

II-255 der Beilagen zu den Stenographischen Protokollen
des Nationalrates XVIII. Gesetzgebungsperiode

Nr. 195 1J

1990 -12- 19

A N F R A G E

der Abgeordneten DDr. Niederwieser, Dr. Müller, Strobl, Mag. Guggenberger
und Genossen

an den Bundesminister für auswärtige Angelegenheiten
betreffend Verhandlungen zwischen EG und EFTA

In der Ausgabe Nr. 0032 vom 11. -14. Dezember 1990 der Wochenzeitung
"The European" ist im Zusammenhang mit einem Bericht über die schwedi-
sche EG-Position auf Seite 12 zu lesen: "In June, all seven Efta coun-
tries presented a drastically shortened list of demands to the EC. This
list has been kept secret even from parliamentarians in Sweden and, as far
as I know, from the peoples of all Efta countries.... The abbreviated
Efta list, dated June 12, ist headlined: 'Strictly confidential. Issues
of fundamental interest to the Efta countries.'"

Unter dem Eindruck der bisher eher spärlichen Informationen des Nationalra-
tes durch den Bundesminister für auswärtige Angelegenheiten über die ver-
schiedensten Annäherungsbestrebungen an die EG und im Zusammenhang mit dem
ausschnittweise zitierten Artikel stellen die unterzeichneten Abgeordneten
an den Bundesminister für auswärtige Angelegenheiten nachstehende

A n f r a g e:

1. Wie lautet der genaue Inhalt des Efta-Abkommens vom 12. Juni 1990 ?
2. In welcher Form wurde das erklärte Interesse Österreichs und insbesonde-
re der Tiroler Bevölkerung eingebracht, über einen Beitritt Österreichs
zur EG erst zu verhandeln, wenn ein zufriedenstellendes Transitabkommen
mit der EG unterfertigt ist, das auch nach einem allfälligen Beitritt
Bestand hat ?

Sweden: a Trojan Horse inside the Community

● Per Gahrton
Swedish Green Party MP

THE ANNOUNCEMENT by Sweden's Government in late October that it intends to apply for full membership of the European Community has created a chaotic political situation as the government tries to move faster than the constitution allows. Negotiations between the European Free Trade Association (Efta) and the EC to create a "European Economic Space" (EES) have been thrown into disarray with EC representatives understandably reluctant to set up new and complex institutions which may rapidly become obsolete.

But more important than technical issues is the wider question: what does Sweden intend to do as a member of the European Community? Those in the EC who favour a widening membership need to ask themselves: will neutral Sweden, fiercely proud of its 180 years of peace and its lengthy history of independence, really change into an obedient member of the European club?

I doubt it. And sincere unionists inside the EC should doubt it also, before it is too late.

A leading Swedish liberal recently said that he wanted his country to apply for EC membership, but then went on to express his opposition to the abolition of checkpoints at national frontiers.

Swedish teetotalers believe it may be possible to retain their country's strict alcohol control policy under full EC membership. They seem to imagine that, after a few stern lectures from Scandinavian representatives, central and southern Europeans will suddenly grasp the dangers of alcoholism and act accordingly.

Swedish trade unionists believe they can sustain current employment levels within the EC (Sweden has less than a quarter of the



Per Gahrton: his attempts to highlight problems in Sweden's EC application have stirred up controversy

Community's average unemployment rate). Such views are typical of the pro-EC mood now sweeping Sweden and other Efta countries. Those who want to join the Community do not want to join the one that exists in reality, but rather an entity that exists only in their dreams.

Neutrality remains sacred to Swedes, and the Commission's plans for a common military grouping are simply ignored by my pro-European compatriots.

If I were an EC citizen - which I am not -

and a sincere supporter of the proposed union - which I also am not - I would be very suspicious about Efta in general, and Sweden in particular.

The heart of the matter is that Sweden wants to get the fullest commercial benefits from the internal market without itself paying a price. What this amounts to is that Sweden is trying to gain covert access to the EC decision-making process to influence the direction of the EC. Most Swedes who regard themselves as pro-EC want to

radically alter the EC - to sabotage the union from within. Being a Green MP, and former co-secretary of the European Greens, I am, of course, opposed to the development of the EC into a union which might become some kind of "superpower fortress".

But, in any case, I do not believe it is a fair political strategy for anti-union Sweden to join the EC partly or fully, with the aim of disrupting what a majority of the present EC members have set as their aim. The Swedish Parliament has already established many conditions for its incorporation within EC legislation. These concern everything from health and consumer protection to a sovereign financial policy.

Despite the significance of these conditions, they have been kept from the EC by a deliberate policy of non-translation. The Swedish Government, as well as parliamentary committees, have refused demands by the Green Party for the relevant parliamentary decisions from 1988 and 1989 to be translated in their entirety into EC languages.

Thus, few people know that although Sweden has promised the EC that it will apply the Cassis Dijon principle - under which any commodity which complies with the legal standards of its EC country of origin has free access to all other EC countries, or EC-harmonised members of the internal market - Sweden's Parliament has decided the opposite, stating that goods which fail to comply with Swedish standards may not be imported.

Furthermore, the EC is unaware, and so are most Swedes, that Swedish authorities have investigated the possible effects of adopting the "acquis communautaire," and have concluded that Swedish harmonisation with EC rules would in many cases lead to a decline in health and environmental security. These reports have in part been classified.

In May the Swedish Government, in a confidential "Problem Analysis EES", listed

around 50 crucial instances where harmonisation with the EC would present serious problems. It follows from this that Sweder would have to demand exemptions to the "acquis". When, earlier this year, I revealed the existence of the EES paper, and listed some of its contents in an article for the *Dagens Nyheter* newspaper, it stirred considerable debate.

In June, all seven Efta countries presented a drastically shortened list of demands to the EC. This list has been kept secret even from parliamentarians in Sweden and, as far as I know, from the peoples of all Efta countries. I can now make it public. The abbreviated Efta list, dated June 12, is headlined: "Strictly confidential. Issues of fundamental interest to the Efta countries."

The list contains 12 main groups, with sub-groups - altogether 22 demands for exemptions to EC-acquis. Sweden demands only eight exemptions. Thus, without public debate - without consulting even the Efta delegation of the Swedish Parliament - our government has unilaterally deleted dozens of crucial demands. Among those deleted are demands concerning Sweden's stricter rules on chemicals, nuclear safety, biotechnology, emissions from cars and trucks, traffic and tax control.

Those who seek to accept Sweden as part of the EC structure are heading for problems. Sweden will be a Trojan Horse in their midst.

My opposition to EES and EC membership does not mean that I reject co-operation with the Twelve. On the contrary, because I want honest and close co-operation between sovereign Sweden and EC countries in the framework of a permanent united nations of Europe, I strongly dissociate myself from the present dishonest approach of Sweden's political and economic establishment.

It is based on a policy of deceiving either the EC or the people of Sweden or, most probably, both.

14. - 16. 12. 90 The European