

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

# BULLETIN



Brussels - No. 10/1982

---

**When notifying us of  
CHANGES OF ADDRESS,**

**you are asked to send back the envelope with your old address as printed by  
our addressograph machine. This helps us to trace you.**

---

# CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<b>I. 201st PLENARY SESSION</b> .....	3
THE FIGHT AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT .....	3
Resumé of speech by Mrs Fenger Møller, Danish Minister of Labour .....	3
Resumé of debate .....	4
<b>ADOPTION OF OPINIONS</b> .....	6
1. TRANSPORT POLICY IN THE 80s (own-initiative Opinion) .....	6
2. XIth COMPETITION POLICY REPORT .....	7
3. JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE III .....	10
4. GENERALIZED TARIFF PREFERENCES .....	11
5. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS RELATED TO ENERGY .....	13
6. WASTES FROM TITANIUM DIOXIDE IN- DUSTRY .....	15
7. EEC/US RELATIONS (information report) .....	16
<b>II. NEW CONSULTATIONS</b> .....	19
<b>III. PROVISIONAL FUTURE WORK PRO- GRAMME</b> .....	21
<b>IV. MEMBERS' NEWS</b> .....	23



# I

## 201st PLENARY SESSION

The 201st Plenary Session of the Economic and Social Committee of the European Communities was held at the Committee's headquarters in Brussels on 27 and 28 October 1982. The Chairman, Mr François Ceyrac, presided.

The Session was attended by Mrs Fenger Møller, the Danish Minister of Labour, in her capacity as President-in-Office of the Council.

### THE FIGHT AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT

Mrs Fenger Møller took part in a debate on the fight against unemployment and the promotion of investment. In view of the very brief preparation time since the Inaugural Session on 12 and 13 October 1982, the Committee decided not to adopt a formal Opinion on this subject.

#### Résumé of Mrs Fenger Møller's speech

Mrs Fenger Møller said, among other things, that in the last analysis it was governments (acting either together in the Community or on their own) who were responsible for the choice of the strategy to be pursued in the face of the challenges raised by the crisis.

Governments however were frequently having to grapple with acute short-term problems and therefore found it hard to tackle underlying problems in depth. The most useful contribution the Economic and Social Committee could make would be to submit recommendations to the Council on the best way of tackling long-term problems.

The experience of the Committee in a wide range of fields could be matched by very few politicians. This was why the Committee should make more use, when necessary, of its right to issue own-initiative Opinions.

Between now and the end of the century, the Community is going to have to accept wide-reaching economic and social changes and make the best of them. We shall have to find ways of using new technologies in

such a way as not only to breathe new life into existing industries, but also to create new industries, and hence new jobs. New working methods will have to be developed and new employment and training criteria worked out. This process will lead to changes in education and the use we make of leisure.

Members of the Committee have the knowledge and practical experience required to advise, support and encourage the Community Institutions when they tackle this type of problem. Great strength of character is needed to launch out in search of new approaches to such problems, but it would be tragic if the Economic and Social Committee lacked the self-confidence to undertake this task.

In the many fields where the Committee is asked to give its views on draft Community legislation, it must show a great deal of humility since there will inevitably be cases where the Committee is not the appropriate body to debate a particular question. When this happens, the Committee must accept the situation as it is without quibbling. However, where the Committee is genuinely qualified to express an opinion, its voice should be heard loud and clear. The Committee must also find time to devote its attention to the long-term problems mentioned earlier.

The Danish Minister of Labour then referred to the preparations for the Joint Meeting of Economic, Financial and Employment Ministers to be held on 16 November.

She expressed her conviction that the Council could count on the constructive collaboration of the Committee — and the organizations represented on it — in the search for solutions to major current problems, in its attempt to coordinate national economic and social policies more closely, and in the drafting of Community measures to combat unemployment.

### **Resumé of the debate**

During the debate the employers' representatives (Group I) stressed the need to view the employment problem in the general context of the economic situation, i.e. the Community's competitiveness at international level. If the Member States were unable to resolve this problem and achieve reasonable economic growth there would be no solution to the unemployment problem. Programmes for the short-term reduction of unemployment were only palliatives and efforts should be concentrated instead on creating permanent jobs. The Community should endeavour to map out the broad lines of the policies to be pursued and to create conditions conducive to the public and private-sector investments that alone could lead to new jobs. Account would have to be taken here of the principle of economic viability. It was not realistic to

think that an increase in wages would stimulate the economy; some of the Member States had the highest labour costs in the world. And protectionism, whether within the Community or outside it, would not offer any solution. Removal of the barriers affecting the Community's internal market was a prime necessity.



Mr Ceyrac, President of the ESC, welcomes Mrs Fenger Møller, Danish Minister of Labour, to the Plenary Session.

The workers' representatives (Group II) noted the massive increase in unemployment. They stressed the need to revitalize the economy through joint stimulation of investment in all the Member States. Community action on this front would be twice as effective as measures taken individually by the Member States. Wage costs were certainly not the main factor in the present economic difficulties; one should think rather of the negative effect of the decline in demand in a number of Member States. The trade union representatives also stressed the idea of sharing the available work and its implementation at Community level, which would in their view make it possible to prevent distortions between the Member States. Given the current changes in the economy in all the Member States, a gradual reduction of working time was inevitable. Finally, the workers' representatives urged the Community to take vigorous action to combat youth unemployment, which had serious implications for our society.

This latter point was also taken up by the representatives of Group III (Various Interests). They suggested that the Community draw up training and apprenticeship programmes and pursue a much more vigorous policy in this area than at present. They were in favour of more aid for small and medium-sized enterprises and a reduction in their financial burden.

## ADOPTION OF OPINIONS

### 1. TRANSPORT POLICY IN THE 80s (own-initiative Opinion)

*“Transport policy of the European Community in the 1980s”*

#### **Gist of the Opinion<sup>(1)</sup>**

The common transport policy of the 1980s will have to be pragmatic without losing sight of fundamental objectives. It must allow as much free competition as possible, though this will have to be curtailed where necessary if the overriding interests of the general public are at stake. This is in essence the central message of the Economic and Social Committee expressed in an Opinion which was adopted by a very large majority, with one abstention. The ESC also makes an urgent appeal to the Council and the Commission to implement a European transport Policy in the 1980s as soon as possible.

The ESC notes that one reason why little progress has so far been made towards a common transport policy (CTP) is undoubtedly that the basic stances of individual Member States differ and are largely predetermined by economic and geographical factors and by national transport market structures. Consequently, some Member States have striven primarily for more liberalization in the transport sector, whilst others have by and large given greater priority to harmonization of the terms of competition. In both cases, guidance has been necessary.

In an economic Community of ten states which trade heavily with each other, efforts to secure an optimum organization of the Community's transport system take on a European dimension and are therefore a matter of general Community interest. Given the inter-relationships between the transport sector and other Community policies, it is obvious that unresolved transport problems can have a negative or even harmful impact on the Community.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. CES 741/82.



The lack of optimum basic conditions leads to an uneconomic use of capital and labour. The CTP of the 80s should primarily be designed to create conditions which are conducive to the formation and operation of financially-sound, commercially and socially well-equipped and expertly managed undertakings. Secondly, the public authorities should provide such undertakings with an optimum transport infrastructure.

The basic factors setting limits to the liberalization of transport are (a) the differences in conditions of production and competition, (b) the importance of transport in regional planning, (c) the environment and energy conservation, and (d) the scarcity of land, raw materials and funds.

In its conclusions, the Opinion emphasizes priority measures that should be implemented in the near future (e.g. the facilitation of frontier checks). The ESC urges the Commission and the Council to abandon the piecemeal approach in favour of a coherent overall blueprint. The Council must make a serious attempt to meet its treaty commitments regarding the achievement of a Community transport policy. To this end, the Council should urge the Commission to submit a realistic blueprint for transport policy in the 1980s as quickly as possible, and by the end of this year at the latest. The blueprint would be accompanied by a programme of concrete proposals. This might at the outset seem an ambitious proposition, but it would allow the gradual implementation of a CTP worthy of the name. It would also restore the confidence of the various parties involved and the citizens of Europe in the resolve of the Community authorities to really create a common market in transport.

*The Rapporteur General for this Opinion was Mr Rouzier (France - Workers).*

## **2. XIth COMPETITION POLICY REPORT**

### ***“Commission’s eleventh report on competition policy”***

#### **Gist of the report**

The eleventh Competition Report, like its predecessors, is divided into different chapters in which the Commission looks at such things as major developments in national and Community policies, the main decisions of the Court of Justice, the most important decisions and measures taken by the Commission, state aid, etc.

The Commission draws particular attention to the initiatives which it has taken to improve the procedures for implementing their competition rules. These initiatives are designed in the first place to improve the legal security of firms and provide additional guarantees of the Commission’s objectivity when dealing with cases.

The legal security of economic operators can be substantially increased by the introduction of faster procedures for exemption, notably in the case of cooperation projects involving substantial investments. The Commission points out that it currently has almost 4,000 exemption applications pending, under Article 85(3) of the Treaty. Around 200 new applications are made each year. In most cases these fall under the block exemption regulations but many still have to be dealt with individually, and the Commission is now examining ways of speeding up the general handling of such cases.

Guarantees of objectivity in the conduct of procedures have been subject to criticism stemming in the main from a feeling of dissatisfaction with the fact that the Commission holds concurrently powers of investigation, examination and decision. But the Commission points out that the investing of such power in a single authority is consistent with the traditional rules of administrative law in most Member States which, however, do provide for two instances of judicial review. The Commission favours the introduction of a two-tier system of judicial review: a court of first instance dealing with questions both of fact and of law, the court of second instance merely re-examining questions of law.

In order to improve the transparency of procedures, the Commission has also taken a series of measures concerning:

- a) Procedures during inspections: The Commission intends to assure firms that the exercise of its powers is strictly lawful, by specifying the scope of their legitimate rights and by guaranteeing that the information thus obtained will be used objectively. The purpose of the inspections is now defined more precisely than in the past and firms are thus better able to check for themselves that the information requested is strictly relevant to the object of inspections.
- b) Access to the Commission's files: The Commission already informs the firms concerned, as far as possible, of the relevant part of formal complaints. It is now considering allowing, in principle, firms involved in a procedure to have access to the file on the particular case, although any such inspection is limited by the Commission's obligation to refrain from disclosing business secrets to other companies. It is examining other possible solutions, such as inspection of the documents in question by an accountant or a firm of auditors.

Finally, it should be pointed out that for the first time the Report on Competition Policy contains a paragraph on the Economic and Social Committee, in which the Commission expresses its conviction that, thanks to the systematic discussions that it will have with the ESC, the points of view of all the groups concerned will be given a hearing both on specific and general questions.

## **Gist of the Opinion<sup>(1)</sup>**

In an Opinion, adopted unanimously, the Committee said it felt the Commission should be given credit for its efforts to improve the procedures for implementing competition rules and pointed out that the Committee had always called for the existing procedures to be simplified and speeded up. These procedures had a direct impact on business costs since they could cause delays which impaired the running of businesses, thus indirectly affecting final users and consumers.

The Committee trusted that the Commission would pursue its studies into improving standards of disclosure and the legal security of economic operators, speed up decision-making as much as possible and encourage objectivity in the preliminary examination of competition files by its departments.

In the light of those general objectives the Committee urged the Commission to appoint duly authorized officials, vested with genuine autonomy and the right of direct access to the relevant Commissioner, to preside over hearings.

The Committee was concerned that the Commission, which had exclusive responsibility for granting exemptions, currently had 4,000 cases pending before it and hoped that the authorization procedures would be reviewed with a view to their being speeded up considerably. Such a move would benefit economic operators, who would thus have all the facts at their fingertips when making decisions, especially as regards investments.

As regards the application of competition rules to small and medium-sized firms the Committee was pleased to note that the Commission was endeavouring to create a legal and economic climate in which such firms could compete, if not on an equal footing, then at least with the best possible chances of success, with large private or public national or multinational companies operating on the same market.

The Committee also called on the Commission to pay special attention to finding ways of enforcing competition rules on state aid more strictly and welcomed the fact that the Commission had already shown its willingness to take action on that issue, as testified by the considerable increase in the number of proceedings and decisions of rejection taken in 1981 compared with previous years.

Finally, the Committee noted with satisfaction that, following the introduction of the new arrangements whereby the Committee was to

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. CES 740/82.

be consulted each year, ESC Opinions were to be taken into account in the Commission's Report. It welcomed the fact that the Commission had explicitly recognized that the Committee was an ideal forum for passing on information to and arranging consultations with all the various socio-economic groups.

*The Rapporteur General for this Opinion was Mr Evain (France - Employers).*

### **3. JOINT RESEARCH CENTRE III**

***“Proposal for a revision in the year 1983 of the multiannual research programme (1980-1983) of the Joint Research Centre”***

#### **Gist of the proposal**

In its October 1981 Communication “Scientific and Technical Research of the European Communities: proposals for the 1980s” the Commission called for the development of a genuine Community R & D strategy founded on a Programme framework of Community Scientific and Technical activities.

In June 1982 the Commission presented the Council with a first outline of the 1984-1987 Programme framework, which is to be submitted in its finished form before the end of 1982. This first outline selected seven priority areas in two of which it is felt the JRC can make a specific contribution: improvement of the management of energy resources (fission, fusion, and new energy sources), and the re-enforcement of aid to developing countries.

As far as the management of energy resources is concerned, and given the urgency attached to solving the problems relating to light water reactor safety, the Commission proposed in particular that the JRC step up its work on the Super-SARA project. Nuclear safety research (safety of light water and fast breeder reactors, etc.) already occupies more than half of the JRC staff. The Super-SARA project is one of 3 important projects in this field, and the opinion of various independent experts is that increased expenditure on the project is highly justified.

In the present proposal the Commission wants agreement on other modifications to the existing JRC 1980-1983 programme which would also have the effect of orienting it towards research connected with the seven basic options referred to above.

The proposal sets out in detail the modifications to research staffing in several different activity areas which the Commission says this new orientation calls for.

Finally, an annex to the proposal gives the budgetary implications of these modifications, which the Council is asked to approve.

### **Gist of the Opinion<sup>(1)</sup>**

While acknowledging the importance of the Super-Sara project in its Opinion, adopted with a large majority and one abstention, the Committee pointed to the desirability of a better balance between nuclear and non-nuclear research.

It went on to support the proposed revision of the programme; a better understanding of the potential repercussions of major accidents was very important, in view of the large number of light-water reactors in service in the Community. At the same time the Committee welcomed the declared intention of tying the JRC in more closely with overall R & D strategy.

When it came to the budgetary implications of all this, however, the Committee expressed serious misgivings about the call for extra posts. The new posts should definitely be done away with by 1985; the Commission should do everything in its power to reduce the number of additional posts by involving national research centres; no new administrative posts should be created.

To avoid further delays in the planned work, and hence unnecessary additional cost, the Committee expressly recommended that the funds requested be approved as soon as possible so that the contracts for the Super-Sara loop and the renewal of the infrastructure could be awarded without delay.

*The Rapporteur General for this Opinion was Mr von der Decken (Germany - Various Interests).*

## **4. GENERALIZED TARIFF PREFERENCES**

***“Commission’s proposals to the Council fixing the Community’s Scheme of Generalized Tariff Preferences for the period 1983 to 1985 and opening the scheme applicable in 1983”***

### **Gist of the Commission proposal**

The new proposals follow on from last year’s. Certain changes have been made to help the least-developed countries in particular, especially as regards agriculture, but substantially the scheme remains the same.

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. CES 738/82.

The Commission is proposing that the least-advanced countries should have the same terms of access to Community markets as the ACP signatories of the Lomé Convention: i.e. 370 products under headings 1 to 24 would be admitted duty-free. The Commission is also proposing an increase in the preference granted to 18 products already on the list, including certain live plants, flowers, mangos, chocolate, grapefruit juice, cigarettes, cigars and cigarillos. In addition nine new products are to be added.

For industrial products (except textiles) the Commission is proposing:

- the transfer of eight products from the “sensitive” to the “non-sensitive” list and two products from the “non-sensitive” to the “sensitive” list;
- the introduction of nine new quotas for certain sensitive products (although seven quotas would be dropped);
- the raising of the ceilings for sensitive products from 0 to 15%, depending on the economic situation in the sectors concerned (there would be no increases for steel, footwear, leather and certain chemical products);
- a 15% increase in the preferences for non-sensitive products;
- the extension to China of preferences concerning three headings on list A and to Romania of preferences concerning seven products on list A and six products on list B (A = sensitive products; B = non-sensitive products).

The Commission makes the following proposal for textiles:

- pending the Community’s accession to the second MFA (1981/1986), which is dependent on the conclusion of voluntary restraint agreements by the supplying countries, products covered by the MFA will be subject to the same rules as at present, except for:
  - a) a 5% rise in quotas (except for those applied to the major exporters; South Korea, Hong Kong, Romania and China) and
  - b) an increase in connection with the “basket withdrawal” procedure, which would have the effect of a 5 to 25% increase.
- non-MFA products would be covered by the same arrangements as industrial products other than textiles;
- arrangements for jute and coir products would be unchanged.

Finally, the Commission confirms that it would like the Council to examine the proposals it has submitted in the past concerning the application of minimum labour standards by GSP beneficiaries.

### **Gist of the Opinion<sup>(1)</sup>**

In an Opinion which was adopted with one vote against and one abstention, the Committee said it felt that the GSP was an important economic development instrument for the beneficiary countries and a vital tool of cooperation policy for the Community. But the Committee wondered if the Commission had taken sufficient account of the current economic and social situation in proposing that the GSP be extended, and particularly if it had managed to strike a balance between the concerns of EEC interests, notably the farmers, and those of developing countries, where often the production and exporting of agricultural products was the only possible road to development.

The Committee reiterated that the GSP should be prepared in the light of comparable systems operated by other industrialized countries and particularly of the possible repercussions on the Community of the United States putting their new ideas on reciprocity into practice in their trading relations with third countries, particularly the developing countries.

The Committee wished to see the GSP reserved above all for those countries which have most need of it. It referred again to the criteria for a selective application of the GSP put forward in its Opinion of 30 April 1980 and consequently repeated its reservations concerning the Commission's proposals to grant certain state-trading countries preferential access to the Community market in an increased number of products.

*The Rapporteur General for this Opinion was Mr Cremer (Germany - Workers).*

## **5. DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS RELATED TO ENERGY**

***“Proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) on the granting of financial support for demonstration projects relating to the exploitation of alternative energy sources, energy-saving and the substitution of hydrocarbons”***

***“Proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) on the granting of financial support for pilot industrial projects and demonstration projects relating to the liquefaction and gasification of solid fuels”***

### **Gist of the Commission documents**

Regulation No. 1303/78 granted financial support for projects designed to exploit alternative energy sources. It aims to encourage

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. CES 739/82.

implementation of "demonstration projects", viz. projects on the brink of industrial breakthrough, in the sectors of exploitation of alternative energy sources and of energy conservation.

In framing the present proposal, the Commission has taken account of the expiry date of the above-mentioned provisions, the conclusions of the Report (COM(82) 324 of 11 June 1982) evaluating the Community programmes for energy conservation and alternative energy sources, and in particular the suggestions contained in this evaluation as to the form further development should take.

Furthermore, the Commission is proposing to the Council that it modify and improve the existing Council Regulations (EEC) Nos. 1302/78 and 728/79 in the light of the evaluation report on the demonstration projects and, in particular, of the first results in the field of liquefaction and gasification of solid fuels.

The main innovations are:

- a Regulation for the liquefaction and gasification of solid fuels;
- extension of the Regulation to cover industrial pilot projects and feasibility studies for which the question of reimbursement does not arise;
- the possibility of carrying out projects outside the Community.

The Draft Regulation fits in well with the role for coal in the Community's energy strategy and meets the energy objectives defined by the Community.

### **Gist of the Opinion<sup>(1)</sup>**

In a unanimous Opinion the Committee agreed on the broad outlines of the measures proposed, whereby the Community is to assist in funding industrial projects relating to the exploitation of alternative energy sources, the rational use of energy and energy-saving measures and the practical application of these findings.

The Committee endorsed the programme envisaged by the Commission in the proposals concerning the gasification and liquefaction of coal. However, at the present stage of research and development the potential short-term economic benefits of those processes — except in the case of aboveground gasification of coal — was not sufficient to justify an immediate start on demonstration projects. But the progress to date on some projects already supported by the Commission justified the extension of the programme. The Committee therefore supported

---

(<sup>1</sup>) Doc. CES 742/82.



the extension of the programme for the funding of gasification and liquefaction, and especially for projects designed to build up the technology which would be needed in the future.

*The Rapporteur General for this Opinion was Mr Mills (United Kingdom - Employers).*

## **6. WASTES FROM TITANIUM DIOXIDE INDUSTRY**

*“Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive No. 78/176/EEC of 20 February 1978 concerning wastes from the titanium dioxide industry”*

### **Gist of the Commission's proposal**

The original Directive No. 78/176 specified that the Member States should establish national programmes for the progressive reduction of titanium dioxide waste pollution and report progress thereon by 1 July 1980, so that six months later the Commission could present to the Council proposals to harmonize these programmes and thus enable the Member States to bring them into operation by 1 January 1982 at the latest. In the event the Member States were behind schedule in submitting their national programmes, and in addition the Commission found that the information provided was inadequate.

This meant the Commission has had to ask for supplementary information, and this will necessitate delay. Consequently, the Commission now proposes in the amending Directive to extend the deadline of “six months later than 1.7.1980” to 30.10.1982 for the submission to the Council of proposals for harmonization, and the deadline of 1.1.1982 to 1.6.1983 for the introduction of the harmonized programmes by the Member States.

### **Gist of the Opinion<sup>(1)</sup>**

In its Opinion, adopted unanimously, the Committee deplores the fact that Member States had not submitted to the Commission the requisite information of national programmes for the progressive reduction of pollution caused by wastes from the titanium dioxide industry.

It endorsed the Commission's proposals to extend until 30 October 1982 the deadline for the submission of a proposal on the alignment of

---

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. CES 737/82.

national programmes, and until 1 January 1982 to 1 June 1982 the deadline for the introduction of the aligned programmes.

The Committee also urged the Commission to meet the deadlines laid down by the new proposal for a Directive.

*The Rapporteur General for this Opinion was Mr Romoli (Italy - Employers).*

## **7. EEC/US RELATIONS (Information Report)**

*“Relations between the European Community and the United States”*

### **Gist of the report<sup>(1)</sup>**

Agriculture, steel and petrochemicals are among the sectors in which the USA and the European Community are at present at loggerheads. Other strains will probably arise in the coming years, particularly with regard to advanced technology and services.

There is nothing surprising about this situation, since the USA and the Community are competitors, although this does not prevent them from showing close solidarity regarding both their security and their attachment to a free society.

The present disputes must be seen in their proper proportion. Only about 5% of trade between the two partners is involved. But what is disquieting is that, faced with a very dynamic American commercial strategy, the Community is on the defensive; it does not have a decision-making system that enables it to react rapidly. This is one of the points made in this Information Report drawn up by the Section for External Relations.

The first part of the Report ranges over the economic and commercial relations between the EEC and the United States. Figures show that the Community's trade deficit with the United States amounted to 24.8 thousand million dollars in 1980.

European investments in the United States have increased quite rapidly (from 7.4 thousand million dollars in 1970 to 37.9 thousand million dollars in 1980) though they are still of a much lower order than American investments in Europe (76.6 thousand million dollars in 1980). The high level of American investment in Europe is nevertheless tending to tail off and the author of the Report sees three causes:

- progress towards bringing into existence a unified “extensive market”, essential for the strategy of American firms, has slackened off;

<sup>(1)</sup> Doc. CES 544/82 fin.

- there exist various Community rules affecting or likely to affect enterprises in third countries (Vredeling Directive, the proposal relating to company accounts);
- the EEC would appear to be a high-cost production zone compared with other regions of the World.

The Report then analyses the attitude of each of the partners towards each other and reviews the main American laws affecting trade with Europe: anti-dumping procedures, countervailing duty, the safeguard clause, trade and tariff laws, etc. The Report goes on to note that American employers are basically favourable to free trade but advocate a tough commercial policy towards Japan and the EEC. Trade union organizations, which are particularly sensitive to the problems of unemployment, are often in favour of limiting imports. Finally, despite the contacts between European and American farmers, the American administration tends, according to the Report, to put the blame on the EEC for the difficulties in the agricultural sector even though the causes are basically to be found in the United States.

On the EEC side, the Rapporteur notes a tougher attitude towards the United States as well as greater use of anti-dumping procedures (chemical industry) and GATT (Domestic International Sales Corporation legislation).

Sectoral disputes between the EEC and the United States do exist. According to the Report two sectors could still pose problems: the car industry, where we must expect greater competition from "European-style" cars manufactured in the States, and advanced technology, a field in which the United States is making rapid progress.

The Report analyses the main pros and cons of giving a fresh impulse to GATT negotiations — a ministerial session is to be held in Geneva next November. It reviews the monetary and economic problems between the EEC and the US: interest and exchange rates, the consensus on export credit rates, East/West trade, relations with Japan, North/South problems and the influence of the USA on the energy situation in Europe.

From this examination the Rapporteur draws several conclusions:

- the United States' economic, financial and political power gives it a special responsibility in its relations with the rest of the world and consequently the EEC; when taking decisions the leaders of the United States should assess the possible impact on other countries;
- one may wonder whether America's leaders still look as favourably as in the past on the further development of European integration and institutions;

- for its part, the EEC has stiffened its attitude and has been able to react strongly to outside pressures, but it needs a decision-taking mechanism which will enable it to act rapidly;
- more than ever it is necessary to increase US/Europe consultations at all levels (political authorities and socio-economic interest groups).

The Economic and Social Committee decided to forward this Information Report to the Council and the Commission.

*The Rapporteur General was Mr Evain (France - Employers).*

## II

# NEW CONSULTATIONS

During the month of October, the Council asked the Economic and Social Committee to deliver an Opinion on the following subjects:

***“Annual Report on the Community’s Economic Situation and Economic Policy Guidelines to be followed by the Member States in the Following Year” (COM(82) 677 final)***

***“Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 76/756/EEC on the Approximation of the Laws of the Member States relating to the Installation of Lighting and Light-Signalling devices on Motor Vehicles and their Trailers” (COM(82) 621 final)***

***“Proposal for a Council Directive authorizing the Commission to raise NIC Loans in order to promote Investment in the Community” (COM(82) 601 final)***

***“Proposal for a Council Directive on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to chemical, physical and biological agents at work: noise” (COM(82) 646 final)***

***“Proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) on rules for a prohibition to import skins of certain sealpups and products derived therefrom into the Community” (COM(82) 639 final)***



# III

## PROVISIONAL FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME

### NOVEMBER 1982 SESSION

#### Opinions

- Air Pollution by Gases from Motor Vehicles
- Competition in Air Transport
- Competition in Sea Transport
- Air Transport Tariffs
- Community Quota
- Origin of Textiles
- Multiannual Data-Processing Programme
- R & D Applied Metrology Programme
- Processing and Marketing of Agricultural Products

#### Information Report

- Fats and Oils

### DECEMBER 1982 SESSION

#### Opinions

- Annual Report on the Economic Situation
- Inward Processing
- Non-Energy Primary Raw Materials
- ASOR
- Crude Oil Saving
- Rational Use of Energy

### JANUARY 1983 SESSION

#### Opinions

- 13th VAT Directive

- 14th VAT Directive
- Use of Sewage Sludge in Agriculture
- Checks on EC Citizens at the Community's Internal Frontiers
- Strengthening the Internal Market
- Relaxation of Border Formalities and Checks
- Simplification of Customs Formalities

## **FUTURE SESSIONS**

### **Opinions**

- Temporary Work
- European Social Fund
- Vocational Training and New Technologies
- Technological and Industrial Innovation
- Road Carriage Rates
- Spirituous Beverages
- Foot-and-Mouth Disease
- Aujeszky's Disease, Swine Vesicular Disease
- New EEC/ACP Cooperation Guidelines

### **Own-initiative Opinions**

- Education
- Border Regions in Ireland
- 7th ERDF Report

### **Information Report**

- Environment and Employment.



## IV

# MEMBERS' NEWS

### **Mr Evain appointed head of Chairman's private office**

Mr François Ceyrac, Chairman of the Economic and Social Committee, has chosen Mr Claude Evain as head of his private office. Mr Evain has just resigned as member of the ESC and was Mr Ceyrac's international relations adviser when the latter was President of the CNPF (National Council of French Employers) from 1974 to 1981.

### **Agriculture Section**

Mr Emo Capodilista (Italy) was re-elected Chairman of the Agriculture Section at the Section's last meeting on 4 November 1982.



# PUBLICATIONS OBTAINABLE FROM THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE

## Periodical

- Bulletin (monthly publication)

## General Documentation

- The Economic and Social Committee (leaflet) (January 1980)
- The Economic and Social Committee (April 1981) (A descriptive brochure) 16 p.
- Annual Report (1981) 96 p. (Ex-33-81)
- The Right of Initiative of the Economic and Social Committee (October 1977) 124 p.

## Opinions and Studies

- The Economic and Social Situation of the Community (2 Opinions) (July 1982) 57 p. (ESC 82-008)
- The Promotion of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (Opinion) (June 1982) 70 p. (ESC 82-007)
- Aims and Priorities of a Common Research and Development Policy (Study) (January 1982) 59 p. (ESC 82-001)
- Agricultural Aspects of Spain's Entry into the E.C. (Opinion) (February 1982) 107 p. (ESC 81-017)
- The EEC's External Relations — Stocktaking and Consistency of Action (Study) (January 1982) 139 p.
- Genetic Engineering (Colloquy) (October 1981) 120 p. (ESC 81-014)
- Prospects for the '80s (Opinion) (Dec. 1981) (ESC 81-018)
- Economic Pointers for 1982 (Opinion) (August 1981) 32 P. (ESC 81-010)
- Problems of the Handicapped (Opinion) (September 1981) ± 46 p. (ESC 81-013)
- Present situation in the Community's Building Sector (Opinion) (September 1981) ± 24 p. (ESC 81-011)
- Community Competition Policy (Opinion) (ESC)
- Prevention of Marine Pollution (2 Opinions) (ESC-81-004)
- Development Policy and Working Conditions (September 1980) (Opinion) 61 p. (ESC 80-012)
- The Organisation and Management of Community R & D (February 1980) (Study) 168 p. (ESC 80-001)
- Agricultural Structures Policy (November 1979) (Opinion) 90 p. (ESC 79-003)
- Enlargement of the European Community Greece-Spain-Portugal (September 1979) (Study) 75 p. (ESC 79-002)
- The Community's Relations with Spain (June 1979) (Study) 112 p. (ESC 79-001)
- Community Shipping Policy Flags of Convenience (April 1979) (Opinion) 170 p.
- Youth Unemployment — Education and Training (November 1978) (5 Opinions) 97 p.
- The Stage reached in aligning labour legislation in the European Community (June 1978) (Documentation) 60 p.
- Employment in Agriculture (June 1978) (Study) 135 p.
- Monetary Disorder (June 1978) (Opinion) 98 p.
- Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in the Community Context (April 1978) (Opinion) 29 p.
- Industrial Change and Employment (November 1977) (Opinion) 98 p.
- EEC's Transport Problems with East European Countries (December 1977) (Opinion) 164 p.
- Community Nuclear Safety Code (July 1977) (Study) 50 p.
- Research and Development (November 1976) (Study) 35 p.
- Systems of Education and Vocational training (August 1976) (Study) 114 p.
- Regional Policy (March 1976) (Opinion) 11 p.
- European Union (July 1975) (Opinion) 33 p.
- The Situation of Small and Medium-sized Undertakings in the European Community (March 1975) (Study) 69 p.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE  
Press, Information and Publications Division

Rue Ravenstein 2  
1000 Brussels

Tel 512 39 20  
513 95 95

Telegrams ECOSEUR  
Telex 25 983 CESEUR

Catalogue Number ESC-82-013-EN