate proposals on the harmonization of non-veterinarian qualifications before such other qualified officers cease to exist in the role for which they have been trained?

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

*(9 November 1982)*

1. It is not Commission policy to interfere with the administrative arrangements of Member States as regards the steps taken to improve food hygiene in their territory, or to interfere in inter-professional domestic relations within Member States.

A problem has arisen in trade between Member States as regards veterinary/environmental health officer control of certain foods of animal origin.

The Commission submitted this question to the study of a group of experts which concluded that the best protection of the consumer would be assured by clearly defining the tasks of each profession — general hygiene control by the environmental health officer — control of meat by the veterinarian. This veterinary responsibility corresponds, moreover, to the practice already recognized at the European and international level.

2. As regards control of the wider field of environmental health for which the environmental health officer in the United Kingdom has been specially established, the Commission is aware of the report of the Consultation of the World Health Organization on the role, functions and Training requirements of 'sanitarians' in Europe. The Commission has already taken positive steps as regards the sector concerned with food of animal origin by proposing that suitable recognition is given to environmental health officers in a Community context for responsibility for sanitary supervision tasks in the sector concerned with poultrymeat and meat products and will extend these steps to the red meat Directive. The other fields listed by the World Health Organization Consultation are:

- water resource management;
- waste management;
- housing;
- epidemiological services;
- air-quality management;
- noise control;
- occupational health;
- protection of the recreational environment;
- control of frontiers, air and seaports and border crossings;
- educational activities;
- radiation health.

The Commission considers that it is not possible to make immediate proposals for harmonization of a single professional qualification covering all of these fields in a Community context, but does not agree that this implies that the profession will cease to exist in the United Kingdom.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 914/82****by Mrs Théobald-Paoli****to the Commission of the European Communities***(20 July 1982)**Subject: Vein-mining in the Community*

Given the shortage of raw materials in the European Community and the resulting drain in foreign currency reserves, it is important for research in this field to be developed in Europe, and no deposit, however small, should be neglected.

However, it appears that too little attention is being devoted to vein-mining, despite the existence of numerous veins and the wide variety of mineral ores contained therein. Extraction, which was being carried out in Europe in Roman times, requires a large workforce, or alternatively the use of sophisticated techniques (e.g., to wash out the minerals) which are available in Europe today.

What measures does the Commission consider possible, perhaps involving the ERDF, to help the regions to stimulate their economy by promoting vein-mining for the extraction of the raw materials most lacking in the Community?

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

*(12 November 1982)*

In 1978 the Community adopted two research and development programmes to reduce its dependence on imported mineral supplies — one on uranium exploration and extraction, the other on non-energy primary raw materials. On 17 May the Council adopted a second raw materials research and development programme which included a sub-programme on metals and mineral substances intended among other things to promote work on vein deposits.

In centuries past, veins and exposed vein beds provided a rich source of base metals. Now they have been worked out, or soon will be. Nevertheless the fact that new vein mines may be opening up soon — for example at Saint-Salvy (Tarn, France) — shows

that these reserves are still considered important. Nowadays, advanced technology and skilled miners are needed to work these deposits systematically and economically — from underground workings if need be.

With this in mind, on 7 July 1982 the Commission sent the Council a communication and a proposal for a Regulation on aid for projects covered by exploration programmes for non-energy raw materials within the territories of the Member States which would be undertaken by mining companies with registered offices in a Community country.

ERDF aid could possibly be awarded in the case of moves aimed at exploiting mines which are considered to be financially sound, are properly defined and which are located in areas which receive national regional aid and which are covered by the ERDF, always assuming that the Member States concerned request the aid. The ERDF could also look into the questions of whether to finance economic and financial feasibility studies on ERDF areas in which the working of vein deposits could constitute an additional source of income and employment.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 926/82****by Mr Key****to the Commission of the European Communities***(22 July 1982)**Subject: Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats*

1. Now that the Commission has ratified on behalf of the Community the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats, how does it propose to:

- (a) ensure Member States comply with the provisions of the Convention?
- (b) collate information and prepare a report on exceptions made to the Convention under Article 9?

2. In funding projects with Community money, does the Community expect that the projects should be financially worthwhile in their own right and would the Community encourage a simple cost-benefit analysis to demonstrate such financial viability?



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

(10 November 1982)

1. In accordance with Article 155 of the EEC Treaty, the Commission will ensure the Community complies with the provisions of the Convention within the limits of the powers vested in it by common rules already in force and by those which come into force as the result of measures adopted by the Council in the future.

The Commission will cooperate closely with the Member States to make this Convention work as well as possible, in particular, by collating on behalf of the Community the information referred to in Article 9 and by preparing the report on exceptions, particularly on the basis of the information it receives in accordance with Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds <sup>(1)</sup>.

2. The Commission assumes that the Honourable Member is referring to projects concerning the protection of the natural environment in certain sensitive areas of Community interest. As with other Community operations concerning the environment, the Commission, when implementing the 1982 budget, adopted a policy of making contributions only to projects of intrinsic benefit from all points of view. It is intending in the near future, moreover, to submit to the Council a proposal for a Regulation on the granting of financial support for Community operations concerning the environment.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 103, 25. 4. 1979.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 931/82**

**by Mr Schmid**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(22 July 1982)

**Subject:** Factors limiting investment by households and small consumers in the rational use of energy

The Commission has produced a document on investment in the rational use of energy.

This document raises the following important questions for the development of a strategy for the introduction of energy-saving measures among small consumers.

1. Does the Commission have any information on the current attitudes of households and small

consumers regarding the profitability of investment in energy-saving measures and on how they foresee trends in energy prices?

2. What information is available about:

- (a) the influence of living and working patterns and consumer habits on the readiness of households and small consumers to invest;
- (b) what they expect in the way of energy savings and return on their investment in energy-saving measures;
- (c) how far they are prepared to compromise as regards the profitability and comfort they expect from such investment?

3. Does the Commission know:

- (a) what are the main channels through which households and small consumers obtain the relevant information;
- (b) how effective these channels are in informing the target groups and in shaping their views on investment in energy saving;
- (c) why even public energy users, who can hardly be said to be short of information, are not investing as much as they should in energy saving?

4. What can be done to improve education and information in this sphere, i.e. what are the obstacles and how can they be overcome?

5. Does the Commission have any information on whether the facilities for financing investment in energy saving are consistent with the other patterns of borrowing by households and small consumers and are they compatible with the current economic situation and the nature of their operating requirements?

What can be done to change the channels and modes of financing and in which specific areas can efficiency be improved?

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

(8 November 1982)

It is difficult to define criteria for the profitability of investment by households since a wide range of relatively subjective individual decisions are involved.

The preference tends to be for investment with short payback times (between three and five years) or small investments which do not require loans. Once

the payback time exceeds five years, households and small consumers begin to doubt the profitability of investment because of the high interest rates.

National and local authorities are in the best position to prepare and disseminate information for private consumers.

A thorough study of the impact of information on investment, the decision-making processes involved and reasons for investing would have to be carried out in order to give a fuller answer to the question put by the Honourable Member.

The Commission will examine in detail and, if necessary, make use of the results of the International Conference on Consumer Behaviour and Energy Policy which was organized by the Foundation for Consumer Research in the Hague and held at Noordwijkerhout in the Netherlands between 26 and 29 September 1982 and in fact discussed these matters.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 946/82

by Mr Galland

to the Commission of the European Communities

(22 July 1982)

*Subject:* Coordination of energy policy with economic and social policies

The Economic and Social Committee has just delivered an opinion in which it maintains that a coherent Community energy strategy cannot be fully effective unless energy policy is closely coordinated with medium and long-term economic and social policies.

Does the Commission not therefore intend to draw up specific proposals for action to this end?

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

(10 November 1982)

The Commission believes that the Community's heavy dependence for its energy supplies on imported oil is among the most important causes of the economic crisis afflicting the Community. The energy strategy it has proposed for the Community, which calls for a rapid reduction in energy dependence, is therefore a necessary condition for the renewal of economic growth and for social progress in the Community.

Changing conditions in energy markets make it necessary *inter alia* to modify the pattern of energy use in industry, to insist on the need for energy to be priced at realistic levels, and to invest in improved energy efficiency. The Commission recognizes that this process of change sometimes involves sacrifices and painful choices. In its proposals on energy policy it has constantly born in mind the need to sustain employment, control inflation, and to protect the least fortunate members of society from the consequences of rapid change.

The Commission wishes in particular to draw the Honourable Member's attention to its recent proposals on investment in the rational use of energy <sup>(1)</sup>; investment of this character is not only among the most important areas for progress towards the Community's energy objectives, but offers the opportunity of job creation in new industries, and of increased economic activity.

(1) Doc. COM(82) 24.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 967/82

by Sir John Stewart-Clark

to the European Communities

(30 July 1982)

*Subject:* Aid for fish-farming in the Community

Would the Commission please give details of any aid available to promote fish-farming within the Community:

In particular:

1. How much aid is potentially available?
2. How much aid was actually given in the last financial year?
3. Which regions of the Community are eligible for such aid, and which, for what reasons, are specifically not?
4. Are any types of fish-farming enterprise specifically excluded from such aid, and for what reasons?
5. Are any species of marine life particularly favoured for aid, and any specifically excluded?
6. Does the Commission envisage any expansion, or contraction, of aid to the fish-farming sector in the future?

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

(10 November 1982)

1, 3, 4 and 5. The terms and conditions of aid from the EAGGF to promote investment in aquaculture (rearing of fish, crustaceans and shellfish) were set out in Regulation (EEC) No 1852/78 <sup>(1)</sup>, which was extended each year, with amendments, up to 1981. On 11 June 1982, the Commission sent to the Council a proposal for a Regulation <sup>(2)</sup> making a total of 30 million ECU available in 1982 for restructuring the inshore fishing industry and supporting aquaculture.

The European Social Fund can also finance training of unemployed persons or persons threatened with redundancy for future employment in fish-farming. Indeed, some training programmes have already been financed, e.g. in Ireland and Scotland. Such programmes rank as part of the Fund's normal operations and there is no special budget heading for aquaculture.

The European Regional Development Fund can contribute to the financing investment in industrial, 'artisan' and service activities already receiving regional aid at national level, and of investment in infrastructure projects covered by regional development programmes. Both types of investment may contribute directly or indirectly to the development of aquaculture.

The European Investment Bank finances public infrastructure and investment in all sectors of the economy.

2. A specific aid totalling 5 047 000 ECU was introduced for 1981 under Regulation (EEC) No 2992/81 amending Regulation (EEC) No 1852/78 <sup>(3)</sup>.

No separate figures are available for the other financial instruments.

6. The Commission has made the development of aquaculture part of a multiannual common measure which is the subject of a proposal for a Regulation presented to the Council in July 1980 <sup>(4)</sup>. Parliament approved this proposal on 19 December 1980.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 211, 1. 8. 1978, p. 30.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 166, 3. 7. 1982, p. 4.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No L 299, 20. 10. 1981, p. 24.

<sup>(4)</sup> OJ No C 243, 22. 9. 1980, p. 5.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 987/82**

**by Mr Cousté**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(6 August 1982)

*Subject:* New approach to the negotiation of Lomé III

Can the Commission provide details of the new approach to the negotiation of Lomé III as regards relations between the EEC and the third world?

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

(10 November 1982)

The Commission has recently submitted a memorandum to the Council and Parliament on Community development policy, describing the broad outlines which the Commission would like to see adopted for the 1980s. The memorandum also specifies the major principles which in the Community's opinion should be followed in negotiating the provisions governing future relations between the Community and the ACP States.

In the light of the outcome of the debate on the memorandum, the Commission will draw up a more specific communication and draft negotiating directives in time for the negotiations, which are due to start on 1 September 1983.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1007/82**

**by Mr Kirk**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(6 August 1982)

*Subject:* Hearing of local authorities on applications for Community aid

The Danish Minister for the Environment has announced that he intends to apply to the Commission for aid for the construction of a reservoir behind the newly-erected dyke on the west coast of South Jutland.

There is widespread opposition to this project among the local authorities in the area.

Before adopting a position on the application from the Ministers for the Environment, will the Com-

mission acquaint itself with the views of the local authorities and take them into account?

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

(12 November 1982)

The Commission has examined the project submitted to it by the Danish Government.

In its opinion, this is a worthwhile project, since it compensates for the loss of a habitat of international importance for a number of threatened species of birds caused by the erection of a dyke required to secure the safety of the local population.

The Commission is aware that the local authorities consulted by the Danish Government expressed a number of reservations, but it is also aware that considerable concern was shown during the planning stage, precisely because the dyke would cause substantial damage to the biotope, and perhaps even its total destruction. Since the project referred to by the Honourable Member is still to be decided upon by the *Folketing*, the Commission considers that the various interests involved will have ample opportunity to put their points of view.

Annex III/2, which lists those species of birds in respect of which trade restrictions can be imposed?

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

(8 November 1982)

The Commission has investigated the biological status and the effects of marketing certain species listed in Annex III, Part 3, to Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds <sup>(1)</sup> and presented a preliminary report to the Committee on the adaption to technical and scientific progress envisaged in the Directive. The conclusions of this report are only provisional, and are being examined in further studies and discussions.

The Commission is at pains to reach a satisfactory solution and will inform the Adaptation Committee in good time to enable the latter to take the requisite steps.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 103, 25. 4. 1979.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 1009/82

by Mrs Van Hemeldonck

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 August 1982)

*Subject:* Protection of woodcock

On 2 April 1979 the Council of the European Communities adopted a Directive on the conservation of wild birds. The Commission was to carry out studies on the biological status, and the effects of marketing on this status, of certain species of birds listed in Annex III/3, including the woodcock, an endangered species, particularly in Belgium.

By 2 December 1980 at the latest, the Commission was to have drawn up a report and presented proposals to the committee referred to in Article 16 of the Directive with a view to the possible inclusion of this species in Annex III/2.

Can the Commission say:

1. whether this study has been completed;
2. if so, what were its findings,
3. whether it is considering transferring the woodcock from Annex III/3 to the Directive to

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 1010/82

by Mr Provan

to the Commission of the European Communities

(6 August 1982)

*Subject:* Copper in animal feedingstuffs

In view of the conclusions of the study on copper in pig feed referred to in the answer to Written Question No 814/77 by Mr Guerlin <sup>(1)</sup> and the conclusions of the EEC workshop on 'Copper in Animal Wastes and Sewage Sludge' held at Bordeaux in October 1980:

1. What additional considerations led the Commission to impose further limitations in the inclusion of copper in animal feedingstuffs, even in Member States where there is a lack of copper both in the soil and in human diets?
2. Will the Commission release their evidence for informed scientific debate?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 98, 24. 4. 1978, p. 3.

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

(10 November 1982)

The restrictions introduced by Commission Directive 82/474/EEC <sup>(1)</sup> on the use of copper in animal feed are based on a favourable opinion expressed by the Member States within the Standing Committee on Animal Nutrition.

The considerations inducing the Commission to introduce further limitations with regard to the addition of copper to feed are the recognition, unchallenged at scientific level, of the toxicity of copper for sheep beyond a certain threshold, and, in the case of pig feed, the need to reduce the scope of national exemptions allowing of high copper contents, in order to protect the environment against an excessive accumulation of copper in soil.

The opinion of the Scientific Committee on the use of copper compounds in feed has been sent to the Member States. In accordance with its usual practice, the Commission will publish this opinion in the fourth series of the reports of the Scientific Committee on Animal Nutrition. It will send this report to Parliament as soon as it is available.

In order to ensure the proper and effective use of sewage sludge in agriculture, the Commission has also included, in its proposal for a Council Directive of 10 September 1982 on the utilization of this sludge <sup>(2)</sup>, a clause restricting copper concentration in sludge and in the soil on which it is spread.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 213, 21. 7. 1982, p. 22.

<sup>(2)</sup> Doc. COM(82) 527.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1021/82**

**by Mr Eisma**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(11 August 1982)

*Subject:* International Rhine Commission

1. What programmes has the International Rhine Commission so far received, from which Member States, in respect of the 'grey' list defined by the Rhine Chemicals Treaty of 1979?

2. When does the International Rhine Commission expect to receive any programmes still awaited, from which countries and in respect of which substances on the 'grey' list?

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

(10 November 1982)

1. The International Rhine Commission — meeting in plenary session on 15 June 1982 in Brussels — has adopted a recommendation on the reduction of pollution by chromium, a substance on the 'grey' list defined by the Convention.

This recommendation is based on the national programmes drawn up by all the riparian States.

2. Other substances, i.e. lead, zinc, nickel and copper, included on list 2, are currently under investigation. It is hoped that the national programmes in respect of these four metals will be drawn up at the beginning of next year.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1024/82**

**by Mr Michel**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(10 August 1982)

*Subject:* Dangerous cosmetics

The Commission has set up a Scientific Committee composed of leading experts on toxicology from the Member States, and has until recently followed its recommendations.

For the first time, however, the Commission has ignored the opinion of the toxicologists it chose to consult, who recommended banning a hair dye which has been shown to be mutagenic and may also cause cancer.

The Commission claims that it decided not to act on the toxicologists' opinion, in order to take account of the interests of the industry concerned. But that opinion was very much in the industry's favour, since it was prepared temporarily to tolerate other

substances on which it stated that the toxicological data were unsatisfactory (so much so that some Member States have had to apply the safeguard clause to comply with Article 3 of the Directive).

1. Since the interests of industrialists have been given precedence over public health requirements, ought not the workers' organizations to have been consulted and account to have been taken of the interests of those who handle these mutagenic substances every day in hairdressing salons?

Why was industry consulted when industrial health representatives of the workers concerned (employed and self-employed hairdressers) were not?

2. In an almost unanimous opinion delivered by the Economic and Social Committee, the Commission's counterpart for social affairs takes the view that the Advisory Committee on Safety, Hygiene and Health protection and Work ought to have been consulted.

Since the Commission has decided not to follow the advice of scientific experts, will it duly engage in these consultations demanded by its social affairs partners?

3. In its Action Programme for Consumers, the Commission recognizes the right of consumers to information. Would it not be right to ensure that substances marketed against the advice of leading scientific authorities were properly labelled? What has happened to the consumer's right to information if hair dyes containing potentially harmful substances cannot be distinguished from those which are safe?
4. Are not manufacturers who discontinue the use of potentially harmful substance likely to suffer from a general loss of public confidence if the composition of products on the market is concealed?
5. The Commission does not intend to ban a substance incriminated by the Scientific Committee because it says such a ban would damage the economic and technical interests of the industry. Does Article 3 of the Directive permit a potentially harmful substance to be marketed simply because it is in the industry's interests to continue to sell the product?

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

(12 November 1982)

1. The objective of Council Directive 76/768/EEC of 27 July 1976 on the approximation of the laws of

the Member States relating to cosmetic products<sup>(1)</sup> is defined on the third recital: it is the safeguarding of public health by means which also take account of economic and technological requirements. The Commission takes care that this objective is adhered to.

With regard to the substance to which the Honourable Member refers, the Commission does not intend to ignore the opinion of the toxicologists; it merely deferred its decision in order to enable the Scientific Committee on Cosmetology to examine the results of fresh studies. (This examination, incidentally, is already taking place.)

Directive 76/768/EEC is based on Article 100 of the EEC Treaty which provides only for consultation of the Economic and Social Committee and the European Parliament.

As far as protection at work is concerned, this is provided for in the action programme of the European Communities on health and safety at work<sup>(2)</sup> and in the Directives deriving from that programme, notably in the framework Directive on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to chemical, physical and biological agents at work<sup>(3)</sup>, followed by the specific Directives.

2. The Commission is aware of the opinion expressed by the Economic and Social Committee at its meeting of 30 June and 1 July 1982, when the Committee considered that consultation of the Advisory Committee on Safety, Hygiene and Health Protection at Work was desirable where the use of certain products is liable to jeopardize the health of the workers concerned.

This opinion is shared by the Commission since it has been applied in the preparation of all the activities on worker protection that are mentioned in point 1.

The European Parliament has not yet delivered its opinion.

- 3 and 4. According to Article 2 of Directive 76/768/EEC, hair dyes which contain substances liable to be injurious to human health when applied under normal conditions of use shall not be placed on the Community market. Consequently, there is no question of their being marketed with appropriate labelling. For this reason the risk of a general loss of public confidence need not be feared.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 262, 27. 9. 1976, p. 169.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 165, 11. 7. 1978.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No L 327, 3. 12. 1980.

5. No. Consequently, the Commission will not fail to take all appropriate measures available to it.

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

(9 November 1982)

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1031/82**

**by Mrs Hoffmann**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(4 August 1982)

*Subject:* Balance between supply and demand in iron and steel products in each country in 1980 and 1985

The Commission recently published figures concerning the balance between supply and demand in iron and steel products in the Community for the years 1980 and 1985. These figures show the maximum necessary production for 1985 (145.4 million tonnes) and the surplus capacities for the same year (27.3 %).

Can the Commission provide a table giving a breakdown of these figures by country (production and maximum possible production — MPP — for 1980, the MPP necessary and MPP forecast for 1985 and the forecast surplus capacity)?

The figures quoted by the Honourable Member concerning the balance between supply and demand in steel products were worked out during the preparation of the general objectives for steel which will be published — often consulting the interested parties, as required by the ECSC Treaty — in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* before the end of the year.

As indicated in the earlier general objectives, the analysis and the forecasts are prepared for the Community as a whole, this being the level at which the balance between supply and demand must be reached.

From figures already published it is, however, possible to assess the gap between actual and possible production in each Member State in 1980, although this is not an indication of balance between supply and demand at national level. The figures currently available for 1985 show only the production capacities reported by the steel companies in the context of the Commission's surveys.

**CRUDE STEEL**

**Production and production potential by Member State**

(million tonnes)

Member State	Actual production 1980	Production potential 1980	Expected production potential 1985
Germany	43.9	66.9	66.6
Belgium	12.3	19.7	19.1
France	23.2	32.5	30.1
Italy	26.5	39.4	39.9
Luxembourg	4.6	6.4	5.9
Netherlands	5.3	8.5	8.6
United Kingdom	11.3	28.0	25.3
Denmark	0.7	1.1	0.9
Ireland	0.0	0.1	0.3
<b>Total EUR 9</b>	<b>127.8</b>	<b>202.5</b>	<b>196.8</b>
Greece	1.2	2.3	3.3
<b>Total EUR 10</b>	<b>129.0</b>	<b>204.8</b>	<b>200.1</b>

Source: ECSC — Commission 'Investment in the Community coal-mining and iron and steel industries — Report on the 1981 survey'.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1034/82****by Mr Glinne****to the Commission of the European Communities***(11 August 1982)***Subject:** Vaccination against poliomyelitis

In which countries of the Community is vaccination against poliomyelitis compulsory?

What percentage of the population has contracted poliomyelitis in each country of the Community?

**Answer given by Mr Richard  
on behalf of the Commission***(10 November 1982)*

According to the information in the Commission's possession, vaccination against poliomyelitis is compulsory in three Member States, i.e. Belgium, France and Italy; in the other countries vaccination is merely recommended.

In this connection, the Commission also refers to its answer to Written Question No 1590/79 by the Honourable Member <sup>(1)</sup>.

As far as the epidemiological statistics are concerned, the numbers of cases reported to the WHO are as follows:

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 140, 10. 6. 1980.

	1977	1978	1979	1980
Belgium	— <sup>(2)</sup>	1	2	—
Denmark	—	0	0	—
Germany <sup>(3)</sup>	24	11	9	6
Greece	—	4	—	—
France	9	27	—	—
Ireland	—	0	—	—
Italy	—	—	3	—
Luxembourg	—	—	—	0 <sup>(1)</sup>
Netherlands	1	67	—	—
United Kingdom <sup>(3)</sup>				
England and Wales	16	3	8	3
Northern Ireland	—	—	—	—
Scotland	—	—	—	—

<sup>(1)</sup> Government statistics for the period 1 August 1981 to 1 August 1982.

<sup>(2)</sup> The dashes indicate no information available.

<sup>(3)</sup> Government statistics.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1053/82****by Mrs Hoffmann****to the Commission of the European Communities***(13 August 1982)***Subject:** Loans to the steel industry

Can the Commission give a table of figures showing loans to the steel industry for conversion (Article 56) and for restructuring (Article 54) from 1974 to 1981?

**Answer given by Mr Ortoli  
on behalf of the Commission***(11 November 1982)*

The information requested by the Honourable Member regarding loans under Articles 54 and 56 of the ECSC Treaty is set out in the following tables.



**1. Total Article 54 loans to steel industry (million ECU, 31. 12. 1981 rates)**

	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
Belgium	—	44.515	53.544	14.430	—	—	—	—	94.489
Denmark	—	25.515	—	—	16.587	—	4.500	—	46.602
Germany	106.999	147.402	162.347	27.410	46.025	116.308	95.966	45.745	748.202
Greece	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
France	94.838	125.931	90.160	121.713	67.289	67.512	122.758	76.930	767.131
Ireland	—	—	—	—	—	18.430	—	10.965	29.395
Italy	74.975	188.726	103.347	192.307	132.897	106.863	147.649	90.073	1 036.837
Luxembourg	—	0.719	—	—	70.628	15.280	66.022	—	152.629
Netherlands	—	29.773	47.474	—	42.488	—	—	—	119.735
United Kingdom	19.306	94.993	347.771	176.840	11.307	13.823	4.239	—	668.279
Community	296.118	657.574	786.643	532.700	387.221	338.216	441.134	223.713	3 663.319
Other	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.955	—	6.955
Total	296.118	657.574	786.643	532.700	387.221	338.216	448.089	223.713	3 670.274

**2. For restructuring**

	1974 to 1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
Denmark	—	—	—	4.500	—	4.500
Germany	—	16.364	31.092	91.875	14.319	153.650
France	—	41.837	—	110.515	76.930	229.203
Ireland	—	—	18.430	—	10.965	29.395
Italy	—	11.864	44.793	53.944	68.655	179.256
Luxembourg	—	70.628	15.280	66.022	—	151.930
Total	—	140.693	109.595	326.857	170.869	748.014

**3. Total Article 56 loans for conversion**

	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
Belgium	11.977	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11.977
Denmark	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Germany	16.906	4.909	4.970	6.137	64.467	7.949	7.743	7.568	120.649
Greece	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
France	8.234	11.192	14.512	14.350	29.893	25.412	114.959	8.222	226.774
Ireland	—	—	0.562	—	—	—	1.023	—	1.585
Italy	0.364	—	29.925	0.811	10.391	4.533	—	—	46.024
Luxembourg	—	—	—	—	—	4.024	4.791	—	8.815
Netherlands	2.156	4.465	—	—	—	—	—	—	6.621
United Kingdom	21.241	41.460	12.902	825	9.708	18.444	144.466	71.988	321.034
Community	60.878	62.026	62.871	22.123	114.459	60.362	272.982	87.778	743.479

**4. To steel firms (excluding global loans)**

	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	Total
Germany	10.238	—	4.970	6.137	—	5.032	4.470	—	30.837
Italy	0.364	—	27.855	0.811	10.391	4.534	—	—	43.955
United Kingdom	21.241	41.459	4.959	—	—	—	—	—	67.659
Total	31.833	41.459	37.784	6.948	10.391	9.566	4.470	—	142.451

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1069/82****to Mrs Rabbethge****to the Commission of the European Communities***(20 August 1982)***Subject:** Development aid budgets of the Member States

Can the Commission provide information on the changes, in actual and percentage terms, in the Member States' development aid budgets for 1982 in relation to the previous year?

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

*(8 November 1982)*

The Honourable Member will find at annex details

of the Member States' official development assistance budgets for the years 1980 and 1981.

The fairly general decline in dollar payments from one year to the next reflects the dollar's steep rise against most European currencies. Member States have actually increased aid spending appreciably; taken together, Community aid budgets registered a real increase of 11% (see the final column of the attached table).

These figures show net payments as recorded by the Development Assistance Committees, it was not possible to produce uniform statistics on the basis of the national figures.

The figures for net payments in 1982 will be available around the middle of next year.

**Net disbursements of official development assistance (ODA)**

Member State	1980		1981		Growth Rate of ODA, in real terms, between 1980 and 1981 — %
	\$ million	As % GNP	\$ million	As % GNP	
Belgium	595	0.50	574	0.59	+15.5
Denmark	474	0.73	405	0.73	— 0.7
France	4 162	0.64	4 022	0.71	+11.0
Germany	3 567	0.43	3 182	0.46	+ 6.2
Greece	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Ireland	28	0.13	31	0.18	(+ 2 )
Italy	683	0.17	670	0.19	+12.4
Luxembourg	8.5	0.19	12	0.25	(+13 )
Netherlands	1 630	1.03	1 510	1.08	+10.1
United Kingdom	1 851	0.35	2 194	0.43	+21.4
<b>Total EEC Member States</b>	<b>12 998.5</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>12 600</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>(+11 )</b>
Japan	3 353	0.32	3 170	0.28	—10.6
USA	7 138	0.27	5 760	0.20	—26.1
<b>Total DAC members</b>	<b>27 256</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>25 461</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>— 3.8</b>

**Source:** Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD except for figures in bracket, which are estimates of the Commission's services.  
n.a.: not available.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1092/82****by Mr Bord****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 August 1982)**Subject: Development of the internal market*

Does the Commission feel that its new proposals for reducing formalities at the Community's internal frontiers have any chance of actually being adopted?

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

*(9 November 1982)*

The Commission sent the proposals referred to by the Honourable Member to the Council on 9 July by way of follow-up to its communication on the strengthening of the internal market. It considered that there was real chance that administrative formalities affecting trade within the Community would be simplified in a way that would contribute to the achievement of a single market. This would meet the legitimate aspirations of the citizens of Europe and of business circles (especially small and medium-sized enterprises) and the oft-repeated requests of Parliament.

The Commission also considered that, following the adoption of the European Passport, a further step had to be taken towards a passport union. Hence one of its proposals was for a Council resolution on the reduction of checks on travellers, which would ease the crossing of frontiers within the Community.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1094/82****by Mr Rogalla****to the Commission of the European Communities***(24 August 1982)**Subject: EEC driving licence*

1. Can the Commission indicate why the First Council Directive of 4 December 1980 on the introduction of an EEC driving licence does not stipulate that the holder of a licence issued in an EEC country may drive without any restrictions in all the Member States?

2. Does the First Directive make it possible using a German driving licence to drive a vehicle in all the

EEC Member States which has been borrowed from someone living abroad?

3. If the First Directive does not contain such a provision, can the Commission indicate when suitable proposals could be submitted to fill this gap and when these rules could enter into force?

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

*(8 November 1982)*

1. Such a provision is to be found in Article 1 of the First Council Directive of 4 December 1980 on the introduction of a Community driving licence <sup>(1)</sup>. This Article provides that the holder of a Community model driving licence is entitled to drive both on national and international journeys vehicles of the categories for which it has been granted.

2. Yes, within the limits fixed by each Member State in so far as these are compatible with the Directive (such as, for example, the degree of equivalence of the licence, the age of the holder etc.).

3. In view of the above, the Commission does not see the need to propose further driving licence measures to cover the point raised by the Honourable Member.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 375, 31. 12. 1980, p. 1.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1098/82****by Mr Welsh****to the Commission of the European Communities***(27 August 1982)**Subject: Rates of VAT on tourist services*

1. Could the Commission publish the rate of VAT levied on the renting of tourist accommodation and provision of meals in each Member State?

2. Could the Commission state which Member States, if any, apply a quantitative ceiling to VAT in respect of tourist services?

3. Does the Commission envisage making any harmonization proposals regarding VAT on tourist services as part of a common tourist policy?

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

(9 November 1982)

1. On 1 January 1982, the rates of VAT levied in nine Member States (Greece does not yet apply the common VAT system) on services provided by hotels and restaurants were as follows:

	Hotel accommodation	Restaurants
Belgium	6 %	17 %
Federal Republic of Germany	13 %	13 % <sup>(1)</sup>
Denmark	22 %	22 %
France	7 % <sup>(2)</sup>	17.60 %
Ireland	15 %	15 %
Italy	8 % <sup>(3)</sup>	8 %
Luxembourg	5 %	5 %
Netherlands	4 %	4 %
United Kingdom	15 %	15 % <sup>(4)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> 6.5 % for food not consumed on the premises.

<sup>(2)</sup> 17.60 % for luxury hotels.

<sup>(3)</sup> 15 % for luxury hotels.

<sup>(4)</sup> 0 % for food or drink not consumed on the premises.

2. Seven Member States (the Federal Republic of Germany, Denmark, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Luxembourg, France and the Netherlands) apply special schemes allowing exemption from VAT for small firms whose annual turnover or annual net tax is less than a specified amount, varying from one Member State to another. No special exemption is provided for in respect of small firms operating in the tourist trade.

3. As regards harmonization of national rates of VAT levied on tourist services, the Commission does not envisage making any proposals for such sectoral measures, for the reasons set out in its report to the Council on the scope for convergence of tax systems in the Community <sup>(1)</sup>.

On the VAT problems which might arise in connection with the development of tourism in the Community, the Honourable Member is asked to refer to the communication from the Commission to the Council on the initial guidelines for a Community policy on tourism <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> COM(80) 139 final, 27. 3. 1980.

<sup>(2)</sup> COM(82) 385 final, 1. 7. 1982.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1099/82**

**by Mr Provan**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(27 August 1982)

*Subject:* Notices of contracts published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* in accordance with Directive 80/767/EEC

Will the Commission give details of all notices of contracts published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* in accordance with Directive 80/767/EEC <sup>(1)</sup>?

Is the Commission aware that Her Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO) has recently awarded a contract to a German firm and is the Commission aware that competing stationery manufacturers in the United Kingdom have not had the opportunity of reading of similar contracts available for tender in other Member States?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 215, 18. 8. 1980, p. 1.

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

(9 November 1982)

The information requested by the Honourable Member is given in the table below, which indicates, for each Member State and for each award procedure, the number of notices of public supply contracts published in 1981 in the *Official Journal of the European Communities* by the central or federal contracting authorities subject to Directive 80/767/EEC and the GATT Agreement on government procurement.

This data does not, however, indicate the value of the contracts since differences in structures and practices in the field of public contracts result in disparities between the average values of public contracts published in the various Member States. These figures must, moreover, be viewed in the light of the different sizes of the Member States.

To the extent that the products required can be identified from the wording of the contract notices, the Commission prepares statistics of published notices broken down into main product categories. For this purpose, it uses the common nomenclature of industrial products (NIPRO). This nomenclature classifies industrial products by sectors of production.

These statistics do not therefore make it possible to identify as such notices of contracts for office supplies, which may come within the ambit of a wide variety of industrial sectors.

If, however, as would appear from additional information obtained by the Commission, the contract referred to by the Honourable Member concerns supplies of paper — envelopes, to be precise — the following particulars might answer his question:

During the first six months of 1982, a total of 55 notices of contracts covered by NIPRO code 47<sup>(1)</sup> were published by Member States — three by Belgium, one by Denmark, four by Ger-

many, 18 by France, three by the Netherlands and 26 by the United Kingdom.

From a scrutiny of these notices it appears that eight were for contracts for the supply of envelopes, of which one was a German contract published by the Deutsche Bundespost for 27 million envelopes, five were French contracts published by the Ministère des Postes et Télécommunications for a total of 990 million envelopes and two were United Kingdom contracts published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office for a total of 115 million envelopes.

<sup>(1)</sup> Paper making materials, paper and paperboard and paperboard products; products of printing and publishing.

**Notices of public contracts published in the Official Journal of the European Communities pursuant to Directive 80/767/EEC and the GATT Agreement on government procurement**

Member State	Open procedure		Restricted procedure				Total	% of EEC total	
			Normal		Accelerated				
	Num-ber	%	Num-ber	%	Num-ber	%			
Belgium	43	82.7	9	17.3	—	0.0	52	5.4	
Denmark	—	0.0	15	78.9	4	21.1	19	2.0	
Germany	63	44.4	66	46.5	13	9.2	142	14.9	
France	69	32.1	135	62.8	11	5.1	215	22.5	
Ireland	7	100.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	7	0.7	
Italy	—	0.0	10	90.9	1	9.1	11	1.1	
Luxembourg	7	100.0	—	0.0	—	0.0	7	0.7	
Netherlands	—	0.0	95	96.0	4	4.0	99	10.4	
United Kingdom	6	1.5	335	83.3	61	15.2	402	42.1	
EEC	Total	195	20.4	665	69.7	94	9.8	954	100.0

# WRITTEN QUESTION No 1122/82

by Mr Seefeld

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 September 1982)

*Subject:* Railway policy in Belgium

1. How does the Commission view the closure of rail links and the cuts in staff and investment ordered by the Belgian Government in Belgium's rail transport system?
2. Could these measures have adverse effects on transfrontier railway traffic and if so, what form would these take?
3. Will this affect the Community's railways policy advocated by the Commission, the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament?

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

(11 November 1982)

Community provisions on relations between Member States and national railway undertakings, and in particular Council Regulation (EEC) No 1191/69<sup>(1)</sup> and (EEC) No 1107/70<sup>(2)</sup> and Council Decision 75/327/EEC<sup>(3)</sup>, allow the Member States, which are also the owners of the national railway undertakings, to lay down their own framework conditions for the operation of these undertakings. These include all the public service obligations and all investment in respect of the undertaking as a whole and the level of compensatory payments and State aid. Obviously, any government decision will

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 156, 28. 6. 1969, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 130, 15. 6. 1970, p. 1.

<sup>(3)</sup> OJ No L 152, 12. 6. 1975, p. 3.

have to take account of national and Community transport policy requirements, of existing economic circumstances and of the resources available in the budget of that Member State. To this extent, economy measures may prove unavoidable, as in the case of Belgium.

2. So far, the Commission understands that the measures taken by the Belgian Government concern primarily local and regional traffic, while transfrontier traffic is not directly affected.

3. The Community's railway policy aims to improve the economic position and efficiency of the railways, and this may require some degree of rationalization. The measures taken by the Belgian Government would not seem to conflict with this policy.

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 1124/82**

**by Mr Penders**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(9 September 1982)*

*Subject: Aid to Lebanon*

Is the Commission prepared to make new funds available for aid to Lebanon and/or make new proposals on aid now that the political situation in Lebanon has entered a new phase?

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

*(11 November 1982)*

By 15 September the Community had voted emergency aid and food aid to a total value of nearly 10 million ECU to help victims of the fighting in Lebanon. Much more still needs to be done; in particular, a great deal of reconstruction work will be necessary. The Commission is looking at the feasibility of further operations to be undertaken with the funds available to it. The European Investment Bank is also at work on a study in response to the Council Decision of 22 July asking it to consider a request from the Lebanese Government for exceptional aid in the form of a loan.

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 1140/82**

**by Mr Bonde**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(9 September 1982)*

*Subject: Purchases of meat in Sweden by Danish housewives*

In its edition of 22 July 1982 the Danish newspaper *Helsingør Dagblad* claims that the ban on shopping for meat in Sweden was introduced when Denmark was about to enter the common market in autumn 1972.

Will the Commission leave it to the Danish authorities to decide to what extent Danish housewives may buy meat in Sweden?

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

*(11 November 1982)*

There are no quantitative restrictions on the imports of meat into the Community from Sweden or any other third country. As far as beef is concerned, special treatment is accorded to imports from Austria, Sweden and Switzerland provided certain conditions are fulfilled in accordance with Commission Regulation (EEC) No 611/77<sup>(1)</sup>. In 1981 Community imports from Sweden amounted to 6 200 tonnes. The information given in the article referred to by the Honourable Member seems to be incorrect. The question, therefore, is based on a misunderstanding.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 77, 25. 3. 1977.

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 1147/82**

**by Mr Bonde**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(27 September 1982)*

*Subject: Limits on the amount of sugar travellers may bring into Denmark duty-free*

Will the Commission withdraw its request to the Danish authorities, mentioned in Mr Tugendhat's answer of 11 June 1982 to Written Question No 142/82 by Mr von Wogau<sup>(1)</sup>; if not, will it state where in the Treaty of Rome it finds the grounds for

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 174, 12. 7. 1982, p. 11.

imposing greater obesity on the Danish population and increasing the number of holes in their teeth?

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

*(9 November 1982)*

The Commission's duty is to enhance the operation of the internal market. An increase in the consumption of sugar is not the object of its proposals on traveller's allowances nor need it be the result. The Commission always seeks to bear health factors in mind.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1151/82**

**by Mr Bonde**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(22 September 1982)*

**Subject:** The training of rangers and bird-counting in Denmark

Can the Commission explain what part of the Rome Treaty provides the basis for its activities in connection with the training of rangers and the counting of birds in Denmark?

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

*(8 November 1982)*

The Commission's concern with the two sectors referred to by the Honourable Member comes under Council Directive 79/409/EEC of 2 April 1979 on the conservation of wild birds<sup>(1)</sup> and in implementation of Item 6613 of the 1982 budget: 'Environmental measures which can help to create new jobs'.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 103, 25. 4. 1979.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1158/82**

**by Mr Boyes**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(22 September 1982)*

**Subject:** Chicken debeaking

Has the Commission any intention of preparing a report on the problem of chicken debeaking which is a process extremely painful to the bird?

Is the Commission aware that machines are used in the UK for burning off up to one-third of an upper beak of a hen in a red-hot vice.

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

*(11 November 1982)*

'De-beaking' is used as a preventive measure to avoid the development of aggressive vices, such as feather pecking which commonly leads to cannibalism. Preventive action is preferable as practical experience has shown that the delay of beaktrimming until vice has developed is not effective in stopping the habit. The procedure is thus normally carried out at an early stage in the bird's life. On balance it must be said, on the basis of information currently available, that the welfare advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

The use of a cautery device for this purpose is to the advantage of the bird as it seals the surface thus preventing infection. Until research programmes sponsored by the Commission and other bodies, into the causes of such vices, can elucidate the matter there are known effective alternatives to the use of this means to lessen the results of such aggression. Endeavours to approach the problem by modification of the environment, including space allocation, ventilation and light level have not been entirely successful.

Recent work of the Council of Europe's Standing Committee of the European Convention for the Protection of Animals kept for Farming Purposes has also touched upon the problem raised by the Honourable Member. The Commission has followed this work closely and its own future policy in this domain will take account of the work done within the framework of the European Convention.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1159/82**

**by Mr Cluskey**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(22 September 1982)*

**Subject:** Sources of beef provided in Commission's staff canteen

Will the Commission state the countries of origin of the beef served in its staff canteen during the last 18 months?

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

(8 November 1982)

The suppliers of meat to the Commission state that beef supplied for its staff canteens during the past 18 months came from Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland and the United Kingdom.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1161/82**

**by Mr Wettig**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(22 September 1982)

**Subject:** Use of fruit and vegetables purchased by intervention agencies

Recently the Administrative Court of Kassel ruled that a producers' organization in Hesse which had released fruit taken into intervention for free distribution to students' organizations was not entitled to the financial compensation payable under Articles 15 and 18 of Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 <sup>(1)</sup> on the grounds that students' organizations did not come under the institutions listed in Article 21 of that Regulation.

In other 'Länder' of the Federal Republic of Germany (e.g. Saxony) financial compensation is granted to producers' organizations in comparable situations.

- Considering that precisely the destruction of fruit and vegetables or their use as fodder, has for many years constituted a scandal which has greatly damaged the public reputation of the European agricultural policy; considering also that a decision such as the above fosters the destruction and use as fodder of fruit and vegetables (by providing financial support) while at the same time penalizing (by refusing to grant compensation) efforts of producers' organizations to find sensible ways of disposing of their goods;
- and considering, finally, that even the Courts have to be asked to clarify disputes of this kind, it then becomes clear that the Commission should attempt to create unequivocal rules for the use of fruit and vegetables in intervention.

I therefore ask the Commission:

1. Whether it can provide information as to which States provide financial compensation under Articles 15 and 18 of Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 in the case of fruit and vegetables in intervention being given to students' organizations?
2. Does it not consider this method of disposing of products in intervention to be sensible and in keeping with the spirit of Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72?
3. What possibilities does it see of formulating Article 21 of Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 in such a way as to include such institutions as students' organizations clearly and indisputably in its provisions?

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

(8 November 1982)

1. Apart from the case in the Federal Republic of Germany mentioned by the Honourable Member, the Commission has no knowledge of fruit and vegetables withdrawn from the market being distributed to university restaurants.

2 and 3. No such arrangement is provided for in Article 12 of Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72. The Commission, moreover, does not consider it advisable to provide for distribution to university catering bodies because this might take the place of ordinary commercial sales.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1170/82**

**by Mr Beyer de Ryke**

**to the Council of the European Communities**

(22 September 1982)

**Subject:** Creation of a European Court for terrorists

Following the declaration made on television on 17 August last by President Mitterrand, the press has taken up the idea of the creation of an European court with special responsibility for cases involving international terrorism and powers to extradite terrorists: this would in fact correspond precisely to the idea of an European legal area which has already been developed.

Can the Council give its views on the subject and details of progress on any projects in this field?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 118, 20. 5. 1972, p. 1.



**Answer (1)***(9 November 1982)*

The question about the creation of an European Court for terrorists has not been discussed so far by the competent ministers within the framework of the European Political Cooperation.

(1) This reply has been provided by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, within whose province the question came.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1171/82****by Mr Cousté****to the Commission of the European Communities***(22 September 1982)*

*Subject:* The use of the term 'blend' in the description 'blend of wines from different countries of the European Community' for table wines resulting from coupage of products originating in more than one Member State of the Community

Article 1 of Council Regulation (EEC) No 3685/81 of 15 December 1981 (1) amending the general rules for the description and presentation of wines lays down that table wine resulting from coupage of products originating in more than one Member State shall be described on the label as 'blend of wines from different countries of the European Community'.

The reason given in the recitals for the use of the term 'blend' is to give the consumer better information.

1. Can the Commission state whether the consumer organizations of the different Member States were consulted before adoption of this Regulation?
2. The term 'mélange' is retained untranslated in the Dutch and Italian versions while the term 'blend' is used in the English version. Does the Commission not believe that the choice of a French term for the rules to be applied in Italy and the Netherlands is likely to mislead rather than inform the consumer?
3. Does the Commission not think that the use of the term 'blend' solely for mixtures of wines from different Community countries will mis-

lead the consumer? The latter could in fact be led to believe that all other wines not bearing the description 'blend', including those of designated appellation, came from the same soil, the same vineyard and the same harvest, whereas in fact most table wines and designated appellation wines and all wines from cooperative cellars on the market are the result of mixtures of wines from different soils and different vineyards and sometimes of different vintages?

4. Does the Commission not think that the use of the word 'mélange' which is not part of the vocabulary of oenology and which, in the French language, has a pejorative nuance when applied to wine, is liable:

— to unjustifiably depreciate in the eyes of the consumer a necessary oenological practice based on the traditional expertise of the professional whereby the wine is enhanced by harmonizing the intrinsic qualities of the components of the mixture,

— to lead to a drop in the consumption of such products in conflict with the aims of the wine market and the interests of producers?

**Answer given by Mr Dalsager  
on behalf of the Commission***(8 November 1982)*

1. In 1976 and 1981 the description of wines resulting from the coupage of wines originating in different Member States was the subject of detailed discussions in the various Council bodies. Since the term 'mélange' was introduced at the final stage it was not possible to consult the consumer organizations.

2. The terms used in the different versions of Regulation (EEC) No 3685/81 to describe the table wines in question reflect the suggestions put forward by each of the delegations in the Council. They were consulted in order to find the most suitable term so as to avoid expressions which were regarded as pejorative, such as 'coupage' in French and 'miscela' and 'mescolanza' in Italian, and to provide the consumer with information enabling him to distinguish the wines in question from table wines originating in a single Member State.

The Council considered that, for the labelling of wines originating in several Community countries, the following descriptions were most likely to meet the objective of the Regulation in question:

— 'Verschnitt' in German,

— 'blanding' in Danish,

(1) OJ No L 369, 24. 12. 1981, p. 1.

- 'ἀναμείγ' in Greek,
- 'blend' in English and
- 'mélange' in French, Dutch and Italian.

3. The term 'blend' in this context should not be considered in isolation but as part of the expression 'blend of wines from different countries of the European Community'. It was found necessary to provide the consumer with this precise information because in several Member States large quantities of table wines resulting from the coupage of wines originating in different Member States had been sold. The labelling of these wines, although complying with the letter of the Community provisions, had been designed to give the impression that the wine originated in the Member State in which it was bottled.

4. The term 'mélange' is used in several places in the Community provisions concerning the wine sector and has not been regarded as pejorative until now.

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 1181/82

by Mr Bonde

to the Commission of the European Communities

(1 October 1982)

*Subject:* External negotiating powers

Can the application of Article 235 of the Treaty of Rome be used to delegate further external negotiating powers from Member States to Community bodies?

Can the Commission give examples of cases where the application of Article 235 has entailed the delegation of external negotiating powers?

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

(10 November 1982)

The EEC Treaty itself confers on the Community institutions the powers necessary to attain the objectives set out in its opening provisions.

The attainment of these objectives involves the adoption of legal instruments, which can either be of a self-contained nature (regulations, directives, decisions, etc.) or, if necessary, take the form of international agreements (bilateral and multilateral commitments).

The powers conferred on the Community — and, in particular, on the Council as the body vested with legislative powers and responsible for the conclusion of external commitments — have their basis either in specific provisions relating to given spheres of activity (agriculture, fisheries, tariff and trade agreements, etc.) or in the general provisions of the EEC Treaty, in particular Article 235, with whose terms the Honourable Member is fully conversant.

The external commitments mentioned below by way of example were concluded on the basis of Article 235 of the EEC Treaty:

#### *Environment*

- 1974 Paris Convention for the prevention of marine pollution from land-based sources (Decision of 3 March 1975 — OJ No L 194 of 1975);
- 1976 Barcelona Convention for the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution, and its annexed Protocols on dumping from ships and aircraft and cooperation in combating pollution by oil (Decision of 25 July 1977 — OJ No L 240 of 1977) and, in the case of the last of the above-mentioned Protocols (Decision of 19 May 1981 — OJ No L 162 of 1981);
- 1979 Bonn Convention on the conservation of migratory species of wild animals (Decision of 24 June 1982 — OJ No L 210 of 1982);
- 1979 Bern Convention on the conservation of European wildlife and natural habitats (Decision of 3 December 1981 — OJ No L 38 of 1982);
- 1980 Canberra Convention on the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources (Decision of 4 September 1981 — OJ No L 252 of 1981);
- Convention on long-range transboundary air pollution (Decision of 11 June 1981 — OJ No L 171 of 1981).

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 1201/82

by Mr Bonde

to the Commission of the European Communities

(10 October 1982)

*Subject:* Article 235 of the Treaty of Rome

Can the Commission produce a summary of the cases in which Article 235 of the Treaty of Rome has been applied?

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

(9 November 1982)

The Commission is sending a computer print-out containing the information requested direct to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat of Parliament.

The Commission would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that he can have direct access to the data base on Community law (CELEX) through Parliament's own departments.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1225/82**

**by Mrs Maij-Weggen**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(5 October 1982)

*Subject:* Unemployment statistics

According to the monthly statistics concerning the number of registered unemployed in the Community, at the end of July 1982 551 000 persons — 375 400 men and 175 600 women — were unemployed in the Netherlands, i.e. 10.3 % of the active male population and 10.2 % of the active female population (Eurostat 7 — 1982).

According to the *Nederlandse Maandverslag Arbeidsmarkt* (Dutch monthly report on the labour market), at the end of July 551 070 Dutch nationals — 375 420 men and 175 650 women — were registered as unemployed. According to this monthly report, expressed as a percentage of the active population, male unemployment amounted to 11.6 %, female unemployment to 15.5 % and total unemployment 12.6 %. The seasonally adjusted percentages were 11.7 %, 14.6 % and 12.4 % respectively.

1. Can the Commission explain why the overall figures given by Eurostat are virtually identical to the Dutch statistics, while the percentages vary substantially?
2. In particular, can it explain how Eurostat can give the percentages for male and female unemployment as 10.3 % and 10.2 % respectively, when the Dutch figures are 11.6 % and 15.5 % respectively?

In other words, how can Eurostat calculate that female unemployment in the Netherlands is lower than male unemployment when the Dutch

statistics show that female unemployment is much higher than male unemployment (when expressed as a percentage)?

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

(12 November 1982)

According to employment offices in the Netherlands, at the end of July 1982 there were 551 070 registered employed of whom 375 420 were men and 175 650 women. These figures are supplied by the Dutch Ministry of Labour and are used by the Ministry and Eurostat to calculate the unemployment rate.

However, there are differences in respect of the reference population used to calculate the employment rate.

Eurostat calculations for all the Member States are based on the working population which includes people in full-time or part-time employment and people who are unemployed. The CBS supplies this figure for the Netherlands. In 1981 (most recent figure available) this population amounted to 5 356 000, of whom 1 725 000 were women. Thus at the end of July 1982 registered male and female unemployment stood at 10.3 % to 10.3 % for men and 10.2 % for woman (figures published in the monthly report on the labour market referred to by the Honourable Member).

The Dutch Ministry of Labour calculates the registered unemployment rate on the basis of total wage-earners in full-time employment (over 25 hours a week) and registered full-time job-seekers estimated for 1982.

Differences in the two reference populations are accounted for by the fact that the Netherlands Ministry of Labour does not take account of self-employed workers, family helpers and part-time wage-earners (under 25 hours a week).

Inevitably, calculations using different bases will give different results. If the numerator is unchanged and the denominator is smaller, the Ministry of Labour's figures for registered unemployment will be higher.

The fact that there are far more women than men engaged in part-time work still further reduces the denominator in their case and the registered unemployment rate for women is correspondingly higher.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1254/82****by Mr Diana****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 October 1982)*

*Subject:* European Council's mandate to the Commission on national aids to agriculture

At the meeting of the European Council which was held in London on 26 and 27 November 1981, the Commission was called upon to produce a study assessing the impact of national aids to agriculture on incomes, production levels and respect for the principle of national solidarity. Can the Commission state what progress has been made with this work and by what date it expects to have fulfilled the mandate assigned to it by the European Council?

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

*(9 November 1982)*

The study of the role, scale and economic effects of public expenditure on agriculture in the Member States has been entrusted to private experts.

There will be three stages: firstly, verification of the inventories of aids on the basis of enquiries among the national authorities and with the organizations working in agriculture and a study of additional data not coming under Article 92 of the EEC Treaty or secondary agricultural law.

In the second stage, the data will be classified by objective.

Lastly, the socio-economic effects of the public expenditure surveyed will be analysed.

The first two stages are to be completed before the end of the year and will cover six consecutive years, 1975 to 1980; the last stage is to be completed by 31 October 1983.

The experts have drafted an interim report including the classification by objective of expenditure relating to the latest year available, i.e. 1979/80.

The chapter in the study concerning Italy cannot be completed on time because of difficulties arising in obtaining both national and regional data concerning this country.

The experts are now standardizing the data with a view to a combined report for the whole Community.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1258/82****by Mrs van den Heuvel****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 October 1982)*

*Subject:* Proceedings against Miss Lehmann in the Federal Republic of Germany

1. Is the Commission aware of events prior to and during the proceedings against Miss Lehmann before the court in Heidelberg in the Federal Republic of Germany?
2. Does the Commission consider that the actual course of events in this case complies with the provisions of Article 5 of the Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms?
3. Does the Commission share my view that for certain suspects the Heidelberg court is wrong to use psychiatric examinations?
4. Does the Federal Republic of Germany have policy guidelines on the treatment of women bringing charges of sexual maltreatment and/or rape? (Guidelines proposing that women who bring such a charge should be treated seriously)
5. Is the Commission willing to inform the German Government of its views on this subject?

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

*(11 November 1982)*

The Commission has no authority to comment on legal proceedings governed solely by national law.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1264/82****by Mr Almirante****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 October 1982)*

*Subject:* Directive on the education of the children of migrant workers

To what extent have the individual EEC countries complied with EEC Directive No 77/486/EEC <sup>(1)</sup> on the education of migrant workers' children?

What is the Commission's opinion of the special classes set up in the Federal Republic of Germany?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 199, 6. 8. 1977, p. 32.

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

*(9 November 1982)*

On the basis of information the Member States are required to transmit to the Commission under Article 5 of the Council Directive of 25 July 1977 on the education of the children of migrant workers, the Commission will draw up a report on the application of this Directive in the first quarter of 1983 for the Council and Parliament.

The Commission report will not cover special classes. The various reception systems and instruction in the language and culture of origin, particularly in the Federal Republic of Germany will be described and commented on.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1265/82**

**by Mr Almirante**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 October 1982)*

*Subject:* Participation by migrants in the next European elections

What action has been taken at Community level to improve the information and awareness of migrants from Community countries, with a view to their participation in the next elections to the European Parliament?

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

*(9 November 1982)*

Information for migrant workers about the European elections, as on all questions concerning the Community, has been channelled through the trade unions and migrants' representative organizations. Localized information operations have been conducted within the tight limits of the Commission's information budget.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1291/82**

**by Mr Galland**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(6 October 1982)*

*Subject:* Siberian gas

Is the Commission aware that the American group General Electric (GE) is building a compression plant in Czechoslovakia for the gas pipeline which is to carry Siberian gas to Italy?

If this information, reported in the specialist German journal *Bonner Energie-Report*, proves correct, does the Commission not regard this as a violation of the American embargo, under which European companies have been forbidden to construct rotors under General Electric licence for the Soviet Union? Even if the embargo applies only to the Soviet Union and Poland, and not to Czechoslovakia, this work is linked directly to the 'Trans-Siberian gas pipeline' project.

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

*(8 November 1982)*

The Commission is aware of the steps taken by General Electric in Prague with a view to the construction of a compression plant for the gas pipeline which is to carry Siberian gas to Italy.

It is not for the Commission to judge whether or not this action is compatible with the United States embargo.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1309/82**

**by Mrs Ewing**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(6 October 1982)*

*Subject:* Proceedings against pulp producers

Will the Commission please state whether the cases referred to in the reply to Written Question 1341/81 <sup>(1)</sup> are still currently pending? If they are not, will the Commission list the names requested in my original question?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 85, 22. 2. 1982, p. 20.

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

*(12 November 1982)*

The Commission confirms that the proceedings against certain pulp producers, to which the Honourable Member has previously referred in his Written Question No 1341/81 <sup>(1)</sup>, are still pending. The names of the undertakings involved can therefore not be disclosed.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 47, 22. 2. 1982, p. 20.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1339/82**

**by Mr Cousté**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(6 October 1982)*

*Subject:* Commission answers to members of the European Parliament

When the Commission answers questions by members of the European Parliament it often states rather evasively that 'studies are in progress' or that

'work is being carried out' or that it is 'drawing up proposals'. However, it never indicates what deadlines have been set for the studies or work concerned. The member must either resign himself to this answer or keep repeating his question until he has obtained the details he requires — unless he tires of fruitless repetition.

Would the Commission not be prepared to indicate, each time it appears necessary, when the work or studies concerned will be completed?

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

*(9 November 1982)*

It is difficult for the Commission to state in advance when surveys and studies or preparatory work on proposal will be completed.

Much depends on when information is received from outside bodies or the Member States; this is something beyond the Commission's control.

It cannot indicate a more precise deadline except where only Commission departments or the members themselves will be involved in the work to be done.

---

## **CLASSIFICATION OF CHEMICALS IN THE COMMON CUSTOMS TARIFF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES**

### **IN SIX LANGUAGES**

- Twenty thousand chemical names (internationally accepted common names, systematic names and synonyms).
- Six languages: Danish (Vol. I), German (Vol. II), English (Vol. III), French (Vol. IV), Italian (Vol. V) and Dutch (Vol. VI).
- Index of equivalent names in all six languages (Vol. VII — six languages).

Features of this publication are:

- the classification (heading and subheading) of a chemical in the Common Customs Tariff of the European Communities can be ascertained immediately from its name in any one of the six languages;
- the equivalent names are listed in all six languages (multilingual glossary).

The chemical names listed may be used to gain access to the European Communities Data and Information Network (ECDIN).

Each volume (except Vol. VII) may be ordered separately.

Price per single-language volume: ECU 9·60, Bfrs 400, £ Irl 6·70, £ 5·25, US \$ 11·50.

Price of a single-language volume plus the six-language volume: ECU 36·30, Bfrs 1 500, £ Irl 25·20, £ 19·50, US \$ 41.

Price of the complete publication: ECU 72, Bfrs 3 000, £ Irl 50, £ 39·20, US \$ 85·25.

Orders should be sent to:

**OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES**  
L-2985 Luxembourg