

GENERAL REPORT

(annexe three tables)

rapporteur

Jean MASSOT
Conseiller d'Etat

Inspired by actual actions having recently come before the French administrative jurisdiction, the cases which formed the basis for the national reports were precisely "*located*" in time and place.

Indeed, one cannot afford to neglect the differing situations in the member-states with respect to immigration levels and the numbers of requests for asylum. Two appended tables provide some statistical indications which seemed essential to understanding why the relevant regulations, and indeed, procedures, are bound to differ according to whether there are in that country hundreds, thousands or hundreds of thousands of asylum-seekers. In the same way, one must not lose sight of the differing historical traditions which govern the law pertaining to aliens and to nationality. One is familiar with the traditional differences in the law on nationality between the respective roles of *Jus sanguinis* and *Jus soli*; but it is clear, too, that depending on whether marriage to a spouse who is a host country national does or does not affect the right to obtain that nationality, or indeed initially, a residence permit, that this will greatly affect the way in which one will ask the question of whether a marriage between persons of different nationalities is simulated (the third appended table gives some statistical details on the number of such "mixed marriages"). Finally, decisions concerning the residence by aliens will differ in nature and in scope depending on whether the country in question is one where residence entails no formalities or, by contrast, where it is compulsory for all, including nationals, to register with the authorities (*Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands*).

The cases were also located in time. It was observed in the French report that, even in *France*, the responses would not necessarily be the same today, in view of the major changes to the law pertaining to aliens introduced in 1993. Nearly all national reports indicate comparable developments and mention recent far-reaching reforms of the relevant law in each of the member-states. At this point, one should pay tribute to the precise care which rapporteurs took to indicate changes, in some cases even taking care to transpose in time the specific situations, as formulated, so as to make allowance for the perturbing effects of certain reforms, such as for example, the exceptional operation regularizing non-Community citizens living in *Italy* on December 31, 1989. In addition, many delegations mentioned ongoing uncertainty as to the legal validity of certain legislative changes given that, as the reports were being written, the competent courts were still examining their constitutionality.

All these difficulties, which were not underestimated when the symposium themes were being chosen, have been successfully overcome which indicate the results of a systematic study of the national reports, show by the very small number of blank spaces, that all the questions put have received detailed replies, very often backed up by references to the relevant texts and case-law.

Since two sessions of the colloquy will be devoted to discussing respectively one of the two cases, **the general report adopts a different approach**. Many of the issues raised in both cases can usefully be taken together. However certain questions concerning the substance of the law required more specific replies in that the law pertaining to requests for asylum is, in nearly all countries, distinct from the ordinary law applying to aliens.

We will therefore consider in succession :

- Issues of competence and procedure on which there is considerable convergence, despite differences between the legal systems.

- Issues of substance, the responses to which are going to be all the closer if the objective situations in respect of the presence of aliens are themselves more comparable.

I. RULES OF COMPETENCE AND PROCEDURE

By taking together the replies to the two cases, one can identify four categories of rule which, beyond the diversity of legal traditions, do involve a considerable degree of convergence. We shall here summarize the replies relating to :

- the competent jurisdictions,
- is it compulsory to be represented by legal counsel and what is the cost of the proceedings,
- does the application have suspensive effect and what are the time limits for judgement,
- and finally, the consequences of jurisdictional decisions and the effectiveness of their application.

I.1 The Competent Jurisdictions

This is undoubtedly the group of questions which gives rise to fewest surprises, since all participants in the colloquy are very well aware of the great diversity of legal traditions and of jurisdictional organisation across our countries. Clearly, the most obvious difference is that which distinguishes those countries not having an independent administrative jurisdiction (*United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark*) from the other countries which do, in one form or another. It is true that in the first group of countries, the scope of the distinction is considerably attenuated by the possibilities of seeking redress, accompanied by numerous safeguards, before specialized bodies sometimes called "*tribunals*", and by the existence of the special procedure of "*judicial review*" of decisions made by these "*tribunals*".

That said, one observes that :

- For decisions relating to the the issuing of residence permits and to deportation, the continental countries generally recognize the competence of the administrative jurisdictions under ordinary law, with their various levels (between 1 and 3 according to the country) and that with or without the obligation of prior administrative redress.

- By contrast, as regards the granting of refugee status, several countries have a special jurisdictional organization which takes the form either of limiting the possibilities in appeal or in cassation (this applies in *Germany* to manifestly unfounded requests), or of the existence of a specialized jurisdiction whose decisions are only subject to review in cassation (*Belgium, France*).

- And finally, that in certain countries, the ordinary courts assume competence in parallel to the administrative jurisdiction in case of measures impinging on a freedom, such as freedom of movement (*Belgium, France*, in the latter country taking the form of an extensive interpretation by certain courts of the "*voie de fait*").

1.2 Representation by Legal Counsel - Cost of the Proceedings

It is interesting to observe that member states are almost evenly divided between those where representation by legal counsel is not compulsory (*Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, Netherlands, United Kingdom*) and those where it is (*Spain, Luxembourg Greece, Italy, Portugal*); *France* is set apart by a distinction between, on the one hand, procedures of redress against decisions by the O.F.P.R.A. denying a permit or refugee status, or deportation orders, which are exempt from the requirement for legal counsel, and, on the other hand, the special procedure of review cassation against decisions of the Committee of Appeal for Refugees which does require representation by counsel of the Conseil d'Etat.

However, in practice, in all those countries where such representation is not compulsory, national reports did indicate that it was strongly recommended to avail of it, and that in actual fact few applicants failed to do so. Three countries, *Denmark*, *Ireland* and *United Kingdom*, gave details of a practice, which no doubt also exists elsewhere, the fact that lawyers are made available free of charge by associations, or indeed by official bodies, which exist to assist asylum-seekers. Many countries have a legal aid machinery, on the details of which one might perhaps come back during the symposium.

The costs of the proceedings are confined in certain countries to lawyers' fees; others retain a system of financial sureties, stamp duties or registry dues; where the amounts concerned are specified, they would seem to lie between 5 to 10,000 FF. Only Ireland indicated a noticeably higher cost and the general rapporteur believes that there is good reason to indicate that the same is true of the *United Kingdom*, when the applicant avails of the services of a solicitor or barrister. In some countries, this amount may be multiplied by the number of possible jurisdictional levels. In most countries, the judge is empowered to order the losing party to bear all or part of the costs.

I.3 Suspensive Effect or Otherwise of the Application

One preliminary point should be made. Although it was not specified in the description of the two cases, several national reports did make this very useful point. The suspensive effect or otherwise of a jurisdictional application clearly does not have the same scope, depending on whether the administrative decision being contested is a refusal (case N° 1 being a refusal to issue residence and work permits, case N° 2 a refusal to grant refugee status) or, by contrast, a decision having an immediate positive effect (deportation order in the second case). Clearly, where decisions take the form of a refusal, one should not interpret the suspensive effect or a stay of execution as implying that the judge issues a provisional permit to the alien in question, but rather that his decision prohibits the administration from drawing any positive conclusions from this refusal, or in other words from considering the alien's presence as irregular and deporting him.

That said, most national reports indicated that a jurisdictional appeal against a decision refusing to issue a residence or work permit did not have suspensive effect (by contrast with what happens in cases of prior administrative appeal in certain countries : *Germany*, *Belgium*, *Spain*, *Netherlands*). In most countries there exists a stay of execution procedure, often subject to the requirement of serious grounds and a prejudice which would be difficult to remedy. Some countries make a distinction depending on whether the foreigner made his request while already being in possession of a previous permit, be it regular or not : in *France* and *Greece*, there can be no stay of execution in cases where, the foreigner's presence being already irregular at the time of his request, the rejection does not alter his legal situation. In the case of the *Netherlands*, it is indicated that although the jurisdictional application does in principle have suspensive effect, the minister may specifically decide otherwise. Finally the law may specifically provide that a request for stay of execution has itself suspensive effect (*Portugal*), or indeed not only in first instance, but also on appeal (*Italy*), that the judge receiving a request for stay of execution may initially make an immediate decision to grant a provisional stay of execution (*Greece*) before making a judgement as to the stay of execution, or finally that a decision on the request for a stay of execution must be made within a certain time limit (*Belgium*, *Italy*).

As regards refusal to grant refugee status, however, there are more countries in which a jurisdictional appeal has suspensive effect, at least where the rejection is based on the merits and not on grounds of the request's being inadmissible, dilatory in intent or manifestly unfounded; this distinction is clearly made in German and Dutch law : it is then only in cases of rejection on the merits that the application has suspensive effect. In countries where an application does not have suspensive effect, it does in any case seem that a stay of execution is granted more liberally for requests relating to recognition of refugee status than for other types of case. Let us mention two distinctive characteristics of French law : the first jurisdictional appeal, that submitted to the Appeal Committee for Refugees, does have suspensive effect, but not review the in cassation by the Conseil d'Etat. But whereas to date a stay of execution before the Conseil d'Etat seemed impossible in case of decisions denying refugee status, the matter may be subject to reexamination given the effects of this decision on the regularity of residence in the light of the legislative reform of August 24, 1993.

Finally, and still with respect to the second case, the French report is the only one to mention a specific procedure for cases relating to deportation orders (a specific procedure did also exist in Belgium; it was repealed by a 1993 legislative reform). This jurisdictional procedure is both suspensive and subject to a very short time limit.

I.4 Consequences and Effectiveness of Jurisdictional Decisions.

This question was only specifically put with respect to case N^o1. One can nevertheless draw conclusions from the national reports, which apply to both cases.

Most indicate that the annulment of a rejection or refusal, entails an obligation to once again make a decision on the alien's request, while of course not committing the same unlawful act. Several reports specify, however, the administration then makes its decision in the light of the circumstances in fact and in law pertaining on the date of the new decision, and which might make lawful something which had previously been adjudged unlawful.

Nonetheless, in a number of countries, the judge when annulling a refusal based solely on grounds which do not involve a discretionary evaluation by the administration, enjoys powers to impose an actual injunction on the administration and to order it to issue the permit which it had previously refused : this approach is clearly indicated in the *German, Belgian, Irish and Portuguese* reports.

Others go even further and state that in certain cases, the judge's decision replaces that of the administration (*Spain, Netherlands*).

Other countries have recourse to punitive sanctions procedures against an administration which fails to act according to the courts judgement (*Denmark, Greece, Ireland, United Kingdom*).

Italy, Luxembourg and France are no doubt the countries where the judge's powers are, at present, the least extensive :

- In *Italy*, a judge who has annulled a refusal is only empowered , where the alien has failed to obtain satisfaction and once again seizes the administrative justice system, to set a time limit for the administration to decide in a given direction;
- In *Luxembourg*, the Conseil d'Etat may, in the same case, appoint a special commissioner to decide the matter in the administration's stead;
- In *France*, an applicant who has obtained an annulment and who encounters inertia from the administration can only seize the Conseil d'Etat, at least six months after the annulment judgement, to impose a penalty for non-performance.

The French report is the only one to mention a particular problem when it comes to implementing jurisdictional rejections. As a result, the administration is empowered to carry out a deportation order; but this will only be possible if there is a country prepared to receive the alien in question. The police is very familiar with the following fraudulent practice, for the foreigner to destroy his papers and all proof of nationality, which makes it extremely difficult to return him to his country of origin, should that country's consular authorities be less than eager to acknowledge him as one of their nationals. It is true that this problem does impinge on the issues of substance which are the subject of the second part of this report.

II. RULES RELATING TO SUBSTANCE

For the purposes of this section we shall adopt a somewhat less synthetic approach than in part I : the issues of substance raised in each of these cases are rather different; on the one hand, the powers of the administration with respect to what it considers to be a simulated marriage, and on the other hand, the status of an asylum-seeker before and after a decision has been made on his request. However, before undertaking separate analyses of the replies to these two categories of issue in the various reports, it does seem appropriate to take under the same heading the replies to the questions concerning the relevant applicable law and the way in which the judge can combine the different categories of rules.

II.1 Applicable Law

Here, the replies from the various countries show considerable convergence. Everywhere, in fact, issues of law pertaining to foreigners are considered both in the light of written rules (even in the *Common Law* countries) and of case-law (even in the countries of statutory law). Equally, these different rules are combined according to the principle of the hierarchy of standards.

Of course, as regards the application of international standards (European Convention and United Nations Pact in the first case, Geneva Convention in the second), one observes the traditional difference between the countries of the monist kind, which directly apply regularly ratified or approved agreements and which as of their being published ascribe to them an authority higher than of legislation, and countries of the dualist kind, in which international conventions are only applicable in domestic law if their provisions have been incorporated into domestic law. The Danish report reiterates this requirement for incorporation into domestic law; the British report specifies that the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms is not part of the United Kingdom's domestic law. But, firstly, in both these countries the Geneva Convention does appear to have been incorporated into the domestic legal order; and secondly, case-law interprets domestic laws in such a way as to ensure that they are in keeping with the requirements of international human rights conventions, which greatly reduces the practical scope of these differences.

Finally, many countries mentioned the fact that there had been major legislative reforms of the law pertaining to aliens during 1993, very often in connection with the SCHENGEN agreement. Although the cases specified do not concern intra-European movement of persons, clearly harmonizing the law pertaining to aliens is a concern shared by all member states. But several countries did indicate that these recent reforms had been subject to disputes before the constitutional jurisdictions. In the case of France, this debate gave rise to a constitutional reform, adopted on November 25, 1993. It will be of interest to ascertain at the May meeting, what replies have been elicited by these questions, notably in the cases of *Germany, Belgium, Spain and the Netherlands*.

II.2 The Issue of Simulated Marriages or Marriages of Convenience

As was stated in the introduction, the number of "*mixed*" marriages, ie. those in which at least one of the spouses is an alien, has been rising in most countries for which statistics are available (see Table N* III). This alone does not of course prove that this rise is due to increasing levels of fraud in the form of simulated marriages. However, such fraudulent behaviour does exist in many countries : receiving wide coverage in the press, radio, television and cinema.

In so far as the validity of a marriage can in general only be contested before the competent judicial authority and that, subject to highly restrictive conditions, the legal issue raised by case N°1 is that of whether the administration may notwithstanding, under certain conditions, lawfully refuse to draw the legal consequences normally ensuing from marriage, by citing its simulated nature.

Naturally, many reports point out that neither the administration nor the administrative judge are competent to contest the validity of a marriage, or a fortiori to annul it : this point is made in particular in the German, Belgian, Spanish and Italian reports. The Danish report even indicates that in such cases, the court to which an administrative decision contesting the validity of a marriage has been referred has to declare it null and void. The Spanish, Luxembourg and Portuguese reports mention the obligation on the administrative judge to put an interlocutory question to the judicial authority in coming to a decision on the validity of a marriage.

However, in many countries the law governing the issuing of residence permits does set requirements as to the duration and genuine nature of the spouses' married life, which in practice enables the administration not to take account of simulated marriages. Thus, German law pertaining to aliens only confers an independent right of residence to a foreign spouse where there has been actual married life for a set period of time. Recent Belgian legislation only assimilates non-community aliens to the community regime where the foreign spouse must come to take up residence with a Belgian spouse, which apparently confers on the administration, subject to verification by the judge, powers to assess the genuine nature of this *taking up of residence*. Spanish law makes the issuing of a residence permit to a foreign spouse subject to the condition of actual married life for a period of two years. The latest amendment to French law pertaining to aliens sets a requirement of the same nature, but limited to actual married life for a period of one year; the Conseil Constitutionnel has approved its constitutionality.

Finally, several national reports indicate that under an explicit legal provision, marriage can only entail consequences in respect of rights of residence provided that the marriage is not a simulated one : this is specifically stipulated in the *Netherlands*' 1982 circular relating to aliens; but the Dutch report raised the issue of whether this provision is compatible with Article 8 of the European Convention and the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights. In the same way, Section 131 of the British Immigration Law only authorizes the administration to issue a residence permit on the basis of marriage to a person resident in the United Kingdom, provided that procuring such a permit is not the primary purpose of the marriage.

One thus observes that all the countries have progressively brought in legal provisions aimed at discouraging the practice of simulated marriages or marriages of convenience.

II.3 Issues relating to the status of asylum-seekers

The statistics set out in table N°II demonstrate the steep rise in the number of requests for asylum in certain community countries. It is well known that the success rate of these requests is very low, given the fact that these requests are most often made by persons who are in no way the victims of persecution but are merely trying to obtain employment in countries where the economic situation is better than in their countries of origin. This then raises the question of how countries subject to this influx of requests can best respond in a speedy fashion, so as to avoid abuse of refugee status, while at the same time ensuring the right to an objective and in-depth examination of requests, a large number of which continue to be made by genuine refugees from countries where persecution is all too real (notably the former Yugoslavia).

As already pointed out with respect to procedural matters and the suspensive nature of appeal proceedings, most replies indicate that applicants for refugee status are entitled to reside legally in the host country until a decision has been made as to their request. They are generally accorded this right, be it by virtue of the law or by virtue of case-law, which is then based, as applied in France in the specific case set out in the questionnaire, on a general principle of law; it then takes the form of issuing a provisional residence permit (*Germany, Belgium, France, Greece, Portugal*) or an extension of a previous permit (*Spain, Luxembourg*). In some countries, however, their continued presence is merely tolerated without any legal permit until such time as a decision has been made on their request. Several countries impose a particular place of residence on the asylum-seeker, or even a compulsory stay in a centre, thus restricting their freedom of movement.

Unfortunately, the replies to the question on working rights were less complete. Only five countries, *Germany, Belgium, France, the Netherlands and Portugal*, indicated that they allowed asylum-seekers access to the labour market, on condition, however, that the employment situation allows. *France*, which had previously been even more liberal, automatically granting a temporary right to work, abandoned this practice in 1991, thus bringing asylum-seekers under the ordinary law pertaining to aliens.

A second type of issue was taken up in numerous national reports : the consideration given in examining requests for asylum to the country from which the asylum-seeker has come, when this country is not that in which the alleged threat of persecution exists. Several countries (*Germany, Italy, Netherlands, United Kingdom*) have incorporated into their law a "safe third country" rule, whereby, when the asylum-seeker comes from such a country, the courts may be prohibited from allowing a stay of execution against any decision to deport (*Germany* since July 1, 1993), or which allows the administration to lawfully refuse them entry to the national territory (*Italy* since a decree-law of 1989), or to render the request inadmissible (*Netherlands* according to the legislative amendment currently underway).

In *France* and *Greece* by contrast, case-law has refused to consider entry via a third country as sufficient grounds to reject a request for asylum. But in *France*, since the laws of August 24 and December 30 1993 it has been possible, following an amendment to the constitution, to refuse entry to the national territory, without right of appeal to the Office de Protection des Réfugiés et des Apatrides, when the examination of the request for asylum is a matter for a signatory state of the DUBLIN and SCHENGEN Conventions, a special category of states which are considered to be safe.

Many replies mention rapid procedures whereby manifestly dilatory or repetitive requests can be quickly disposed of. Mention has already been made of the restrictions under German law to the right of appeal in such cases. *Belgium*, too, with a law of May 6, 1993, has introduced a provision which, under these circumstances, precludes any administrative appeal or emergency interim proceedings, and which only allows an appeal to the Conseil d'Etat under ordinary law. *France*, which had in a first stage adopted on a case-law basis the lawfulness of escorting to the border an asylum-seeker whose request was manifestly dilatory, by a law of August 24, 1993, empowered the administration in such cases to refuse entry to the national territory. *Italy*, in cases of repetitive requests, applies the theory of a confirming decision not subject to appeal. A legislative amendment underway in the *Netherlands* would also allow for special processing of inadmissible or manifestly ill-founded requests.

Finally, little needs to be said about the replies to questions concerning consideration by the judge of the situation pertaining in the asylum-seeker's country of origin : all the reports reiterate that the Geneva Convention requires that consideration be given to the threat of persecution or ill-treatment in that country. The French and Dutch reports indicate that an independent dispute may develop as to the country of destination of the asylum-seeker whose request has failed, whereby the Geneva Convention is no longer involved.

*
* *

It is still too early to draw any final conclusions : the discussions which will take place during the colloquy will certainly enable us to clarify and further add to them.

If it is true, as we have suggested, that there is a link between the numbers of asylum-seekers or the rise in simulated marriages on the one hand, and on the other hand, developments in case-law or legislative reforms designed to prevent this, then it might be of interest to study the effectiveness of these developments or reforms. The statistical tables appended give varying results, if, for example, one compares the situations in *France* and *Germany*. One might perhaps ask why this is so and compare not the number of requests made, but the number of jurisdictional appeals; provided, that is, national rapporteurs are in a position to give some quantitative indication of how these types of proceeding have developed over recent years.

At the same time, and in the light of the ongoing debate in a number of countries as to the constitutionality of such restrictive measures, one should also seek to answer the question of whether it has been possible to find the right balance between the requirements of human rights, in particular in retaining the appropriate jurisdictional procedures, and preventing the legal abuses to which these procedures have given rise in the recent past.

Tableau n° 1

Entry of asylum-seekers intos certain O.E.C.D.
•Thousands•

Pays	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992*
Austria	34.6	6.3	5.9	7.2	6.7	8.6	11.4	15.8	21.9	22.8	27.3	16.2
Belgium	2.4	3.1	2.9	3.7	5.3	7.6	6.0	4.5	8.1	13.0	15.4	17.6
Denmark	0.3	0.3	0.3	4.3	8.7	9.3	2.7	4.7	4.6	5.3	4.6	13.9
Finland	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	2.7	2.1	3.6
France	19.8	22.5	22.3	21.6	28.8	26.2	27.6	34.3	61.4	54.8	47.4	28.9
Germany	49.4	37.2	19.7	35.3	73.8	99.7	57.4	103.1	121.3	193.1	256.1	438.0
Greece	-	-	0.5	0.8	1.4	4.3	6.3	9.3	6.5	4.1	2.7	2.0
Italy	-	-	3.1	4.6	5.4	6.5	11.0	1.4	2.3	3.6	24.5	2.6
Netherlands	0.8	1.2	2.0	2.6	5.6	5.9	13.5	7.5	13.9	21.2	21.6	17.1
Norway	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.8	2.7	8.6	6.6	4.4	4.0	4.6	5.2
Portugal	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.6
Spain	-	-	1.4	1.1	2.3	2.8	3.7	4.5	4.1	8.6	8.1	11.7
Sweden	-	-	4.0	12.0	14.5	14.6	18.1	19.6	30.0	29.4	26.5	83.2
Switzerland	5.2	7.1	7.9	7.4	9.7	8.5	10.9	16.7	24.4	35.8	41.6	18.1
United-Kingdom	2.4	4.2	4.3	4.2	6.2	5.7	5.9	5.7	16.8	38.2	67.0	-

(*) Provisional Data Source Report 1993 of the SOPEMI (O.E.C.D. Migrations Observatory)

Tableau n° 1**Number of refugees in the community contries on december 31,1992**

Germany	827.100
Belgium	24.300
Denmark	58.300
Spain	9.700
France	182.600
Greece	8.500
Irland	500
italy	12.400
Luxembourg	2.200
Netherlands	26.900
Portugal	1.800
United kingdom	100.000

Source "The State of the World's Refugees" United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Tableau n°3**Mixed marriages in certain O.E.C.D. Countries, 1980,1985 and the last available year**

Contry	year	total number of marriages	mixed marriages	of which :		mixed marriages as a share total (%)
				foreign husband	foreign wife	
Belgium	1980	66.369	6.944	4.103	2.841	10.5
	1985	57.559	5.583	3.182	2.401	9.7
	1990	64.554	6.868	4.029	2.839	10.6
Finland	1980	28.627	962	761	201	3.4
	1985	25.983	520	134	386	2.0
	1990	23.900	1.793	1.010	783	7.5
France	1980	334.377	20.615	12.287	8.328	6.2
	1985	269.419	21.417	12.644	8.773	7.9
	1990	287.099	30.543	17.937	12.606	10.6
Germany	1980	362.408	28.011	18.927	9.084	7.7
	1985	364.661	25.706	15.756	9.950	7.0
	1990	414.475	39.784	22.031	17.753	9.6
Luxembourg	1980	2.149	427	209	218	19.9
	1985	1.962	411	186	225	20.9
	1990	2.312	508	212	296	22.0
Netherlands	1980	90.182	6.329	3.301	3.028	7.0
	1985	82.747	5.228	2.868	2.360	6.3
	1990	95.649	10.337	5.868	4.469	10.8
Norway	1988	21.744	2.863	1.232	1.631	13.2
	1991	19.880	2.766	1.377	1.389	13.9
Portugal	1985	68.461	958	540	418	1.4
	1991	71.808	1.290	741	549	1.8
Switzerland	1985	40.200	3.321	1.123	2.198	8.3
	1991	47.600	3.871	1.224	2.647	8.1

Source "Report SOPEMI 1993"