

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1982-1983

31 January 1983

DOCUMENT 1-1154/82 /
rev.

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

tabled by Mr BOCKLET, Mr AIGNER,
Mr I. FRIEDRICH, Mr K. FUCHS, Mr GOPPEL,
Mr HABSBURG, Mr LUCKER,
and Mrs SCHLEICHER

pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure

on the seat of the Community trademark office

The European Parliament,

- A. having regard to the Commission proposal for a directive to approximate the laws of the Member States relating to trademarks (COM(80) 635 final 2),
 - B. having regard to the obligation on the Community to employ public funds as rationally as possible,
 - C. having regard to the obligation on the Community to promote regional development,
1. Is of the opinion that the decision regarding the seat of the Community trademark office must be based on selecting the optimal location;
 2. Is of the opinion that, on this basis, it is not necessary to site the trademark office in Brussels or Luxembourg or in the capital of any other Member State;
 3. Is of the opinion that a long-term positive stimulus to the development of a regional economy could ensue from the establishment of a trademark office;
 4. Is of the opinion, however, that the level of unemployment obtaining in a particular region is no argument in favour of establishing the trademark office there since the jobs created by doing so can make no significant contribution to reducing regional unemployment;
 5. Considers it necessary to establish the trademark office in a city affording the facilities required by an international organization, for example one that is well integrated into the European transport network, acts as a bridge between a number of Member States and possesses a high standard of infrastructure;
 6. Considers it rational to establish organizations with complementary functions and related tasks in close geographic proximity;
 7. Proposes therefore the Bavarian provincial capital of Munich as the seat of the European trademark office;

8. Points out that Munich offers a unique advantage in that the Community trademark office could be attached to the European Patent Office already in Munich, by analogy with the logical practice in other European countries;
9. Points out that the European Patent Office is not a Community institution and that Munich would, therefore, acquire its first Community institution with the establishment of the trademark office;
10. Points out that when a location for the JET project was determined a few years ago, Munich was overlooked even though it offered the best conditions for it.

