

# Official Journal

## of the European Communities

ISSN 0378-6986

C 129

Volume 24

29 May 1981

English edition

## Information and Notices

---

### Contents

### I Information

#### European Parliament

##### *Written Questions with answer*

No 1425/80 by Mrs Ewing to the Commission Subject: Spanish fleet .....	1
No 1830/80 by Mr Cariglia to the Commission Subject: Measures to assist the victims of the earthquake in Italy .....	1
No 1886/80 by Sir Frederick Warner to the Commission Subject: Emergency aid .....	2
No 1897/80 by Mr Gendebien to the Commission Subject: Effects of the steel crisis in Wallonia .....	3
No 1942/80 by Mr Müller-Hermann to the Commission Subject: Difference in income levels in the Member States of the Community .....	3
No 1977/80 by Mrs Lizin to the Commission Subject: EIB financing of the Doel 3 and Tihange 2 nuclear investments: statements by the electricity undertakings in the Belgian press on 19 December 1980 .....	4
No 1998/80 by Mrs Lizin to the Commission Subject: Abuse of the dominant position of the 'Boerenbond' (Article 85 <i>et seq.</i> of the Treaty) .....	6
No 2051/80 by Mr Muntigh and Mr Van Minnen to the Commission Subject: Work programmes of the European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions with reference to unemployment .....	6

<b>No 2086/80 by Mr Schmid, Mr Van Minnen, Mr von der Vring, Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and Mr Walter to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Swearing in of the new Commission before the European Court of Justice. ....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>No 2088/80 by Mr Welsh to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Aids to the French textile industry .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>No 2101/80 by Mr Cousté to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Dialogue with the textile industry .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>No 2113/80 by Mr Damseaux to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Mail-order sale of weapons .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>No 2117/80 by Mr Damseaux to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Compensation for flood victims .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>No 2140/80 by Mr Linkohr to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Salaries of officials of the European Communities .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>No 2149/80 by Mrs von Alemann to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Production and 'sell-by' dates on preserved foods .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>No 2157/80 by Mr Cohen to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: UNCTAD raw materials fund .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>No 2163/80 by Mr Michel to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Resinated wine .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>No 2164/80 by Mrs Vayssade to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Reorganization of the dairy industry in Lorraine .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>No 2175/80 by Mr Albers to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Use of Citizens' Band transceivers by lorry drivers and tourists .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>No 2178/80 by Mr Albers to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Tourism .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>No 2195/80 by Mr Welsh to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Curriculum of the European School at Culham .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>No 2196/80 by Mr Welsh to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Community olive oil production .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>No 2203/80 by Mrs Boserup to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: The Adams affair .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>No 2209/80 by Mr Marshall to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Recruitment to the Commission's Service .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>No 2219/80 by Mr Adam to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Oil purchases .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>No 2225/80 by Mr Muntingh to the Commission</b>	
<b>Subject: Oil pollution in the North Sea .....</b>	<b>17</b>

<b>Contents (continued)</b>	<b>No 2238/80 by Mr Früh and Mr Langes to the Commission</b>	
	<b>Subject: Rectified grape must concentrate</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>No 2243/80 by Mr Penders to the Commission</b>	
	<b>Subject: Food deliveries to Poland</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>No 2247/80 by Mr Balfe to the Commission</b>	
	<b>Subject: Answers to written questions</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>No 2257/80 by Mr Pöttering to the Commission</b>	
	<b>Subject: Assistance for infrastructure projects from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>No 2270/80 by Mr Cousté to the Commission</b>	
	<b>Subject: Accession of Greece to the Communities and consequences for the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>No 2295/80 by Mrs Lizin to the Commission</b>	
	<b>Subject: The notion of 'indirect discrimination' in the Directives on equal treatment</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>No 2297/80 by Mr Cousté to the Commission</b>	
	<b>Subject: Living standards of fishermen in Community countries over the last five years</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>No 2300/80 by Mr Cousté to the Commission</b>	
	<b>Subject: Executive aircraft market in the United States</b>	<b>23</b>
	<b>No 2310/80 by Mr Seefeld to the Commission</b>	
	<b>Subject: Distribution of staff in the various places of work</b>	<b>23</b>

## I

*(Information)*

## EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

## WRITTEN QUESTIONS WITH ANSWER

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1425/80****by Mrs Ewing****to the Commission of the European Communities***(7 November 1980)**Subject: Spanish fleet*

In view of the fact that members of the Spanish fleet fish in EEC waters at present, what proposals does the Commission have to ensure that on Spain's entry to the Community, the Spanish fleet will not cause hardship to coastal fleets?

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

*(15 April 1981)*

1. Arrangements for fishing by Spanish vessels in Community waters are made annually following consultations with the Spanish authorities under the Framework Agreement on Fisheries between the EEC and Spain signed on 15 April 1980; this Agreement still has to be ratified by Spain, in the next few weeks, prior to definitive adoption by the Council of the arrangements for 1981.

2. The Agreement, which has been implemented on a *de facto* basis since the completion of the negotiations in March 1977, provides in effect for gradual reduction of fishing opportunities for Spanish vessels so as to achieve satisfactory equilibrium with the relatively much more modest fishing rights

which continue to be available to Community vessels in Spanish waters. In this connexion, the number of licences granted to Spanish trawlers was 240 in 1978, 200 in 1979, 168 in 1980 and 142 in 1981.

3. The declining scope for fishing in the Community zone poses for the Spanish authorities the same problem of adjusting fishing capacity as that facing the Member States as a result of reductions in fish stocks and in the catches allowed in the waters of non-Community countries. The information available to the Commission indicates that Spain is pursuing in this field a policy of structural adaptation of the fleet to the existing or foreseeable fishing possibilities.

4. The integration of the Spanish fleet under the common fishing policy will be negotiated as part of the enlargement negotiations.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1830/80****by Mr Cariglia****to the Commission of the European Communities***(16 January 1981)*

*Subject: Measures to assist the victims of the earthquake in Italy*

What steps does the Commission propose to take to assist the victims of the earthquake in the regions of Campania and Basilicata?

Although such decisions must be taken as soon as possible, will the Commission, in addition to taking steps to tackle urgent needs, draw up a plan within the context of the Social Fund to restore normal working conditions to the areas affected and confidence in their economic future?

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

*(22 April 1981)*

On 25 November 1980 the Commission decided to grant immediate aid of 1.5 million ECU from resources available at Chapter 59. On the basis of a Commission proposal dated 4 December 1980 the budgetary authority has adopted a supplementary budget of 40 million ECU for 1980 to provide emergency assistance to the victims. A further amount of 15 million ECU was entered at Chapter 59 of the 1981 budget. The emergency aid was paid out on 2 March 1981 in the manner agreed with the Italian authorities.

At the same time, Commission Decision 80/1206/EEC <sup>(1)</sup>, based on Council Regulation (EEC) No 1410/74 <sup>(2)</sup> authorized the duty-free importation into Italy of all goods intended to be distributed free of charge to earthquake victims.

As for medium- and long-term reconstruction, the Council, acting on a Commission proposal dated 4 December 1980, decided on 20 December 1980 to authorize the Commission and the EIB to borrow funds totalling up to 1 000 million ECU for relending to Italy to help finance this work. Detailed consultations with the Italian authorities on the use to be made of these funds are in progress. The Commission hopes that this aid, together with resources from the other Community financial instruments, will help to restore normal working conditions to the areas affected and confidence in their economic future.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 369, 31. 12. 1980, p. 28.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 150, 7. 6. 1971, p. 4.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1886/80**

**by Sir Frederick Warner**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(19 January 1981)*

*Subject: Emergency aid*

Could the Commission provide a full list of the requests for emergency aid which it has received over the last year, indicating whether the request was granted or not, what the cause of the damage was and what country or territory received the aid, including separate references for the overseas departments and territories of Member States.

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

*(23 April 1981)*

1. The procedures for granting Community aid to disaster victims in the Community (Chapter 59 of the Budget) do not provide for the lodging of official requests by Member States.

The procedure is set in motion after direct contact between the Commission and the governments responsible for disaster victims.

A list of aid granted in 1980 is being sent direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat. The list will include cases in which such aid was granted to overseas departments or territories.

2. The rule governing emergency aid to disaster victims in non-member countries (Article 59 of the Lomé Convention and Article 950 of the budget) is that the country concerned must make an express request.

Statistics for 1980 are being sent direct to the Honourable Member and to Parliament's Secretariat.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1897/80****by Mr Gendebien****to the Commission of the European Communities***(19 January 1981)**Subject: Effects of the steel crisis in Wallonia*

The 'state of manifest crisis' in the iron and steel industry will, as far as Wallonia is concerned, compound the effects on employment of the restructuring process proposed by the Commission in 1977 to 1978.

How many thousands of jobs are likely to be lost in the Wallonian iron and steel industry over the five year period 1978 to 1982 as a result of the measures taken under the auspices of the Community?

What steps does the Commission intend to take and what funds does it propose to allocate in 1981 to make good these losses:

- (a) at the social level;
- (b) as regards the reconversion of industrial activities?

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

*(21 April 1981)*

1. The declaration of the state of manifest crisis and the introduction of a system of production quotas intended to restrict steel production and divide it fairly among all steel undertakings has not had any new effects on employment so far and is not expected to.

2. It is not possible to give exact figures yet about the job losses for the period 1978 to 1982.

Under the terms of a bilateral Agreement between Belgium and the Commission, based on Article 56 (2b) of the ECSC Treaty, the Commission can, following a request from the Belgian Government, grant aid to workers in the iron and steel industry. The Belgian Government can apply for these aids, and on the basis of this application the Commission can decide.

Moreover, the Commission has submitted to the Council a proposal for the creation of special tem-

porary allowances to help workers in the iron and steel industry, in the framework of the Community restructuring plan.

3. As the steel industry in Wallonia requires restructuring, the Commission decided on 25 July 1980 to grant an overall loan of Bfrs 1 500 million to the Wallonia regional investment company (SRIW) for it to grant conversion loans to small and medium-sized undertakings. So far, however, the SRIW has been unable to sign the loan contracts with the Commission.

In 1980 the Council approved a specific Community regional development measure contributing to overcoming constraints on the development of new economic activities in certain zones adversely affected by restructuring of the steel industry<sup>(1)</sup>. In Belgium, this measure covers the provinces of Luxembourg, Liege and Hainaut with the exception of the 'arrondissements' of Ath and Tournai. The Belgian Government will soon put forward a special five-year programme for these regions, qualifying for a Community contribution of Bfrs 240 million.

<sup>(1)</sup> Commission Regulation (EEC) No 2616/80 of 7 October 1980, OJ No L 271, 15. 10. 1980, p. 9.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1942/80****by Mr Müller-Hermann****to the Commission of the European Communities***(4 February 1981)*

*Subject: Difference in income levels in the Member States of the Community*

Can the Commission provide information on the difference in income levels in the Member States of the Community, for example the relationship between the top 20 % of incomes and the bottom 20 % of incomes?

**Answer given by Mr O'Kennedy  
on behalf of the Commission**

*(21 April 1981)*

In many Member States statistical data showing disposable income distribution is not available.

Accordingly, the Commission does not have information which would permit valid comparisons.

However, frequency distributions of employees according to the level of earnings, based on the concept of average gross earnings, have been compiled in the context of the Community surveys on the structure of earnings in industry and services (wholesale and retail distribution, banking and insurance). These surveys have been carried out for the periods 1966, 1972/74 and 1978/79.

Unfortunately, some Member States have yet to send in the results of the 1978/79 survey; relevant data will be sent to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat General of the European Parliament as soon as they are available.

Corresponding data from earlier surveys can be

found in the (yellow) social statistics series published by EUROSTAT, as follows:

- Structure of Earnings in Industry — 1972 (volumes 2 to 7, tables II/C/1 to II/C/3 for manual workers and tables III/C/1 to III/C/3 for non-manual workers. For an explanatory note on frequency distributions and comparisons between 1966 and 1972, see volume 1 'Methods and Definitions', par. 9.2, page 463).
- Structure of Earnings in Wholesale and Retail Distribution, Banking and Insurance in 1974 (volumes 2 to 10, tables C5 to C7).

As an example, the following table (extracted from table 7 of the 1974 structure of earnings publications for the Federal Republic of Germany, France and the United Kingdom) shows quartiles of distribution of full-time employees according to gross annual pay in total retail trade in these countries.

	Germany (DM)	France (FF)	United Kingdom (£)
First decile (0·10)	11 066	15 186	962
First quartile (0·25)	14 033	17 372	1 201
Median (0·50)	18 122	22 016	1 622
Third quartile (0·75)	23 660	30 311	2 296
Last decile (0·90)	30 141	43 558	3 010

#### WRITTEN QUESTION No 1977/80

by Mrs Lizin

to the Commission of the European Communities

(9 February 1981)

**Subject:** EIB financing of the Doel 3 and Tihange 2 nuclear investments: statements by the electricity undertakings in the Belgian press on 19 December 1980

In its reply to my question H-575/80 <sup>(1)</sup> in the European Parliament (December part-session) the Coun-

cil stated that it could not comment on EIB financing decisions, in particular those regarding Bfrs 5 000 million for the two new nuclear power stations of Doel 3 and Tihange 2.

This reply is, to say the least, incomplete and must be reconsidered in the light of new developments.

1. In which bodies of the EIB is the Commission represented effectively?
2. Within these bodies, is there provision for the compatibility of the Bank's actions with its statutes to be checked?

<sup>(1)</sup> Proceedings of the European Parliament (December 1980).

3. Which body can assess this compatibility? Does it have Commission or Council representatives, or members nominated by these institutions?
4. Article 130 is restrictive. Can the Commission state which paragraph of Article 130 covers the Belgian nuclear power stations?
5. The regions concerned, particularly Doel, are definitely not less-developed regions. The aid for nuclear investment must therefore be covered by paragraphs (b) and (c) of Article 130, which necessarily presupposes that these activities cannot be financed in the normal way by the Member States. Can the Commission ask its representatives within the EIB what basis was used for the assessment of national financial markets in the case of Doel and Tihange?
6. How does the Commission envisage ensuring that its representatives at the EIB take into account the following public statement (Belga 19 December 1980) made during an internal Belgian debate by the electricity undertakings: 'Until now the Belgian electricity sector has had no difficulty in financing its investments. It has never requested any aid from the public authorities for financing its investments'?

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

(15 April 1981)

1. Under Article 11 of the Statute of the European Investment Bank, which forms an integral part of the EEC Treaty, the Commission nominates one director and one alternate to the Bank's Board of Directors.

Members of the Board are appointed by the Board of Governors (composed of one Minister from each Member State) for a renewable term of five years. The director nominated by the Commission is the Director-General for Economic and Financial Affairs, and the alternate is the Director-General for Regional Policy.

2 and 3. Article 11 also provides that the Board of Directors has sole power to take decisions in respect of granting and raising loans; it fixes the interest rates on loans granted, sees that the Bank is properly

run and ensures that it is managed in accordance with the provisions of the EEC Treaty and of the Statute and with the general directives laid down by the Board of Governors; members of the Board of Directors are chosen from persons whose independence and competence are beyond doubt; they are responsible only to the bank.

Under Article 21 of the Statutes, before granting a loan the Bank must obtain the Commission's opinion on the conformity with Community objectives of the investment to be financed. If an unfavourable opinion is delivered the Board of Directors may not grant the loan concerned unless its decision is unanimous, the director nominated by the Commission abstaining. The Commission has delivered a favourable opinion on the Bank's financing of the new units of the Doel and Tihange nuclear power stations.

4. Amplifying the guidelines adopted in its resolutions of 1974 and 1975, the Council adopted on 9 June 1980 a resolution concerning Community energy policy objectives for 1990. One of its chief objectives is to cover, by 1990, 70 to 75 % of primary energy requirements for the production of electricity by means of solid fuels and nuclear energy<sup>(1)</sup>. Investments which help attain the Community's energy policy objectives fall within the task entrusted to the Bank by paragraph (c) of Article 130 of the EEC Treaty.

5. The EIB envisages granting a loan only where examination of the financing plan of a project reveals that its assistance is essential for completing the project. It agrees to cover part only of the cost of a project, supplementing the borrower's own funds or funds from other sources.

6. The Commission understands that the statement alluded to by the Honourable Member means that the Belgian electricity industry has always been able to finance its investments out of own funds or by means of loans from various sources, including the Community (EIB, Euratom).

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 149, 18. 6. 1980, p. 1.



**WRITTEN QUESTION No 1998/80****by Mrs Lizin****to the Commission of the European Communities***(9 February 1981)*

**Subject:** Abuse of the dominant position of the 'Boerenbond' (Article 85 *et seq.* of the Treaty)

In their terms for the acceptance of cereals the buying and selling agencies of the 'Boerenbond' have made it clear that they wish to reserve this service for their customers. In the areas where the 'Boerenbond' has a dominant position this procedure may pose serious difficulties for farmers who are not their customers. Does the Commission not agree that this constitutes an abuse of a dominant position within the meaning of Article 85 *et seq.* of the Treaty? Moreover, since farmers have to use the services of intermediaries to benefit from the intervention guarantees provided for in Article 39 and if these intermediaries create difficulties for them or force them to agree to their terms, can the Commission still claim that the objectives referred to in Articles 39 to 43 of the Treaty are being met?

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

*(22 April 1981)*

The Boerenbond runs a cooperative for processing and marketing agricultural products and for purchasing production resources. The purchase and sale of cereals brought in by its members is one of the normal activities of such a cooperative.

The agency responsible for Community intervention operations in Belgium, including operations to do with cereals, is the Office Belge de l'Economie et de l'Agriculture (OBEA). It may happen that this agency commissions the Boerenbond's cooperative, along with other cooperatives or private firms, to store cereals under conditions and for periods fixed by the agency. It is not the Boerenbond's function to apply the Community rules on cereals intervention.

The information available to the Commission does not suggest that the Boerenbond is abusing a dominant position on the cereals market.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2051/80****by Mr Muntigh and Mr Van Minnen****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 March 1981)*

**Subject:** Work programmes of the European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions with reference to unemployment

In our Written Question No 1531/79 of 16 January 1980 <sup>(1)</sup> we put the following question to the Commission.

'Is the Commission prepared to request the management board of the Foundation to carry out a study of the consequences for living and working conditions of the introduction in the European Community of:

1. a seven-hour working day;
2. a five-hour working day;
3. an additional shift in firms in continuous operation;
4. the option of allowing employees to work a four-hour day between the age of 55 and retirement age;

as these reductions in working hours would all help to solve the unemployment problem and, in the case of point 2, female unemployment in particular?'

On 7 May 1980, the Commission gave the following answer:

'In the course of 1980 the Management Board of the European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions will draw up a

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 140, 10. 6. 1980, p. 8.

new four-year programme for the period 1981 to 1985.

The Commission representatives on the Management Board — which includes nine representatives of Community trade union organizations and nine representatives of employers in the Community — will not fail to take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the members of the Management Board to the points made in the Honourable Members' questions.'

The Commission is requested to answer the following questions:

1. Has the Commission informed the members of the Management Board of our abovementioned request?
2. If so, what was their reaction and have the studies we called for been included in the new programme for 1981 to 1985?
3. If they have been included, when are the findings likely to be available?
4. If they have not, why not?

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

*(23 April 1981)*

The Commission representatives on the Management Board of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions brought up the Honourable Members' points in the course of the discussions on the 1981 to 1985 four-year programme.

On 18 November 1980, the Management Board adopted the four-year programme for the period 1981 to 1985. The modification of daily and weekly working hours is one of the subjects for study. The Foundation is to conduct studies on the consequences of modifying in working hours for living conditions, quality of life, the environment and leisure as part of the work initiated by other Community institutions in which the Commission is directly involved.

This topic has also been included in the Foundation's programme for 1981.

The Management Board expressed the wish that the Foundation should first conduct an analysis of the existing documentation on the modification of weekly and daily working hours and total working time.

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 2086/80**

**by Mr Schmid, Mr Van Mingen, Mr von der Vring,  
Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and Mr Walter**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

*Subject: Swearing in of the new Commission before  
the European Court of Justice*

On the basis of what provisions do the members of the Commission take their oath of office (the solemn undertaking required under Article 10 of the Treaty establishing a single Council and a single Commission) before the Court of Justice and not before the European Parliament although political supervision of the Commission is one of Parliament's duties and Parliament has the right to dismiss the Commission?

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

*(22 April 1981)*

There are indeed no Treaty provisions which dictate that the solemn undertaking required by Article 10 of the Merger Treaty be administered by the Court of Justice. The main justification for the present practice is that this solemn undertaking is an individual act by each Commissioner concerning binding legal obligations, the violation of which can only be adjudicated by the Court pursuant to Article 10 of the Merger Treaty. In contrast, the Commissioners' responsibilities *vis-à-vis* the Parliament are political and collective in nature.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2088/80****by Mr Welsh****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 March 1981)**Subject: Aids to the French textile industry*

*The Financial Times* of 1 December 1980 included a report from their Paris correspondent on State aid to the French textile industry. This stated that the Committee for the Development of Strategic Industries (CODIS) would be empowered to make grants and soft loans to the most dynamic companies in this sector, with whom they would sign development contracts. The Interministerial Committee for the Development of Investments and Aid to Employment (CIDISE) will make participatory loans available to companies whose capital and reserves need strengthening and banks will be able to apply for loans for a special new fund financed partially by the State for on-lending to the textile industry.

1. Is the Commission aware of this report?
2. What information has it received from the French Government concerning these special measures in accordance with Article 93 of the Treaty of Rome?
3. Does it consider that there is any likelihood of these measures violating Article 92 of the Treaty of Rome?
4. Does the Commission accept that such reports underline the need for a unified policy on aids to the textile and clothing industries?
5. Does the Commission plan to introduce such a policy and if so, when will proposals be made?

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

*(22 April 1981)*

1, 2 and 3. The role of the Committee for the Development of Strategic Industries (CODIS) and of the Interministerial Committee for the Development of Investments and Aid to Employment

(CIDISE) is to deliver opinions before loans, possibly in quasi equity form, are granted from the resources of the Economic and Social Development Fund (FDES) to firms in the private sector.

It is not the role of the two Committees to make grants to firms. The French authorities may grant loans to the textile industry, as to any other industry, after consulting CODIS or CIDISE; such decisions do not require notification to the Commission.

However, the French authorities are required to notify the Commission when they grant loans that are equivalent to aid, whether general or sectoral, in accordance with the Commission's specific rules for such aid.

So far, the French Government has not notified the Commission of any loan involving CODIS or CIDISE granted to any textile firm.

4. The Commission considers that guidelines ensuring Community cohesion on aids to the textile and clothing industries are necessary to prevent an escalation in aid which would be ruinous for the Member States and of little effect for firms that are faced with competition from non-Community imports and with the need to carry out a more radical restructuring of the industry.

In cooperation with the Member States, the Commission established in 1971, and supplemented in 1977, a framework for aids to the textile industry <sup>(1)</sup>; the texts contain the criteria and conditions to be observed in order to ensure that national aids are consistent with sectoral development objectives, while at the same time complying with the conditions of intra Community competition.

5. The Commission is aware that the abovementioned framework arrangements — which must be adjusted as the situation in the industry develops — cannot produce the desired effects unless the guidelines which they contain are fully observed, notably

<sup>(1)</sup> Documents sent to the governments of Member States on 30 July 1971 (on 19 December 1973 in the case of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom) and on 4 February 1977 respectively.

when Member States work out schemes for granting assistance to the textile and clothing industries.

In the light of this requirement, the Commission, when scrutinizing aids pursuant to the Treaty, keeps a particularly close watch on national aid measures notified to it so as to ensure that they meet with the criteria laid down in the framework arrangements.

talks due to start in Geneva on 7 May. The various aspects of this proposal have been considered on a number of occasions with the representatives of the industry and the trade unions.

---

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2101/80**

**by Mr Cousté**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

*Subject: Dialogue with the textile industry*

Is the Commission prepared to resume the dialogue with textile industry representatives, to propose an international trade framework less disadvantageous to our industries than the present Multifibre Arrangement and to adopt special measures to maintain the competitive position of these industries on the European and world markets?

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

*(15 April 1981)*

The Commission has never suspended the dialogue with representatives of the textile and clothing industry. Consultations take place on a regular basis with European organizations and, when necessary, with national trade federations.

As regards international trade, the Commission will shortly be transmitting a communication to the Council for a decision on a draft negotiating brief for the renewal of the MFA, in preparation for the

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2113/80**

**by Mr Damseaux**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

*Subject: Mail-order sale of weapons*

Can the Commission state in which Member States the sale of weapons by mail order is legal or tolerated?

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

*(22 April 1981)*

The restrictions on mail order sales of sporting and target shooting weapons are the same as those on retail sales. They are very severe.

In most Member States these restrictions include identification of the purchaser, a minimum age and, in some cases, prior issue of a licence.

Apart from Northern Ireland, where there is a total ban on sales of weapons, national rules vary to some extent in severity from one country to another. Belgium has the most liberal rules.

Because of these restrictions mail order firms tend at present not to sell such articles.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2117/80****by Mr Damseaux****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 March 1981)**Subject:* Compensation for flood victims

Has the Community contributed to compensation for victims of the floods of July and August 1980 and, if so, to what extent?

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

*(22 April 1981)*

The Community granted Belgium emergency aid of 800 000 ECU from Article 59 of the budget for the victims of the floods which occurred in certain areas of the country in July and August 1980.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2140/80****by Mr Linkohr****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 March 1981)**Subject:* Salaries of officials of the European Communities

1. The implementation of Council Regulations 3085/78 and 3086/78 <sup>(1)</sup> has in part led to substantial decreases in the salaries of Community officials. Officials whose place of employment is in Italy have been particularly affected, suffering in some cases reductions of more than 30 %.

Why has the Commission not kept the assurances given to Parliament that:

(a) its proposals would in no way affect the real value of the payments made to officials in the form of remunerations and allowances

and

(b) its proposals would in no way adversely affect the remunerations and other allowances of officials and other servants of the European Communities?

2. Parliament requested the Commission to introduce in good time the administrative measures needed to ensure that the use of the EUA did not disrupt existing administrative practices or even temporarily harm the interests of the European civil service. Why has the Commission not taken these measures?

3. Why did the Commission subsequently alter essential aspects of the proposal approved by Parliament, without again consulting Parliament and the Staff Regulations Committee, although there were clear legal objections?

4. Does the Commission not agree that the way in which these Regulations were introduced is contrary to Parliament's resolution of 7 July 1977 (Failure to keep guarantees and promises, failure to consult Parliament after modification of the proposals)?

**Answer given by Mr O'Kennedy  
on behalf of the Commission**

*(23 April 1981)*

1. Application of the provisions of Regulation (EEC) No 3085/78 which relate specifically to the remuneration of officials and to the way in which it is paid (Articles 1 and 3 and Article 2, as regards the new version of the first paragraph of Article 17 of Annex VII) has had no adverse effect on the net amounts received by the officials concerned, because Regulation (EEC) No 3086/78 was applied at the same time. Consequently, the Commission had indeed respected its assurances to Parliament to which the Honourable Member refers in point 1 (a) and (b) of his question.

The situation is different as regards application of the new version of the second and third paragraphs

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 369, 29. 12. 1978, pp. 6 and 8.

of Article 17 of Annex VII with effect from 1 April 1979. But on this point, the Commission never made any declaration whatsoever about guaranteeing or maintaining existing financial situations.

2. The unfortunate effects to which the Honourable Member refers are not therefore the result of the updating of the exchange rates provided for in Article 65 of the Staff Regulations. The financial losses suffered by some officials stem solely from the new arrangements for transferring part of the remuneration, an area where previously, by virtue of the existence of weightings based on the International Monetary Fund's exchange rates of 1 January 1965, certain pecuniary advantages were possible, particularly to countries where the currency had depreciated sharply since that date.

Here too the institutions have, by common agreement, adopted rules laying down the procedure for the transfer of part of an official's emoluments; these have also applied with effect from 1 April 1979.

3. The application of the second paragraph of Article 149 of the EEC Treaty does not require renewed consultations as stated by the Honourable Member.

4. No.

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 2149/80**

**by Mrs von Alemann**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

**Subject:** Production and 'sell-by' dates on preserved foods

Can the Commission indicate the progress of discussions and/or studies on an EEC Regulation under which preserved foods must bear the production and 'sell-by' dates?

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

*(15 April 1981)*

At Community level, the dating of foodstuffs is governed by the provisions of Council Directive

79/112/EEC of 18 December 1978<sup>(1)</sup> on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs for sale to the ultimate consumer.

Under the terms of this Directive, the labelling of any foodstuff shall include the date of minimum durability (Articles 3 and 9). This obligation therefore applies to preserved foods. Nevertheless, Member States may waive the obligation laid down in this provision in the case of foodstuffs whose minimum durability exceeds 18 months (Article 23). This derogation will, moreover, have to be re-examined later on.

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

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 2157/80**

**by Mr Cohen**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

**Subject:** UNCTAD raw materials fund

In October 1980 the Commission asked the Member States of the Community to ratify the agreement on the raw materials fund, set up under UNCTAD, as quickly as possible.

What response has the Commission had to its request?

What further action does the Commission intend to take to ensure that the Member States which have not yet complied with its request do in fact ratify the agreement?

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

*(15 April 1981)*

The Commission has had a favourable response to its request made to the Member States last October to ratify as quickly as possible the Agreement on the Common Fund.

The Council has given favourable consideration to the Commission recommendation on the Com-

munity's participating in the Fund alongside the Member States, it being understood that the Council should take its decision only when the decision-making process has been completed in each Member State and that the Community should sign the Agreement after the Member States, in accordance with normal procedure.

Up to now eight out of the ten Member States have signed the Agreement. Belgium is expected to do so in the very near future, and the Commission has contacted the Greek authorities on this.

Stock is taken of the situation at regular intervals during meetings of the Council Working Party on Commodities.

munity rules governing the wine sector<sup>(1)</sup>, defining the product and the oenological practices in question and prohibiting coupage of this wine with other table wines.

The only difference between the production of 'retsina' and other dry white wine is the addition to the must, during fermentation, of morsels of Aleppo pine resin, which are then removed with the lees in the first racking.

The production of 'retsina' has a very long tradition in Greece and the rules governing it under Hellenic legislation have been tightened up in recent years; these provisions, relating to production and wine-making areas, vine varieties and controls, remain in force under the Community rules.

The Commission does not therefore consider it necessary at this stage to consult the Scientific Committee for Foodstuffs.

<sup>(1)</sup> Council Regulation (EEC) No 1990/80 of 22 July 1980 amending Regulation (EEC) No 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine; OJ No L 195, 29. 7. 1980, p. 6.

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 2163/80**

**by Mr Michel**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

*Subject: Resinated wine*

With the accession of Greece in mind, the Commission has proposed including in the Regulation on the common organization of the market in wines (No 337/79) those wines obtained by the addition of Aleppo pine resin.

Is it willing — if it has not already done so — to consult the Scientific Committee for Food on this practice?

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

*(21 April 1981)*

It was agreed during the accession negotiations with Greece to take account of the special situation of 'retsina' table wine, which is produced exclusively and traditionally in certain regions of Greece. To that end adjustments have been made to the Com-

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 2164/80**

**by Mrs Vayssade**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

*Subject: Reorganization of the dairy industry in Lorraine*

1. Has the Commission been informed of the agreements reached in Lorraine and Alsace involving the Lorraine-Lait and Laiterie Saint-Hubert groups?

2. Can it state on what basis these agreements were reached?

3. Can it indicate the implications they will have for production and employment levels?

4. Will these agreements, which seem to be intended to rationalize production, have short,

medium and long-term implications for the future operation of the production plants covered by the groups? If so what are they likely to be?

5. Do these agreements fit in with the milk production and consumption objectives of the Commission?

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

*(15 April 1981)*

The French Government presented a programme under Regulation (EEC) No 355/77 <sup>(1)</sup> for the modernization and reorganization of the processing and marketing of milk products, which was approved by the Commission on 4 December 1980 <sup>(2)</sup>.

The programme provides in particular for the rationalization of processing facilities in eastern France.

The Commission has not, however, been informed of the agreements to which the Honourable Member refers. It is therefore unable to reply to her questions.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 51, 23. 2. 1977, p. 1.

<sup>(2)</sup> Decision 80/1321/EEC published in OJ No L 380, 31. 12. 1980.

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 2175/80**

**by Mr Albers**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

**Subject:** Use of Citizens' Band transceivers by lorry drivers and tourists

What are the results of the intensive study carried out into the problems arising in connection with the free movement of persons within the Community

for those who take Citizens' Band transceivers with them on their travels <sup>(1)</sup>?

<sup>(1)</sup> Written Question No 634/80 (OJ No C 283, 3. 11. 1980, p. 9); and Written Question No 1431/79 (OJ No C 105, 28. 4. 1980, p. 29).

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

*(21 April 1981)*

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answers to Written Questions No 1606/80 by Mr Pedini <sup>(1)</sup> and No 2123/80 by Mrs Ewing <sup>(2)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 56, 16. 3. 1981, p. 20.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 116, 18. 5. 1981.

#### **WRITTEN QUESTION No 2178/80**

**by Mr Albers**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

**Subject:** Tourism

1. When allocating portfolios did the new Commission take account of the growing importance of tourism in the Community?

2. Which Commissioner is supposed to have a particular responsibility for tourism?

3. What was the result of efforts by the ITA (Bureau of Organizations of the International Touring Alliance), which can be regarded as representing over 13 million members, to have a place allotted to tourism in the organizations of the Community commensurate with its importance through the establishment of a special department for tourism <sup>(1)</sup>?

<sup>(1)</sup> See the letter dated 9 March 1977 from the ITA to the President of the Commission.



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

*(23 April 1981)*

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its reply to Written Question No 1800/80 by Lord O'Hagan <sup>(1)</sup>.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 87, 16. 4. 1981, p. 12.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2195/80**

**by Mr Welsh**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(5 March 1981)*

**Subject:** Curriculum of the European School at Culham

In the magazine 'European Community' (No 10 of October 1980) there is an article on the European School at Culham which contains the following passage:

'There is no morning assembly with prayers or hymn singing. Religious instruction is given by visiting clergymen or priests to those who wish to receive it. Secularists, on the other hand, are given non-religious ethics.'

1. Does the Commission regard the absence of a morning assembly as a matter for self-congratulation?
2. How do pupils who wish to receive instruction from visiting clergymen or priests make their wishes known?
3. Is it assumed that all those who do not make such wishes known are automatically 'secularists'?
4. How does the Commission distinguish non-religious ethics from ethics?
5. What are the qualifications of the teachers who 'give non-religious ethics'?
6. What are the contents of the basic non-religious ethics course?

7. Does the prose style of this particular article accurately reflect the standard of English teaching at the European School at Culham?

**Answer given by Mr O'Kennedy  
on behalf of the Commission**

*(21 April 1981)*

The Commission would respectfully remind the Honourable Member that the Board of Governors, on which the Contracting Parties and the Commission are represented, is the supreme authority of the European Schools.

1. Morning assembly with religious acts of worship is not the general practice in schools in other Member States of the European Community (except perhaps in Ireland); the Culham School follows the curriculum common to all the European Schools.
2. Normally it is the parents who indicate to the School if they wish their children to receive religious instruction from visiting clergy.
3. It is not assumed that those children not wishing to follow religious instruction are automatically 'secularists'; but some parents wish their children to have experience in both courses.
4. Non-religious ethics may be described as the study of moral questions without religious bias.
5. The qualifications of the teachers who give courses in non-religious ethics vary; some are specialists, others are teachers of, for example, the history of philosophy, who volunteer. Of the Member States, only Belgium and France use teachers specially trained in this subject.
6. The contents of this basic non-religious ethics course are too voluminous to quote in a written answer, and in any event are being revised. A copy will be sent to the Honourable Member and to the Secretariat General of the Parliament.
7. The article referred to was written by a professional journalist who bears sole responsibility for its content.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2196/80****by Mr Welsh****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 March 1981)***Subject:** Community olive oil production

In a letter to the Irish Ministry of Foreign Affairs from the Agricultural Attaché at the United States Embassy in Dublin dated November 1980 there is the following statement:

'Based on Commission's own data supplied to international organizations Community presently is a major olive oil deficit region requiring net annual imports between 100 000 and 150 000 million tonnes or about normal olive oil surplus in Spain and Greece adjusted for Portugal's small deficit. Thus in the enlarged Community, the supply and demand of olive oil will remain essentially in balance.'

Could the Commission confirm the accuracy of this statement and indicate what information it supplied to international organizations which might lead to this conclusion?

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

*(15 April 1981)*

In its Communication to the Council on the agricultural aspects of the negotiations for Spanish accession, the Community stated that the enlargement of the Community to include Greece and then Spain would have the effect of creating an annual structural surplus of some 200 000 tonnes in the olive oil sector, unless measures to prevent this were taken in good time.

Even at present levels of production and consumption, the Community of Eleven would have a surplus of olive oil (see table below). Moreover, the dismantling in Greece and in Spain of the import restrictions on oilseeds and the consequent change in the price relationship between olive oil and its competitors will worsen the imbalance between supply and demand as a result of the likely drop in consumption of olive oil in these two countries.

On the facts at its disposal the Commission sees no need to alter its conclusions on this subject as expressed in the abovementioned communication.

Compared with olive-growing in the Community of Eleven, olive-growing in Portugal is on a very small scale and is thus unlikely to affect the situation described above.

**Olive oil supply balance — average for 1975-1976-1977**

*(1 000 tonnes)*

	EEC 9 ( <sup>3</sup> )	Greece ( <sup>1</sup> )	EEC 10	Spain ( <sup>2</sup> )	EEC 11	Portugal ( <sup>1</sup> )	EEC 12
Production	540	218	758	440	1 198	49	1 247
Imports from non-member countries	113( <sup>4</sup> )		113	—	113	1	114
Consumption	617	177	794	302	1 096	52	1 148
Exports to non-member countries	19( <sup>5</sup> )	9	28	82	110	2	112
Rate of self-supply (%)	88	123	95	146	109	94	109

Sources: (<sup>1</sup>) IOOC.

(<sup>2</sup>) National statistics.

(<sup>3</sup>) Estimate based on applications for production aid and NIMEXE statistics on trade.

(<sup>4</sup>) Including imports from applicant countries.

(<sup>5</sup>) Including exports to applicant countries.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2203/80****by Mrs Boserup****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 March 1981)**Subject: The Adams affair*

According to recent reports <sup>(1)</sup> it was in all probability a director-general in the Commission who, in 1976, denounced Stanley Adams to the Swiss authorities as 'thanks' for the confidential information he had given the Commission about Hoffman-La Roche.

I am aware that the director-general concerned has denied this accusation, but does not the Commission consider that this fairly well-substantiated accusation in itself throws doubt on the Commission's discretion and that this will inhibit any further disclosures of confidential information?

Will the Commission therefore take steps to remove all doubt about its director-general's complicity in Adams' denunciation? If so, how will it do this?

<sup>(1)</sup> *Der Spiegel*, 12. 1. 1981.

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

*(22 April 1981)*

On 14 January, following the press reports to which the question refers, the Commission issued a statement putting the record straight, to which the Honourable Member's attention is drawn.

In its statement, the Commission makes it clear that in the Hoffman-La Roche case, as for that matter in any other case in the competition field, the Commission and its staff have consistently refused to divulge the source of confidential information in their possession.

In these circumstances, the Commission firmly insists that the allegations made in the Adams affair, which are both ill-founded and tendentious in their presentation, and cast doubt on the strict compliance by Commission officials with the fundamental rules relating to the protection of confidential information, should cease.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2209/80****by Mr Marshall****to the Commission of the European Communities***(5 March 1981)**Subject: Recruitment to the Commission's Service*

In Community countries such as the UK, entry to the higher grades of the Civil Service is by a competitive annual examination. Could the Community institute a similar examination held at the same time each year?

**Answer given by Mr O'Kennedy  
on behalf of the Commission**

*(22 April 1981)*

The Commission does not consider that the solution referred to by the Honourable Member is an acceptable means of selection for individual high level posts. Nor does it believe it to be the common practice in Member States.

Staff are recruited to A grade posts by means of open competitions which are organized periodically. Successful candidates are placed on a list from which the Commission nominates staff as and when posts become available. At the moment the small number of posts available annually would preclude the organization of a competition each year though the Commission accepts that from the point of view of candidates this would be helpful. Candidates may write to the Commission to obtain information as to the likely dates of competitions.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2219/80****by Mr Adam****to the Commission of the European Communities***(6 March 1981)**Subject: Oil purchases*

It has recently been reported prior to the December OPEC meeting on oil prices, that importers were

paying over US \$ 40 per barrel for oil against a standard price of US \$ 37 per barrel.

Has the Commission information to state whether or not oil is being imported into the Community above the OPEC rate and if so will they state the name of the purchaser and the quantity and the price of purchase?

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

*(21 April 1981)*

The question refers to a standard OPEC price of US \$ 37 per barrel. In fact, no such a standard price exists, official prices for crude oil differing between producer countries and qualities. For example, during the fourth quarter of 1980, official OPEC prices ranged from under US \$ 25 for Venezuelan heavy to approximately US \$ 37 for Libyan and Nigerian lights crudes.

Whenever there are anxieties over crude oil supplies, premiums of one kind or another over official prices tend to be demanded by oil producers, at least for some cargoes, and paid by purchasers. To keep the situation under surveillance and to provide Member States with relevant information, the Commission operates a system of registration of crude oil imports into the Community under Council Regulation (EEC) No 1893/79<sup>(1)</sup> and subsequent implementing regulations.

This system, based on monthly reports by Member States of cargoes landed in their territories, relates to loadings some time earlier, due to the time taken by the voyage, and indicates both quantities and fob prices. The information is passed by Member States to the Commission in aggregated form without identification of individual purchases.

Information on landing in the Community during December 1980 indicated that premiums above official OPEC prices averaged less than 30 cents a barrel.

# **WRITTEN QUESTION No 2225/80**

**by Mr Muntingh**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(6 March 1981)*

*Subject: Oil pollution in the North Sea*

1. Is the Commission aware of the ecological disaster in the North Sea, in which many hundreds of birds have died on the coasts of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands as a result of oil pollution?

2. Is the Commission aware of the results of the investigation, which indicate that a Greek tanker was the source of the oil?

3. Does the Commission realize that this tanker, which was initially detained under suspicion of its involvement in the disaster, had to be released for lack of proof?

4. Does the Commission not agree that such proof could have been provided in time if an oil-marking system had been in operation, enabling oil to be traced directly to the vessels concerned?

5. Is the Commission prepared to take steps to introduce such a system at the earliest possible date?

6. Is the Commission prepared to reach agreement with Greece on the question of holding the said tanker liable for ecological damage caused, and of exacting the appropriate penalty?

7. The oil companies apparently have a fairly rapid system for identifying oil leaks from one of the North Sea wells; to what extent is this system available for use by other bodies?

8. Is the Commission prepared to take steps, if necessary, to ensure that it is possible for bodies other than the oil companies to analyse oil specimens and identify the well in which the oil originated, and to do so in the shortest possible time?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 73, 19. 3. 1980, p. 1.

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

(21 April 1981)

1, 2, 3 and 6. The Commission is aware of the circumstances which aroused suspicions that it was a Greek vessel which caused the death of a large number of birds in the North Sea.

According to the information at the Commission's disposal, there is circumstantial evidence but no proof that the vessel to which the Honourable Member refers was responsible for the aforementioned ecological disaster. Moreover, it seems that the birds were killed by a discharge which does not come under the 1954 Oilpol Convention or any of the amendments thereto and which cannot therefore be considered to contravene current international maritime law.

Consequently, there are no grounds for asking the Greek authorities to take sanctions against the tanker in question.

4, 5, 7 and 8. The Commission shares the Honourable Member's interest in the use of oil-marking to trace the source of oil spills. The Baltic States intend to inform IMCO of the results of their experiments in this field by the end of the year. The Commission then intends to ask the Advisory Committee on the control and reduction of pollution caused by hydrocarbons discharged at sea, which it set up on 25 June 1980 <sup>(1)</sup>, to make a more detailed analysis of the subject.

The Commission can reassure the Honourable Member that the companies operating offshore oil wells are fully aware of the chemical behaviour in the sea of the hydrocarbons that they extract and are able to carry out comparative analyses of oil specimens from unknown sources and oil from the various North Sea wells. Public authorities can also undertake similar analyses.

Nevertheless, the fact that an oil sample of unknown origin has the same chemical composition as oil from a given well does not mean that it is safe to assume that both samples come from one and the same well.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 188, 22. 7. 1980, p. 11.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2238/80**

**by Mr Früh and Mr Langes**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(6 March 1981)

**Subject:** Rectified grape must concentrate

Since the Commission did not reply in full to Written Question No 469/80 by Mr Früh <sup>(1)</sup>, we hereby repeat the unanswered questions, supplementing them on the basis of Commission Regulation No 2726/80 of 24 October 1980 which has since been adopted on the granting of aid for concentrated grape must and rectified concentrated grape must used in wine-making during the 1980/81 wine year.

Can the Commission say:

1. On what basis of calculation the aid for rectified grape must concentrate was fixed at the same level as that given in the report by the scientific institute referred to in Written Question No 469/80 and with whose findings the Commission does not agree because they are allegedly based on doubtful hypotheses?
2. Whether it believes that it is right to set up plants for the manufacture of rectified grape must concentrate when
  - (a) pursuant to Article 14 of Regulation (EEC) No 337/79, this product may only be used in certain years to enrich wine, and
  - (b) the product can be marketed only with the help of permanent subsidies.
3. For what purposes rectified grape must concentrate or the grapes from which it is produced will be used in years when, according to the EEC Regulation cited above, it may not be used or used only to a limited extent to improve wine.
4. For what length of time aid will be granted for rectified grape must concentrate, assuming it is not planned to make this aid permanent, and to what extent rectified grape must concentrate will be marketable should this aid lapse.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 275, 23. 10. 1980, p. 4.

5. Whether it is likely, given the aid for the manufacture and marketing of rectified grape must concentrate, that the production and marketing of sugar from these products will also be encouraged with EEC funds in other agricultural markets that have a structural surplus (milk, fruit)?

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

(21 April 1981)

1. The aid provided for under Regulation (EEC) No 2726/80 <sup>(1)</sup> was fixed on the basis of two factors. Firstly the Commission took into account the difference between the prices of a degree of potential alcoholic strength by volume as produced from concentrated grape must or from sucrose; secondly, it differentiated this aid according to the origin of the concentrated grape must or rectified concentrated grape must, in order to maintain the existing pattern of trade in the products and blending wines, as specified in Article 14 <sup>(1)</sup> of Regulation (EEC) No 337/79. The Commission stresses that the reason why it does not agree with the findings of the scientific institute is that its hypothetical calculation for assessing the different intervention measures to absorb surpluses is based on the buying price of wine in the context of preventive distillation.

Preventive distillation is a 'low price' distillation so that, as the most recent harvests have demonstrated, only a small number of wine-growers wish to take part. The Commission feels that any comparison should be made with distillations at nearer the market price entailing higher public expenditure.

2 and 3. Banning the use of sucrose for enriching wines will be the culmination of a long development in the wine sector, on both a statutory and a technological level. Promoting the production of rectified concentrated grape must for use in wine-making represents a considerable step towards realizing such a ban, as referred to in the 1979 to 1985 Commission action programme for the progressive establishment of balance on the market in wine <sup>(2)</sup>.

Rectified concentrated grape must may find a regular outlet in the processing of wine into sparkling wines and wine-based drinks.

The variation in demand for concentrated grape must used in enrichment, according to the degree of ripeness of the grapes, may be compensated for by the technical possibilities for storage of this product.

In the view of the Commission, the marketing of rectified concentrated grape must will not necessitate permanent subsidies. Indeed the product will become increasingly attractive as production is stepped up and manufacturing costs reduced; this, in conjunction with measures taken to reduce the use of sucrose, justifies the aid granted for promoting production of rectified concentrated grape must.

4. At this stage, the withdrawal of aid for the use of rectified concentrated grape must is not envisaged. This aid forms part of a set of measures directed towards progressively dismantling discrimination between regions using sucrose and those which have to use concentrated grape must.

The results obtained from these measures will determine the procedures for fixing the annual amount of aid granted for the use of concentrated grape must and rectified concentrated grape must.

5. The Commission stresses that, unlike the wine sector where the addition of sucrose is forbidden in some Community regions but permitted in others, the addition of sugar to milk products and fruit does not give rise to similar distortions.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2243/80**

**by Mr Penders**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(6 March 1981)

*Subject:* Food deliveries to Poland

Can the Commission confirm the statement made on German television (ARD) on Sunday, 8 February

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 281, 25. 10. 1980, p. 18, Article 2.

<sup>(2)</sup> Doc. COM(78) 260 final, 31. 7. 1978.

1981 that virtually none of the food offered to Poland by the Community at favourable prices before Christmas has left the warehouses?

If so, what is the explanation for this?

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

*(24 April 1981)*

No. Following the decision of the Council (Foreign Affairs) on 16/17 December 1980 to supply agricultural products to Poland at special prices, the Commission rapidly ensured that the necessary administrative procedures were established for the implementation of these sales. The quantities involved were as follows: 30 000 tonnes butter; 3 000 tonnes whole milk powder; 15 000 tonnes beef; 35 000 tonnes pork; 200 000 tonnes cereals (barley and rye); 15 000 tonnes rice; 10 000 tonnes pearled barley; 50 000 tonnes sugar; 40 000 tonnes rape seed and 600 tonnes olive oil.

Despite certain difficulties, particularly in obtaining export credits, contracts have been signed for about 100 % of the butter, 70 % of the beef, 100 % of the cereals and of the sugar. The Commission expects the rest of the contracts to be completed as soon as possible.

Actual deliveries have been under way since the end of January and are expected to be completed by the end of April, based on estimates by the Polish authorities.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2247/80**

**by Mr Balfe**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(6 March 1981)*

*Subject: Answers to written questions*

1. Can the Commission state how many questions for written answer from me were still awaiting reply

as at 1 January 1981, and how long has each of those questions been waiting for reply?

2. Does the Commission consider that its present rate of reply is satisfactory? If not, what plans does the Commission have to improve on this?

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

*(21 April 1981)*

1. The information requested by the Honourable Member can be obtained from Parliament.

2. The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to Written Question No 2187/80 <sup>(1)</sup> by Lord O'Hagan on the same matter.

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No C 88, 21. 4. 1981, p. 27.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2257/80**

**by Mr Pöttering**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(6 March 1981)*

*Subject: Assistance for infrastructure projects from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF)*

Some 70 % of ERDF assistance is granted for infrastructure projects. In practice the assistance provided by the Commission varies greatly from one Member State to another. In the United Kingdom and Ireland, for instance, the emphasis is on advance factories, while in Italian the bulk of the support is for water supply and sewage facilities. In France assistance is concentrated on improving the road and telephone network.

1. What criteria does the Commission use in selecting infrastructure projects to be aided?
2. Does the Commission consider it necessary to review its current aid practices?

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

(15 April 1981)

From the grant applications submitted to it by the Member States, the Commission selects infrastructure projects according to the contribution they make to the economic development of the region in question. Under Article 6 of the ERDF Regulation, investments may benefit from assistance only if they fall within the framework of regional development programmes. The Commission's choice of investment projects is therefore linked to national regional development priorities.

The Commission intends to continue its efforts to ensure, particularly through a steady improvement in regional development programmes, that projects conform more closely to regional priorities and that ERDF assistance is less dispersed.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2270/80**

**by Mr Cousté**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

(9 March 1981)

*Subject:* Accession of Greece to the Communities and consequences for the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement

Will the Commission state what consequences the accession of Greece to the Community will have on the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement?

What amendments are planned to the protocol to the Agreement as regards:

- Turkish exports to the Community;
- tariff quotas?

If the Community agrees to Turkish demands on these two points will it add new clauses and if so which?

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

(23 April 1981)

As regards the effects of Greek accession on the EEC-Turkey Association, the view of the Commission is that they will be of a marginal and positive nature overall. This is essentially for two reasons.

First, by virtue of her Association Agreement with the Community, Greece already received prior to accession:

- duty and quota-free access to Community markets for industrial products (apart from ECSC products not covered by the Agreement);
- and duty-free access for over 90 % of its agricultural exports.

Greek accession therefore will not significantly alter the factor of competition between Greek and Turkish exports on the Community market.

Secondly, the adoption of the Community's 'acquis' towards Turkey will involve Greece in considerable trade liberalization. As well as applying tariff preferences towards Turkey, Greece will have to abolish quantitative restrictions and measures of equivalent effect. For Turkey, Greek accession will mean the opening up of a hitherto highly protected market, albeit a small one, and the potential thus exists for Turkey to increase its exports to Greece.

Negotiations for a protocol of adaptation to the EEC/Turkey Association Agreement to take account of Greek accession opened on 21 January 1981 and are still under way. The Community's position is that Greece shall apply in full the provisions of the EEC/Turkey Agreement subject only to certain transitional arrangements. This adaptation includes the adjustments of quotas to take account of traditional trade flows between Greece and Turkey, where such trade exists.



**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2295/80****by Mrs Lizin****to the Commission of the European Communities***(9 March 1981)***Subject: The notion of 'indirect discrimination' in the Directives on equal treatment**

Directives 76/207 of 9 February 1976 <sup>(1)</sup> and 79/7 of 19 December 1978 <sup>(2)</sup> define the principle of equal treatment as meaning that 'there shall be no discrimination whatsoever on grounds of sex either directly, or indirectly, by reference in particular to marital or family status'.

Has the notion of indirect discrimination by reference to marital or family status been defined at Community level or during the preparation of these two Directives?

If not, would the Commission accept that 'indirect discrimination shall include any measure which, while having an apparently neutral or non-sexual basis, in fact affects predominantly workers of one sex'?

<sup>(1)</sup> OJ No L 39, 14. 2. 1976, p. 40.

<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No L 6, 10. 1. 1979, p. 24.

**Answer given by Mr Richard  
on behalf of the Commission***(21 April 1981)*

1. The notion of 'indirect discrimination' by reference to marital or family status has not been defined either in the body of the Directives adopted (Directives 76/207/EEC of 9 February 1976 and 79/7/EEC of 19 December 1978) or during the preparation of the Directives.

2. In the Commission's report to the Council <sup>(1)</sup> of 9 February 1981 on the application of Directive 76/207/EEC, several examples of what is considered to be indirect discrimination in the Member States are listed on pages 13 to 21.

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. COM(80) 832 final.

3. As far as the Commission is concerned, this term should be interpreted as referring to hidden discrimination which might in practice affect workers of one sex as a result of marital or family status being taken into account in determining the rights covered by the two Directives.

4. It should, however, be pointed out that Member States have until December 1984 to comply with Directive 78/7/EEC.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2297/80****by Mr Cousté****to the Commission of the European Communities***(9 March 1981)*

**Subject: Living standards of fishermen in Community countries over the last five years**

Can the Commission compare the living standards of fishermen in the different countries of the Community over the last five years with particular reference to:

- the income from their work;
- the benefits which they receive?

**Answer given by Mr Richard on behalf of the  
Commission***(22 April 1981)*

The remuneration of persons working in the Community's fishery sector is generally fixed on a share basis, i.e., the crew receives a percentage of the value of the catch. The share due to the crew and the way it is divided up among the crew members are usually fixed by individual contract and vary according to the type of vessel or the type of fishing engaged in. In some cases, particularly as regards deep-sea fishing, fishermen covered by a collective agreement receive a guaranteed minimum wage. In addition, some contracts lay down that the crew's

share is fixed after deduction of certain overheads, such as fuel.

In view of this diversity, no objective comparison of the incomes which fishermen derive from their work in the various Member States can at present be made.

The Commission is unaware of any direct national aids to fishermen's incomes.

383 <sup>(1)</sup> being Falcons built by Avions Marcel Dassault, France, and 315 BAe 125s built by British Aerospace, UK.

<sup>(1)</sup> Including 32 Falcon 20s operated by the Federal Express Corporation.

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2300/80**

**by Mr Cousté**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(9 March 1981)*

*Subject:* Executive aircraft market in the United States

Can the Commission say what is Europe's share of the executive aircraft market in the United States?

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

*(23 April 1981)*

There are about 4 500 business jets registered in the United States.

At 1 March 1981, 698 of these came from the Community (i.e. about 16 % of the estimated total)

**WRITTEN QUESTION No 2310/80**

**by Mr Seefeld**

**to the Commission of the European Communities**

*(9 March 1981)*

*Subject:* Distribution of staff in the various places of work

Can the Commission indicate the number of officials in all categories employed in the individual departments at the various places of work (Brussels, Luxembourg, etc.)?

**Answer given by Mr O'Kennedy on behalf of the Commission**

*(21 April 1981)*

The Honourable Member will find in the attached table a breakdown of officials and temporary staff by category and grade in the Commission's places of employment at 31 December 1980.

**Breakdown of officials and temporary staff by category between the places of employment at  
31 December 1980**

Place of employment	Category	Administrative appropriations	JRC	Indirect action	Total
Brussels	A	1 869	15	77	1 961
	B	1 309	2	28	1 339
	C	2 388	8	36	2 432
	D	344	—	—	344
	LA	881	—	—	881
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6 791</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>6 957</b>
Luxembourg	A	297	—	1	298
	B	492	—	—	492
	C	575	—	—	575
	D	78	—	—	78
	LA	232	—	—	232
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 674</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1 675</b>
Others	A	88	—	106	194
	B	71	—	47	118
	C	66	—	14	80
	D	—	—	1	1
	LA	4	—	—	4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>397</b>
Geel	A	—	47	—	47
	B	—	86	—	86
	C	—	56	—	56
	D	—	8	—	8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>197</b>
Ispra	A	—	378	—	378
	B	—	523	—	523
	C	—	699	—	699
	D	—	49	—	49
	<b>Total</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>1 649</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>1 649</b>
Karlsruhe	A	—	42	—	42
	B	—	76	—	76
	C	—	80	—	80
	D	—	7	—	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>205</b>
Petten	A	—	36	—	36
	B	—	74	—	74
	C	—	42	—	42
	D	—	7	—	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>—</b>	<b>159</b>
<b>Grand total</b>		<b><u>8 694</u></b>	<b><u>2 235</u></b>	<b><u>310</u></b>	<b><u>11 239</u></b>