

legislation of other Member States or the transfer of the contributions for those periods which may have been paid in such Member States.

Due

Chloros

Grévisse

Delivered in open court in Luxembourg on 18 February 1982.

For the Registrar

H. A. Rühl

Principal Administrator

O. Due

President

**OPINION OF MR ADVOCATE GENERAL
VERLOREN VAN THEMAAT
DELIVERED ON 17 DECEMBER 1981¹**

*Mr President,
Members of the Court,*

In Case 55/81 I should like in essence to follow the worthy example set by Mr Advocate General Warner in Case 69/79, *Jordens-Vosters v Bedrijfsvereniging voor de Leder- en Lederverwerkende Industrie* ([1980] ECR 88). In principle I subscribe in this case too so completely to the observations of the Commission that it accordingly suffices for me to adopt them as my own. The questions submitted to the Court by the Seventh Chamber of the Labour Tribunal, Liège, should in fact be answered, in my opinion, in accordance with the proposals of the Commission in this matter.

In this connection I would simply add that the Office National des Pensions pour Travailleurs Salariés (ONPTS)

acknowledged during the oral procedure the correctness of the remarks of the Commission with regard to the periods of employment abroad required to comply with Article 13 (2) (d) of Regulation No 1408/71 (defence at pp. 6 and 7).

The provisions regarding increased benefits provided for by that article in conjunction with the Belgian legislation concerning periods spent in military service and as a prisoner of war has, however, already led to an increase in Mr Vermaut's pension. The questions of the Labour Tribunal did not, however, relate to that point. Since that matter has become irrelevant to the original dispute it need accordingly have no effect on the answers drawn up by the Commission, which I have adopted, to the questions submitted.

¹ — Translated from the Dutch.