

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY

# BULLETIN

LIBRARY



The Bulletin reports every month (10 issues yearly) on the activities of the Economic and Social Committee, a Community consultative body. It is edited by the Secretariat-General of the Economic and Social Committee of the European Communities (2 rue Ravenstein, B-1000 Brussels) in the official Community languages.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE  
Division 'Information, Publications and Relations  
with Socio-economics Groups'

Rue Ravenstein 2, B-1000 Brussels

Tel. 519 90 11  
Telecopier 513 48 93

Telegrams ECOSEUR  
Telex 25 983 CESEUR

Catalogue number: ESC-90-010-EN

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 1990  
Catalogue number: EX-AA-90-003-EN-C

Reproduction is authorized, except for commercial purposes, provided the source is acknowledged.

*Printed in Belgium*

# Contents

	<i>Page</i>
274th PLENARY SESSION OF 28 FEBRUARY AND 1 MARCH 1990 .....	3
Extracts from Mr Mac Sharry's speech .....	3
Debate .....	5
<b>Adoption of Opinions</b> .....	6
1. Farm prices 1990/91 .....	6
2. Competition rules — Air transport .....	9
3. Community civil aviation .....	14
4. Access to the market in international carriage of goods .....	16
5. Conformity-assessment procedures .....	18
6. Control of transfrontier movements of hazardous wastes .....	21
7. Civil liability — Waste .....	21
8. Dangerous substances (10th amendment) .....	24
9. Envireg .....	25
10. Comett II agreement — EEC/EFTA .....	28
11. Cotton .....	30
12. Improving farm structures .....	31
13. Veterinary safeguard measures .....	32
14. Bovine leukosis .....	33

EXTERNAL INFLUENCE AND PRESENCE OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMIT- TEE .....	34
INFORMATION VISITS .....	36
FUTURE WORK PROGRAMME .....	38

## **274th Plenary Session of 28 February and 1 March 1990**

The 274th Plenary Session of the Economic and Social Committee of the European Communities was held in Brussels on 28 February and 1 March 1990. Mr Alberto Masprone, Committee Chairman, took the chair.

The Session was attended by Mr Ray Mac Sharry, Member of the Commission, who addressed the Committee in connection with the drawing-up of its Opinion on farm prices.

### **Extracts from Mr Mac Sharry's speech**

After having recalled, on 1 March, that stabilizers had achieved positive results in cutting down surpluses and would therefore have to be maintained, Mr Mac Sharry said in particular:

'It is, of course, undeniable that stabilizers have bitten — they were designed to. And this has been painful for some.

But this is why the Commission this year is putting particular emphasis on modulating our policy where it affects those farmers and areas most in need and least able to adapt to current — more market-oriented — conditions.

This emphasis is all part of our rural development strategy — the aim of which is not only to underpin our farming population but to ensure the continued presence of a vital rural society in a countryside we must all cherish and maintain.

Secondly, it is perfectly true that there is a margin of more than ECU 4 billion between planned expenditure and the 1990 guideline. But you have to bear in mind that half of that 4 billion is the result of an automatic increase in the guideline following growth in the Community's GNP.

Furthermore — and even more important — the guideline does not represent an obligation to spend but is a ceiling.'



*From left to right: Mr Masprone, Committee Chairman, with Mr Mac Sharry, Member of the Commission.*

The Commissioner then warned of the dangers of building up excessive surpluses of agricultural products in the near future.

'Speaking of medium-term forecasts brings me to my third general point — that of the present market situation and prospects for the future, both inside and outside the Community. These are factors which, given the Community's role as an agricultural superpower, increasingly play a critical role in our planning and decisions.

But even with stabilizers and the full range of other measures designed to get some control over production and spending, we can, for example, expect to see an increase in butter stocks which had virtually been eliminated, and in the case of cereals, improved yields are expected to keep production above the maximum guaranteed quantity for the foreseeable future.'

Referring to the Community's negotiating position in GATT, Mr Mac Sharry said:

'The steps which we have taken since 1984 to reform our farm policy, to let the market play a bigger role but to retain some degree of stability, and to improve market balance have often been painful. They have been taken and will continue to be taken in the interest of the Community's farmers and consumers, and to protect our position as the world's largest importer and second largest exporter of farm products.

This is what lies behind our negotiating position and the proposals we made in Geneva at the end of last year, proposals which were described as realistic and constructive.

I have to say that this is not the way I would describe the very disappointing proposals tabled by the United States which take us back to square one, instead of moving the process forward.'

The Commission's overall proposals concerning prices:

'are a package which opts for a course of "steady as we go". And proposes that — apart from a few exceptions, justified by exceptional circumstances — the institutional prices obtaining this year, subject of course to the automatic application of stabilizers agreed by the Heads of State or Government in February 1988, should continue for another year.'

## Debate

Mr Francesco Fresi (Italy — Employers), rapporteur for the Committee's Opinion, recognized that the reform of the common

agricultural policy had led to more competitive farming but warned that too stringent a policy would lead to vast farming areas becoming an economic liability to the Community. He also advocated the dismantling of the co-responsibility system.

Mr Jaap Nieuwenhuize (Netherlands — Workers) warned of the dangers of reducing production to levels which would no longer allow the Community to provide food aid to developing and East European countries. Several other speakers, such as Mr Joseph Yverneau (France — Various Interests) complained that while the Community was cutting its production in compliance with GATT, the Americans were continuing their aggressive policies, particularly for grain and sugar.

Mr Rudolf Schnieders (Germany — Employers' Group) warned of the discontent of farmers, particularly cereal farmers, who had recently organized protest demonstrations. He urged the Commission to send positive signals to encourage farmers, while Mr Patrick Murphy (Ireland — Workers) pleaded for help for disadvantaged farmers, particularly smallholders, as did his countryman, Mr Joseph Rea (Employers' Group).

In his reply, Mr Mac Sharry promised that the Commission would continue its endeavours in the GATT negotiations, where it had managed to win some support. He also stressed the need to make the set-aside policy in the Community more effective.

## *ADOPTION OF OPINIONS*

### 1. FARM PRICES 1990/91

#### **Commission proposals on the prices for agricultural products and on related measures (1990/91)**

#### **Gist of the Commission proposals**

The Commission believes that the reform of agricultural policy initiated in recent years is beginning to produce results.

By contrast with previous years, it is now possible to manage the principal markets without accumulating stocks, as the present extremely low levels of dairy products, beef and veal and olive oil would appear to suggest. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the Community can relax its efforts to maintain market equilibrium.

The market price of various products was clearly correct, and even favourable, particularly in the animal sector, where average real farm incomes increased substantially (by 7%, compared with 1.2% in 1988). The situation varies considerably throughout the Community, ranging from stability in Spain and Ireland to a 25.9% increase in Denmark which was largely due to the success achieved in the pig sector.

There are also sectoral differences. Animal-sector income improved in nearly all the Member States as, to a lesser extent, did income from such crops as beet and oil seeds. Cereal producers' income, on the other hand, was subject to renewed pressure.

*Against this general background and since markets appear to be relatively well-balanced at current prices, the 1990/91 price proposals are essentially designed to ensure maintenance of the status quo without price increases.*

*In the case of related measures, an important feature of this price package is its emphasis on rural development through the adjustment of market mechanisms for the benefit of small farmers and structurally weak areas.*

The Commission outlined this policy in its communication to the Council and Parliament of October 1989.

In addition to the proposal concerning support for small cotton producers recently transmitted to the Council, this price package covers:

- (i) assistance for small arable farmers (first 10 hectares);
- (ii) support for 'small' cereal producers (millet, canary seed and buckwheat);
- (iii) extension of the suckler cow premium to small farmers with mixed herds.

The Commission proposals also cover a programme for the purchase of milk quotas, with a view to their redistribution to small farmers in less-favoured upland regions, and direct support for sheep farmers in those regions.

As regards agrimonetary measures, the Commission hopes to make further progress in dismantling MCAs. It is also proposing the abolition of monetary gaps between EMS currencies complying with fixed margins. The only exception concerns cereals in the Federal Republic of Germany, for which it is proposed to reduce existing gaps by half to 0.7 of a percentage point. Otherwise, after this financial year, all the participants in the system and Portugal

will apply the green exchange rate. In the case of Spain and the United Kingdom, the Commission is proposing a one-third reduction in existing gaps and, for Greece, a reduction corresponding to the rate of inflation minus 5 percentage points.

In order to take account of external factors in the animal sector, it is proposed to reduce external protection for milk (3.5% target-price reduction) and beef (6% price reduction). This will not affect market prices.

Whilst supply and demand are fairly well adjusted in the case of the principal products, tobacco and alcohol stocks continue to cause concern.

From the budgetary standpoint, the additional costs accruing in 1990 derive essentially from the rural development provisions of this package and the transfer of the programme for the grubbing-up of vines from the Guidance to the Guarantee Section. These costs (approximately ECU 450 million) can easily be covered from the 1990 budget (ECU 26 500 million).

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The ESC stressed that excessive cut-backs in support and external protection for Community agriculture would considerably increase the size of the disadvantaged regions. They would put serious pressure on farm incomes, and would mean fully subsidized agriculture in more than 50% of the Community.

Reductions in support and external protection would, under present circumstances, be ill-advised as they would weaken the Community's negotiating position.

The Committee could not support the idea of aligning Community prices on current world-market prices. That would mean subordinating Community interests to a residual world market on which only marginal quantities of products were traded. Prices should instead take account of the need to cover production costs and the income expectations of farmers.

The ESC also said that the 1990/91 proposals on farm prices and ancillary measures involve several significant cuts in real prices which were not fully justified either by the situation on Community and world markets nor by budget requirements, taking account of

<sup>1</sup> CES 221/90.

the rise in production costs and in inflation. The availability of certain staple products and the production cuts being sought by applying stabilizers and other agricultural policy measures must be reviewed in the light of the likelihood of food aid and food supplies being needed in the short term in the face of international developments, particularly in Eastern Europe.

The ESC, however, endorsed the plan to rationalize Community agriculture further and target farm spending more strictly. This would create an integrated agri-food network which was more competitive internationally, and improve market balance whilst also (a) making full use of the Community's natural resources — with the attendant benefits; (b) helping to improve the balance between production areas; (c) preventing desertification of the countryside and the decline of rural areas; and (d) guaranteeing a fair income for the farming population, and reasonable prices for consumers.

The Committee considered that a reasonable policy on prices and related measures must seek to avoid the reappearance of unmarketable production surpluses. Intervention must again be used solely as a safety net in cases of market imbalance caused by the weather or by exceptional levels of production.

The Committee conceded that stabilizers had certainly been successful in curbing production in sectors with structural surpluses and in containing uncontrolled farm spending. Nevertheless, it was vital to ensure that stabilizers were administered in a flexible manner more in keeping with the needs of the Community and world markets.

*This Opinion, adopted by 72 votes to 8, with 5 abstentions, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Agriculture and Fisheries, chaired by Mr Laur (France — Various Interests). General rapporteur: Mr Fresi (Italy — Employers).*

## 2. COMPETITION RULES — AIR TRANSPORT

### **Development of civil aviation in the Community and application of the competition rules to air transport** [COM(89) 373 final — COM(89) 417 final]

#### **Background**

In its first memorandum 'Air transport: a Community approach' published in 1979, the Commission set out to stimulate dialogue by proposing ideas for possible action aimed at the harmonious

development of air transport in the Community. This was followed in 1980 by a Commission proposal on inter-regional air services which was adopted by the Council in 1983.

The Commission presented a second memorandum on civil aviation in March 1984, the purpose of which was to develop and expand on the objectives of the Commission's 1979 memorandum in the light of developments which had occurred and to make specific proposals within an overall framework for a Community air transport policy. The Committee adopted its Opinion on this memorandum in September 1987. The Council took the first step towards the creation of a common air transport policy for the EEC by adopting a package of legislative measures on aviation based on the Commission's proposals in civil aviation Memorandum No 2. Although the December 1987 package was a sound foundation on which to build an ambitious common air transport policy, it can only be regarded as a first phase. It was specifically stated in both the Directive on fares and the Decision on capacity sharing and market access that the Council would revise them by 30 June 1990, on the basis of Commission proposals to be submitted by 1 November 1989. It is also stated that, in view of the completion of the internal market in air transport by 1992, the Council would adopt further measures of liberalization at the end of the three-year period covered by the first package.

### **Gist of the Commission proposals**

The proposals put forward involve a decisive step towards establishing a common air transport policy. They were prepared following extensive consultations with a large number of interested parties, including government experts, airlines, airports, trade unions, consumers, shippers, travel agents, freight forwarders, manufacturers, etc. The Commission also benefited from the very useful discussions in ECAC.

The Commission's proposals come under three general headings:

#### **1. Opening the market**

- (a) **Market access:** it is proposed to reduce the capacity sharing ratio a Member State can demand for its national airline from 40% (the percentage in force in 1990) to 25% on 1 April 1992. A Member State will not be able to prevent airlines from another Member State from operating on a route if more than 100 000 passengers use it every year or if there are over 600 return flights yearly (in 1990 the limit will be raised to 180 000

passengers or 1 000 return flights.) As long as economic and technical standards are met, a Member State will have to grant traffic rights to its own airlines on a non-discriminatory basis and will not be able to refuse rights without a valid reason. The large number of exemptions awarded to Member States in December 1987 will be deleted (although new inter-regional routes will continue to be protected). Airlines will be entitled to attract customers in another Member State and carry them to a third (Fifth freedom) within a limit of 50% of capacity (100% in the case of aircraft with less than 100 seats) as against 30% in 1990. Spain, Ireland and Portugal will all lose their exemption from this rule. A first step towards cabotage will be taken: an aircraft from one Member State will be able to link two airports in another provided the number of passengers taken aboard does not exceed 30% of capacity.

- (b) Air fares: an air fare proposal will not be turned down unless it is rejected by both Member States concerned (i.e. where the route begins and ends). If one of the Member States gives its approval, but the other does not, the proposal will be automatically accepted. If there are any doubts about the fare proposal (e.g. if it is 20% lower than the previous corresponding season) it must be examined in detail. Either the State or airline may seek arbitration.

## 2. The application of competition rules

The Commission wishes to avoid a repetition of the 'mistakes' made in the United States, and believes that group exemptions satisfy a genuine need for legal certainty among air carriers. It will take pains to limit the restrictive effects of competition by authorizing, for example, coordination of capacity between airlines for schedules, consultations on fares and slot allocation (both into air corridors and for landing). New carriers should be encouraged to come on to the market. The Commission is also hoping that the Council will empower it to examine arrangements between airlines for both national and international flights, thus broadening the scope of group exemptions. This would allow the internal market in air transport to develop with greater certainty and stricter discipline. In concrete terms, the Council should now give the Commission the necessary powers to clarify how Articles 85 and 86 apply to domestic and extra-Community air transport.

In its first Regulation modifying Council Regulation (EEC) No 3975/87, the Commission proposes the deletion of Article 1(2)

which contains the limitation on its scope of application to international flights between Community airports.

The second Regulation amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 3976/87 would allow domestic air transport to be included within its scope. On the basis of the power granted to it, the Commission would extend the block exemption for slot allocation to cover domestic air transport. The Commission would examine whether and if so how far it was also appropriate to grant block exemptions for other inter-airline cooperative activities in the area of domestic air transport.

The third Regulation would empower the Commission to grant block exemptions for airline agreements, decisions and concerted practices in respect of international air transport between the Community and third countries and concerned with the joint planning and coordination of capacity, revenue pooling, joint preparation of proposals on passenger tariffs and cargo rates and slot allocation at airports.

### **3. Support measures**

Later on the Commission will be making proposals on the following areas: minimum safety and social standards; mutual recognition of diplomas and pilot licences; airworthiness requirements to facilitate exchange of aircraft, parts and components between European airlines. Maintenance and training programmes will also be harmonized, making leasing easier.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The Committee welcomes the Commission proposals as they constitute a further step towards a more liberal air transport system for Europe. The incorporation of these proposals in a comprehensive air-transport policy will bring the realization of a people's Europe much closer.

Air transport is an integral part of the transport system and is relevant to other modes such as rail or road. The Committee calls for measures:

- (i) which avoid the negative effects which followed from deregulation in the USA;

<sup>1</sup> CES 214/90.

- (ii) which take account of the experience of liberalization elsewhere in the world;
- (iii) which enable Community airlines to compete effectively internationally.

### **Infrastructure/congestion**

The Committee stresses the following points and recommends that these be examined by the Commission and the Council of Ministers in the coming months:

- (i) substantial and coordinated investment;
- (ii) Eurocontrol should have the necessary authority to act decisively and have the necessary resources to meet targets;
- (iii) harmonization of technical systems must be achieved;
- (iv) action to ease congestion on air-traffic routes by extending the use of air space now restricted for military/defence reasons.

### **Environment**

The Committee calls on the Commission to take action to reduce noise levels and emissions at airports.

### **Harmonization measures**

The Committee supports the decision in principle taken by the Council of Ministers in December 1989 to press forward with harmonization measures in parallel with liberalization of air transport, while agreeing that this should not result in delaying liberalization.

### **Fares**

The Commission stresses that the expansion of the zone system as proposed by the Council guideline should be achieved during the first half of 1990 so as to meet as closely as possible the objective of a more competitive airfare system.

### **Access to the markets**

The Committee is in broad agreement with the Commission's proposals in regard to market access and particularly the elimination of the reverse discrimination clause.

*This Opinion, adopted by 120 votes to 18, with 9 abstentions, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Transport and Communications, chaired by Mr L.J. Smith (United Kingdom — Workers). Rapporteur: Mr Kenna (Ireland — Employers).*

### 3. COMMUNITY TRANSIT

**Proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) on Community transit**  
[COM(89) 480 final — SYN 225]

#### **Gist of the Commission document**

The Community transit procedure, established in 1969 and at present regulated by Council Regulation (EEC) No 222/77 of 13 December 1976, provides both the legal and technical basis for the movement of goods within the Community.

At the moment, a transit advice note must be lodged each time an internal frontier is crossed, so that any irregularity can be traced to the Member State in which it occurred.

The Community transit procedure applies to the movement of all goods within the Community; for this purpose two distinct procedures are involved: an external procedure (known as the 'T1 procedure') applicable to third-country goods which have not been cleared through customs (non-Community goods), and an internal procedure (known as the 'T2 procedure') applicable to Community goods.

Under the terms of Article 8a of the Treaty, as amended by the Single European Act, the internal market must be established progressively by 31 December 1992 at the latest; the internal market will comprise an area without internal frontiers in which *inter alia* the free movement of goods is guaranteed.

Consequently, from that date onwards any goods falling within the scope of the internal market provisions, as defined by Article 9(2) of the Treaty (i.e. products originating in Member States and products coming from third countries in free circulation in Member States, otherwise known as 'Community products'), must be able to move from one point in the Community to another without undergoing any formalities or customs controls.

One effect of the free movement of Community goods within the Community will be to eliminate use of the internal Community procedure to a considerable extent. This procedure should then only apply in the case of:

- (i) goods consigned to or via the EFTA countries, in view of the Community's commitment to those countries under the EEC/EFTA Convention on a common transit procedure;

- (ii) goods subject to the internal Community transit procedure, in application of a specific Community provision;
- (iii) goods which, during the transitional period following the accession of Spain and Portugal to the Community, are traded between the Community of Ten and those two Member States or between those two Member States themselves and which do not benefit from the total abolition of customs duties and charges having equivalent effect or are subject to other measures as set out in the Act of Accession.

The external Community transit procedure will clearly remain fully applicable since it essentially relates to the movement of third-country goods not in free circulation (non-Community goods).

It is necessary to lay down special rules for cases in which goods are transported by sea or air from one port or airport in the Community to another. This is because ports and airports are at the same time internal and external frontiers of the Community.

As regards the functioning of the external or internal Community transit procedures, in so far as the latter will still be applicable, removal of the internal frontiers will result in elimination of all formalities linked to the crossing of these frontiers, in particular the requirement that a transit advice note be lodged.

In this context, it should be noted that the Commission has submitted to the Council a proposal for a Regulation concerning the abolition of the requirement to lodge a transit advice note.

Since Regulation (EEC) No 222/77 on Community transit has been amended five times since it entered into force, it would seem appropriate to seize the opportunity offered by the reforms linked to the completion of the internal market and consolidate the Regulation, replacing it with a new amended and updated Regulation.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

While broadly endorsing the Commission proposals, the ESC thinks, however, that the internal transit procedure for Community goods will have to be changed.

<sup>1</sup> CES 211/90.

To continue to subject intra-Community movements of Community goods to a customs procedure is not compatible with the internal market.

If other administrative controls (e.g. in the tax field) are to be necessary after 1992 for the direct transport of goods with Community status between two or more Member States, it will be necessary to find solutions outside the field of customs law.

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously, less one abstention, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Industry, Commerce, Crafts and Services, chaired by Mr Kazazis (Greece — Employers). Rapporteur: Mr Broicher (Germany — Employers).*

#### 4. ACCESS TO THE MARKET IN INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE OF GOODS

**Proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) amending Regulation (EEC) No 3164/76 concerning access to the market in the international carriage of goods by road [COM(89) 572 final]**

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

1. The Commission is proposing an annual increase of 40% in the Community quota for road haulage between Member States in 1990, 1991 and 1992. This will cover the whole of the transition period, 1 January 1993 being the deadline laid down in Regulation (EEC) No 1841/88 for abolishing all quotas, including the Community quota.
2. The Commission justifies the year-on-year increase of 40% over three consecutive years on legal, economic and political grounds, stating that it is:
  - (a) in line with the policy conclusions adopted by the Council at the meeting of 30 June 1986 and the Commission proposal presented in November 1986;
  - (b) equivalent to the Community quota increases in 1987, 1988 and 1989;
  - (c) absolutely essential if the proportion of operations effected under Community authorizations is to be increased and complete freedom to provide road haulage services between the Member States thereby established;

- (d) a response to market needs since the number of tonne-kilometres performed under the Community quota increased by 37% per annum between 1986 and 1988; and
  - (e) necessary to ensure a smooth transition to the system which will be in force from 1 January 1993 and in which there will no longer be any quantitative restrictions on access to the market (as quotas will have been abolished).
3. The Commission proposes that the extra authorizations resulting from the increase in the Community quota be distributed among the Member States on a linear basis, as in 1989. This method has the advantage of simplicity.
  4. The Commission also calls for the abolition of the present formality requiring a customs stamp on the record sheet, in line with Article 8a of the Single Act.
  5. Attached to the proposal is a report on the effects of the various increases in and the allocation of the Community quota.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The Committee stresses that in two Opinions of 26 November 1986 (OJ C 333 of 29 December 1986) and 1 July 1987 (OJ C 232 of 31 August 1987), it agreed in principle with the phased liberalization of the intra-Community road-transport markets during the transitional period. It did, however, underline the need to introduce a number of support measures relating to operating and working conditions during this transitional period.

On this basis, the Committee endorses the Commission's proposal aimed at securing an annual increase of 40% in Community quotas up to 1993.

It notes that a number of accompanying measures have been taken in recent years, in particular:

- (i) the introduction of a Directive on more uniform application and monitoring of driving and rest periods;
- (ii) the extensive approximation of technical provisions concerning commercial vehicles.

The Committee is, however, of the opinion that the Commission and the Council still have a long way to go if they are to introduce, by the end of the transitional period, operating and working condi-

<sup>1</sup> CES 212/90.

tions guaranteeing equality of treatment for carriers and their staff both within and between different modes of transport.

The Committee unreservedly approves the Commission's proposals for facilitating the crossing of the Community's internal frontiers.

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Transport and Communications, chaired by Mr L.J. Smith (United Kingdom — Workers). Rapporteur: Mr Corell Ayora (Spain — Employers).*

## 5. CONFORMITY-ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

**Proposal for a Council Decision concerning the modules for the various phases of the conformity-assessment procedures which are intended to be used in the technical harmonization Directives**  
[COM(89) 209 final — SYN 208]

### **Gist of the Commission document**

The present proposal for a Council Decision, which is accompanied by a memorandum, sets out a true European policy on standardization which, based on criteria that are objective and recognized by all, will create the necessary confidence to make more homogeneous and transparent national activities (public or private sector in the area of certification, tests, inspection) which allow controls assuring consumers that a product deserves a quality label.

With this policy it would be possible to have a 'contract of confidence' which will enable economic operators to make savings, by reducing the number of costly and repetitive tests and trials currently needed for EC approval as well as at the international level. This 'contract of confidence' would ensure that no new barriers to trade will appear in the EC for new products due to different certifications which are not reciprocally recognized.

Since 1983 the Commission has used a pragmatic and rather simple method to eliminate technical barriers preventing the free movement of products throughout the EC, by applying a more transparent policy. The central element of this policy is to have recourse as much as possible to standards already established by international bodies and to limit recourse to binding legislation to cases in which the general interest must be protected: health, safety, con-

sumers or the environment. In cases in which the general interest must be protected the Commission is proposing a system of 'modules' (in fact the obligatory procedures to be followed in order to attain the goal assigned to each 'module'). These modules contain simple and rational formulas in cases in which the national legislature must necessarily intervene. The modules which can be used separately or in combination, enable the 'EC' mark to be obtained, i.e. the certification that the product meets the requirements of the EEC Directive concerned. The modules concern *inter alia*:

- (1) the declaration of EC conformity;
- (2) the type examination (prototype);
- (3) the EC declaration of conformity to the type;
- (4) the EC declaration of product-quality assurance;
- (5) EC verification, etc.

In cases in which European standards are not strictly necessary, national standards remain and are mutually recognized, in compliance with the decision of the Court of Justice in the 'Cassis de Dijon' case, according to which any product legally manufactured in an EC Member State can be sold throughout the EC. The European partners will however have to accept that testing and certification bodies (public or private-sector laboratories) and methods of analysing product quality should be comparable. The Commission is proposing, on the one hand, the creation within the European standardization bodies (CEN/Cenelec) of a real network which will allow mutual recognition of the various national public or private-sector laboratories and, on the other hand, the use of criteria established by CEN/Cenelec for evaluating the quality of a laboratory. A similar recognition procedure is envisaged for third countries that negotiate and conclude reciprocity agreements with the EEC.

## Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>

The Committee:

- (i) supports the modular approach to testing and certification;
- (ii) endorses the emphasis on transparency and the creation of confidence in the regulated sector through the use of the new CEN/Cenelec standards;
- (iii) encourages the promotion of quality assessment through the use of the CEN/Cenelec (EN 29000 series) standards;
- (iv) supports the emphasis on mutual recognition of products legally placed on the market in the different Member States;
- (v) approves the aim in the non-regulated sector to build on systems which are in place at the national level either by broadening their scope or by developing understanding between existing schemes;
- (vi) supports the concept of the global approach which requires an infrastructure for certification and testing. The Committee recognizes the need for positive measures (e.g. know-how transfers) and budgetary support;
- (vii) supports the concept of a European organization for testing and certification to promote a Community infrastructure;
- (viii) is concerned that overlap and contradiction between the global approach and the 'product liability', 'general product safety' and 'safety at the work place' Directives should be avoided;
- (ix) suggests that the Commission be asked to review the interrelation between the Directives on a strictly legal basis and then issue a simple guide which can be understood by producers, workers and consumers alike;
- (x) believes that the Commission needs to give further attention to its overall policy on third countries.

The Committee urges that a Directive on the EC mark be produced as soon as possible and calls for a simplified approach including visual explanations which can be used to inform and convince all groups of people including consumers, workers and industry (including SMEs).

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously with one abstention, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Industry, Com-*

<sup>1</sup> CES 210/90.

*merce, Crafts and Services, chaired by Mr Kazazis (Greece — Employers). Rapporteur: Mr de Normann (United Kingdom — Employers).*

## 6. CONTROL OF TRANSFRONTIER MOVEMENTS OF HAZARDOUS WASTES

**Council Decision on the acceptance by the Community of an OECD Decision/Recommendation on the control of transfrontier movements of hazardous wastes**

### **Gist of the proposal for a Decision**

The original Commission proposal, submitted by the Council to the Committee following a change in the legal basis, concerns acceptance by the Community of an OECD Decision/Recommendation on the control of transfrontier movements of hazardous wastes.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The Committee welcomes the proposal recommending the ratification and rapid application of the Treaty signed in Basle on 22 March 1989 by some of the OECD Member States as well as by the Community.

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously with one abstention, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Protection of the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Affairs, chaired by Mr Jaschick (Germany — Various Interests). Sole rapporteur: Mr van Dam (Netherlands — Employers).*

## 7. CIVIL LIABILITY — WASTE

**Proposal for a Council Directive on civil liability for damage or injury to the environment caused by waste**  
[COM(89) 282 final — SYN 217]

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

The proposal, based on Article 100 of the Treaty, has twin objectives: (1) to improve the position of the victim, and (2) to align

<sup>1</sup> CES 209/90.

competition conditions. This harmonization is necessary because (a) the differences between national laws on liability and (b) the absence of the concerted development of concepts such as damage covered by liability, the causal relationship, etc., would lead to unequal conditions for competition among Member States.

The two principles behind the proposal are: preventive action and 'the polluter pays'. By putting the onus on the polluter the Commission seeks to enhance the attraction of clean technologies and other ways of minimizing waste. If liability were to be ascribed to the holder, the producer would be encouraged to rid himself of the waste at the lowest price possible.

### **Scope**

The proposal covers all wastes generated in the course of commercial activities, except nuclear wastes or hydrocarbon pollution/waste covered by existing Conventions between Member States. This excludes domestic wastes and wastes from other products after use by the consumer.

### **Strict or 'no fault' liability**

Under this principle, liability is ascribed automatically; this ensures compensation for victims and environmental rehabilitation; economic operators also have to shoulder their share of the responsibility.

### **Damage to the environment**

A separate category — that of damage to the environment — has been added to the usual categories covered by civil liability. This means harm caused to society at large and not to a private person; it is sometimes difficult to determine the extent of such damage. In such cases, only major, persistent damage to the environment, caused by changes in water, soil or air conditions, falls under this category. Finally, the proposal does not provide for punitive damages; it simply requires restoration of the status quo or the reimbursement of expenditure within reasonable limits. Only public authorities have the right to take legal action. However, public interest groups (acting for protection of the environment or public health) may also do so where national law so provides.

## Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>

The Committee accepts the present proposal as far as its principal objectives are concerned, i.e. the prevention of environmental damage and the harmonization of national laws.

However, it has a large number of serious comments, as follows:

- (i) the juridical basis should be Article 130r and 130s rather than Art. 100a;
- (ii) the legal concept of 'overwhelming probability' could lead to difficulties in interpretation in the national laws of some Member States;
- (iii) the definition of 'waste' is unsatisfactory;
- (iv) the concept of liability 'jointly and severally' should be extended to cover the 'producer' and the 'person who has actual control of the waste';
- (v) in the definition of 'injury to the environment' it would not always be clear in practice what would constitute a 'modification' of water, soil or air, or how it would be possible to establish what would constitute 'interference' in the environment;
- (vi) the right to take legal action in respect of environmental damage should be extended to cover action against public authorities where they are responsible for the damage;
- (vii) it is not specified what criteria will have to be met by waste disposal undertakings seeking authorization to operate;
- (viii) the Commission should also examine the establishment of a compensation fund for risks not covered by insurance.

*This Opinion, adopted by 109 votes in favour, with 18 abstentions, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Protection of the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Affairs, chaired by Mr Jaschick (Germany — Workers). Rapporteur: Mr Proumens (Belgium — Employers).*

<sup>1</sup> CES 215/90.

## 8. DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES (10th amendment)

**Proposal for a Council Directive amending for the 10th time Directive 76/769/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations**

[COM(89) 548 final — SYN 224]

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

The proposal is part of the Community action programme to combat pollution caused by cadmium, as embodied in Council Directive 76/769/EEC on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations.

The ban on the use of cadmium affects three areas of application (pigments, stabilizers and plating) but the purpose of the ban differs in each case.

The implementation date may vary according to the product involved, so as to give manufacturers different periods of adjustment.

Article 2 of the proposal contains a reference to technical and technological advances in finding substitutes for cadmium and its compounds.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The Committee endorses the proposal, regarding it as further progress in the integrated strategy indicated by the Community's action programme against cadmium pollution.

In taking note of the proposed exemptions on the grounds of safety and reliability, the Committee would stress that adequate involvement of the two sides of industry in the practical definition of cases where such needs arise is essential.

It thinks it advisable for the strategy indicated in the Council Resolution of 25 January 1988 to be pursued, while encouraging research and development activities already in progress which are aimed at finding alternative solutions, and calls for more thorough

<sup>1</sup> CES 208/90.

investigation of the other sectors which contribute to cadmium pollution of the environment and which are not yet regulated.

The Committee also stresses that the two sides of industry should be properly involved in the assessment of the results achieved and the identification of further action to be taken.

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously with one abstention, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Protection of the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Affairs, chaired by Mr Jaschick (Germany — Various Interests). Rapporteur: Mr Beltrami (Italy — Employers).*

## 9. ENVIREG

### **Regional action programme on the initiative of the Commission concerning the environment (Envireg)**

#### **Gist of the Commission document**

In promoting the economic and social development of disadvantaged regions — one of the specific tasks of the structural Funds — full account must be taken of environmental protection requirements, which figure among the Single Act's priorities.

A damaged environment hampers the sustained, balanced development of many of the Community's less prosperous regions.

The European structural Funds have undertaken considerable action in this area. Under the Community's support frameworks for the less-developed regions (Objective 1), ECU 1.2 billion is to be earmarked from 1989 to 1993 for environmental protection. This priority will also be one of the mainstays of the Community's support frameworks for regions suffering from industrial decline (Objective 2) and rural areas covered by Objective 5b.

These measures are, however, inadequate and the Commission has consequently decided to initiate action (Article 5(5) of Regulation 2052/88) in the environmental field, in the form of the Envireg programme. It also invites Member States to implement operational programmes centred on a number of priority measures.

#### **Priorities**

The Commission seeks to assist coastal areas in Objective 1 regions and Mediterranean coastal areas (Objective 2 and 5b regions).

The environmental situation is particularly disturbing in the coastal areas of Objective 1 regions, particularly Mediterranean regions. Over the last 30 years, most of these coastal areas have experienced rapid growth in both tourism and industry. This has led to heavy concentrations of population and activity and uncontrolled urban sprawl. Sewerage infrastructure and facilities are a particular problem.

Objective 2 regions are also clearly faced with serious environmental problems which are impeding their conversion efforts. The Commission is therefore helping to fund a large number of environmental enhancement measures under programmes instigated by itself and by the Member States (e.g. non-quota textile and steel programmes, Resider and Renaval programmes). The Community support frameworks for these regions and the programme for the conversion of mining areas (Rechar) also come into play here.

Given the range of activities involved and the fact that the structural Fund rules require around 80% of the ERDF's resources to be used in Objective 1 regions, only Mediterranean coastal areas of Objective 2 regions will be covered by Envireg.

The two main priorities are:

- (a) pollution of coastal areas,
- (b) management of hazardous and toxic industrial waste.

### **Budget, duration and implementation of the Envireg programme**

For 1992-93 a total of ECU 500 million has been earmarked for Envireg in line with total structural Fund aid.

Envireg actions are to be jointly funded by the Member State concerned and the Community.

It is up to the Member State concerned to devise and draw up operational programmes consistent with Envireg's objectives. These programmes are to be submitted to the Commission within six months of Envireg's adoption.

Operational programmes under Envireg are scheduled to run for four years.

### **Conclusion and reference to the Medspa programme**

The Envireg programme is designed to control the environment in coastal regions and to improve the management of toxic and dangerous wastes, a *sine qua non* for any development including tourism. By helping to enhance the environment of the regions concerned, Envireg will not only foster sustained economic development but will also improve the implementation of Community environment policy and the dissemination of know-how and innovation in the areas covered by the programme, Envireg will also undoubtedly boost employment in the target areas.

Envireg, which covers in the Mediterranean and embraces not only Objective 1 coastal areas, but also the handful of coastal areas covered by Objective 2 and Objective 5b (rural areas), will be backed up by a Community action designed to protect the Mediterranean environment (Medspa). The Medspa programme has similar priorities to Envireg but covers the coastal areas of (a) Community regions which are not eligible for assistance under the structural Funds, and (b) third countries in the Mediterranean.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The Committee approves the Envireg programme, subject to the following comments:

- (i) In addition to effective measures and investments, a campaign on training and education in environmental problems should be launched, as this should be part of everyone's general culture. The campaign should also seek to develop a greater sense of responsibility on the part of tourists.
- (ii) The Envireg programme, which concentrates on disadvantaged regions, should be an integral part of a comprehensive environment policy, and only those regions which already comply with existing Community directives should be eligible for assistance under the programme.
- (iii) As the total amount of ECU 500 million is not very high, efforts must be made to prevent financial resources from being spread too thinly, to ensure that assistance is subject to strict financial and technical monitoring and to prevent resources from being wasted. To this end, trained staff should be on duty to maintain plants which are in use, and local

<sup>1</sup> CES 217/90.

authorities and representatives of economic and social interest groups should be involved in drawing up all programmes.

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously with one abstention, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Regional Development and Town and Country Planning, chaired by Mr Vasco Cal (Portugal — Workers). Rapporteur: Mr Della Croce (Italy — Workers).*

## 10. COMETT II AGREEMENT — EEC/EFTA

**Proposal for Council Decisions concerning the conclusion of Agreements between the European Economic Community and the EFTA countries establishing cooperation in the field of training in the context of the implementation of Comett II (1990-94)**

### **Gist of the Council documents**

The second phase of Comett, the programme on cooperation between universities and industry regarding training in the field of technologies, entered into force on 1 January 1990 for a period of five years and with a budget of ECU 200 million.

In accordance with the Council Decision of 22 May 1989, universities and businesses in the EFTA countries (European Free Trade Association) will be eligible to participate in Comett II.

To this end, six identical bilateral agreements on cooperation in the field of training in technology in the context of Comett II have been signed between the Community and Austria, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

### **Conditions governing participation**

Universities and industry in the EFTA countries may participate in the four strands of Comett II on the same terms as EC universities and industry. In order to safeguard Community interests, however, transnational projects submitted by a promoter from an EFTA country will only be eligible if at least two EC Member States are participating. Furthermore, in the case of exchanges of students and personnel, only exchanges between an EFTA and an EC country will be financed.

### **Financial contribution**

Each of the EFTA countries will contribute to the Comett II budget in accordance with a proportionality factor which is determined by the ratio between its GDP and the total GDP of the Community and the country concerned.

The six countries concerned will be able to participate in the programme as soon as it becomes operational in 1990, in so far as the ratification procedures for the agreements have been completed.

This opening-up of Comett II is in the interests of both parties and will make it easier to pursue the objectives of cooperation in the field of education and training so as to help raise the level of qualifications of Europe's human resources.

### **The four strands of Comett II**

Strand A Development of university-industry training partnerships  
— UITP

Strand B Transnational exchanges of students and personnel  
between universities and industry

Strand C Joint projects for continuing training in, in particular,  
advanced technology and for multimedia distance training

Strand D Complementary promotion and back-up measures.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion**<sup>1</sup>

The Committee approves the proposals contained in the Council's Decision.

*The general rapporteur for this Opinion, adopted unanimously, was Mr Pearson (Ireland — Employers).*

<sup>1</sup> CES 216/90.

## 11. COTTON

**Proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) instituting a special system of aid for small cotton producers**  
[COM(89) 611 final]

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

The Commission proposes to set up a system of flat-rate aid to small cotton producers (cultivating an area no larger than 1.5 hectares) to offset falls in their income when Community output exceeds the guaranteed threshold fixed for the marketing year concerned, as has been the case in recent marketing years.

Aid is fixed at ECU 250 per hectare for each of the next three marketing years, and may be reduced in proportion to the amount by which areas sown to cotton by small producers exceed a Community maximum guaranteed area.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The Committee feels that the system of aid for cotton should be revised, pointing out that:

- (1) there is a shortfall in cotton as an industrial product. It is an important source of jobs and income for farming communities and also provides thousands of jobs in the processing industry;
- (2) the Community does not produce enough cotton to meet its own needs;
- (3) the Commission should guarantee the maximum guaranteed quantity for 1989-90 to a level equivalent to the Community's present potential output;
- (4) the Committee supports the Commission's proposal to grant flat-rate aid worth ECU 250 per hectare and to exempt small farmers from the principle of co-responsibility.

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Agriculture and Fisheries, chaired by Mr Laur (France — Various Interests). Rapporteur: Mr Bazianas (Greece — Various Interests).*

<sup>1</sup> CES 213/90.

## 12. IMPROVING FARM STRUCTURES

**Proposal for a Council Regulation (EEC) amending Regulation (EEC) No 797/85 on improving the efficiency of farm structures**  
[COM(89) 597 final]

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

Farmers participating in the set-aside scheme (but with a minimum proportion of 30% instead of 20% of their arable land) would be allowed to produce cereals for non-food uses on, at most, half as much land as has been set aside, and receive a certain premium.

The basic condition for receiving this non-food premium would be a contract concluded between any industrial company and individual farmers (or groups of farmers). In this contract the processor would guarantee that the product will not be used for food or feed manufacture.

Contracts will not qualify if the buyer/processor of the crop applies for aid under the existing scheme for granting production refunds for the manufacture of non-food products from starch.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The Committee considers that the aims and content of the Commission proposal require substantial revision.

In the Committee's view:

- (i) the system must be open to both traditional and new crops, particularly the latter. It should not rule out the production, on land which has not been 'set aside', of varieties grown under the 'agro-industrial fallow system';
- (ii) the amounts produced must not be included in quotas and maximum guaranteed quantities;
- (iii) the producer premium must be set at the same level and applied in the same way in all Member States, production potential being equal;
- (iv) provision must be made, if necessary, for appropriate incentives for users; the user is crucial to the success of attempts to develop non-food agricultural production.

<sup>1</sup> CES 220/90.

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Agriculture and Fisheries, chaired by Mr Laur (France — Various Interests). Rapporteur: Mr Luchetti (Italy — Various Interests).*

### 13. VETERINARY SAFEGUARD MEASURES

**Proposal for a Council Decision concerning safeguard measures in the veterinary field in the framework of the internal market**  
[COM(89) 493 final]

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

The draft Directive lays down the veterinary checks to be made in intra-Community trade, in the internal market context. The aim is to protect the public and animals from serious animal diseases, whose spread could be facilitated by the free movement of agricultural products.

Restrictive measures are to be taken by authorities of Member States in which an outbreak or suspected outbreak of a serious animal disease occurs. The Commission is to have the power to intervene rapidly and effectively. In exceptional cases the Commission will be able to authorize the other Member States to take protective measures.

#### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The Committee approves the Commission's proposal.

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Agriculture and Fisheries, chaired by Mr Laur (France — Various Interests). Rapporteur: Mr Storie-Pugh (United Kingdom — Various Interests).*

<sup>1</sup> CES 218/90.

## 14. BOVINE LEUKOSIS

**Proposal for a Council Directive amending Directive 64/432/EEC as regards enzootic bovine leukosis [COM(89) 652 final]**

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

From 1 July 1990 intra-Community trade in certain types of bovine animals intended for breeding or production will be restricted to herds that are enzootic leukosis-free within the meaning of this term, or which come from EBL-free Member States or regions as defined by this proposal.

Article 4 of Council Directive 88/406/EEC, which amends Council Directive 64/432/EEC on enzootic bovine leukosis, requires that the Commission (a) lays down the criteria enabling a Member State or region to be recognized as being free from enzootic bovine leukosis, (b) sets the conditions to guarantee the maintenance of such status, and (c) lays down the rules applicable to trade from enzootic bovine leukosis-free regions or Member States. The present proposal is intended to achieve this.

The rules for intra-Community trade from EBL-free herds, regions and Member States will now be the same in all these cases, i.e. a negative test 30 days before loading.

In addition, it is proposed to modify the provisions concerning the Council's delegation of powers to the Commission by deleting the 'contre-filet' clause in the Regulatory Committee procedure.

### **Gist of the Committee Opinion <sup>1</sup>**

The Committee approves the Commission's proposal subject to a number of specific comments.

It considers that the Commission proposal is a simplistic but pragmatic approach to a difficult problem and notes that the proposed rules will be reviewed at a later date.

*This Opinion, adopted unanimously, was drawn up in the light of the paper produced by the Section for Agriculture and Fisheries, chaired by Mr Laur (France — Various Interests). Rapporteur: Mr Storie-Pugh (United Kingdom — Various Interests).*

<sup>1</sup> CES 219/90.

## **External influence and presence of the Economic and Social Committee**

### **Activities of the Committee's Chairman and Secretary-General**

1 February 1990: Participation at the meeting between the Polish Prime Minister, Mr Tadeusz Mazowiecki, the enlarged Bureau of the European Parliament, the EP Political Affairs Committee, External Economic Relations Committee and the EP-Poland Delegation.

6 February: Participation at the meeting of the Joint ESC/EFTA Contact Group. The meeting focused on a consideration of issues relating to the European social area (ESA), basic social rights and the specific roles of the EFTA Consultative Committee and the Economic and Social Committee in the development of a European economic area. Following a discussion on relations between Western and Eastern European countries, the approach to be adopted to the examination of that issue in Gothenburg on 12 June 1990 at the 20th joint meeting was determined.

7 February: Talks between Mr Moreau and the President of the Federation of African Workers in France, Mr Kiticki Kouamba, who proposed to arrange, in the run-up to the establishment of the single market, a seminar on emigration in Paris in May 1990.

7 February: Talks with the Chairman of the EP Committee on Institutional Affairs, Mr Oreja.

7 February: Address given by the Chairman at a meeting of the Agenzi per la mondializzazione dell'impresa.

7 February: Talks with Mr José Luis Sagredo de Miguel of the Junta de Castilla y León at the Committee building in Brussels.

8 February: Talks with Mr Van Caenegem, Chief Executive of the CIAA (Agri-food industries).

9 February: Participation at the official ceremony marking the inauguration of the branch office in Brussels of the Nord-Pas de Calais Regional Council based at the French Embassy.

13 February: Talks with a delegation from the Italian National Economic and Labour Council (CNEL).

14 February: Talks with the Irish Minister for Transport, Mr Brennan, assisted by Mr O'Duffy, Mr Cullin, and Mr Toomey, Mrs McGinley, Irish Permanent Representative, and Mr Smith, Mr Carroll, Mr Kenna, Mr Vassilaras (Committee Members) and Mr Pena (EC Commission).

15 February: Talks with the Ambassador of Malta, Mr Licari, and the Head of the Section for Relations with the EC at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr Borg.

19 February: Talks with Ms Papandreou, Member of the EC Commission.

20 February: Talks with the President of the EC Pharmaceutical Group, Mr Capilla, and the Secretary-General, Mr Baetens.

20 February: Talks with Mr Wolte, Ambassador Extraordinary and Head of the Austrian Mission to the EC.

## Information Visits

The following information visits to the Committee took place during the period under review:

- 2 February 1990 Ifocap — Institut de formation pour les cadres paysans et agro-alimentaires et pour la gestion des entreprises (France)
- 6 February 1990 North Warwickshire College of Technology and Art (UK)
- 6 February 1990 Kirkby College of Further Education (UK)
- 8 February 1990 Europäische Akademie Bayern (Germany)
- 13 February 1990 Newark Technical College (UK)
- 13 February 1990 International Education Centre (Denmark and USA)
- 14 February 1990 Cambridge Regional College (UK)
- 14 February 1990 The Institute of Cultural Affairs International (Belgium)
- 15 February 1990 Eastleigh College (UK)
- 15 February 1990 Bromley College of Technology (UK)
- 15 February 1990 Hoger Economisch en Administratief Onderwijs (Netherlands)
- 15 February 1990 Cork Regional Technical College (Ireland)
- 16 February 1990 North-East Worcestershire College — Department of Business and Professional Studies (UK)
- 20 February 1990 Sprogsam — S sammenslutningen af Sproglaererforeninger i Danmark (Denmark)
- 20 February 1990 Bristol Polytechnic (UK)

- 21 February 1990 Catharijne College (Gemeentelijke scholengemeenschap voor middelbaar economisch, administratief en handelsonderwijs) (Netherlands)
- 21 February 1990 The Liverpool Polytechnic — School of Social Science (UK)
- 21 February 1990 Standing Committee on Consumer Affairs in the Norwegian Parliament
- 22 February 1990 Catharijne College (Netherlands)
- 22 February 1990 IUC — International Education Centre (Denmark)
- 22 February 1990 Produits Sandoz — Division agrochimique (Centre Est-Rhône Alpes) (France)
- 22 February 1990 Université de Paris (Sorbonne) — Centre de recherche et dess en gestion européenne et internationale (France)
- 22 February 1990 Institut universitaire de technologie de Saint-Denis (Département GEA Formation gestion européenne et internationale) — Université Paris-Nord (France)
- 23 February 1990 Teesside Polytechnic — Department of Administrative and Social Studies (UK)
- 27 February 1990 Loughborough University (Department of European Politics) (UK)

# Provisional future work programme

## March 1990 Plenary Session

### OPINIONS

#### *Social Affairs Section*

Continuing vocational training  
[COM(89) 567 final]

#### *Environment Section*

Treatment of acute human poisoning  
[COM(89) 505 final]

Pollution caused by certain dangerous substances discharged into  
the aquatic environment  
[COM(90) 9 final]

#### *Industry Section*

European Company Statute  
[COM(89) 268 final — SYN 218 — SYN 219]

#### *Transport Section*

Recognition of vocational qualifications — Civil aviation  
[COM(89) 472 final]

Use of self-drive vehicles  
[COM(89) 430 final]

Research and development programme — Transport (Euret)  
[COM(89) 557 final — SYN 226]

#### *Agriculture Section*

Salmonids  
[COM(89) 502 final]

Prevention of pathogens in foodstuffs  
[COM(89) 509 final]

Game and rabbit meat  
[COM(89) 496 final]

Fresh poultry and game bird meat  
[COM(89) 507 final]

Products of animal origin  
[COM(89) 492 final]

#### OWN-INITIATIVE WORK

##### *Regional Development Section*

Declining industrial areas

##### *External Relations Section*

EC relations with the countries of Eastern Europe

#### OTHER WORK

##### *External Relations Section*

The Community's Mediterranean policy (Supplementary Opinion)

##### *Subcommittee*

Agricultural and forestry resources

### **April 1990 Plenary Session**

#### OPINIONS

##### *Section for Social Affairs*

European Foundation for Training  
[COM(90) 15 final]

Tempus (Trans-European Mobility Programme for University Studies)  
[COM(90) 16 final]

##### *Environment Section*

Imports of certain furs  
[COM(89) 198 final]

Municipal waste-water treatment  
[COM(89) 518 final]

Restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances (11th amendment of 76/89)  
[COM(89) 665 final — SYN 239]

##### *Industry Section*

Approximation of laws relating to machinery  
[COM(89) 624 final — SYN 233]

Simple pressure vessels  
[COM(89) 636 final — SYN 232]

Electrically operated lifts  
[COM(89) 638 final — SYN 234]

*Regional Development Section*

14th ERDF report

*Energy Section*

Euratom health protection — radioactive waste shipment  
[COM(89) 559 final]

Development of a Eurotra system  
[COM(89) 603 final — SYN 228]

Cooperation agreements EEC/Austria/Finland/Norway/Sweden/  
Switzerland (SPES agreement)

Cooperation agreements EEC/Finland/Switzerland/Norway/Sweden  
(BCR)

*Agriculture Section*

Expenditure in the veterinary field  
[COM(89) 666 final]

Biological agricultural products  
[COM(89) 522 final]

**May 1990 Plenary Session**

**OPINIONS**

*Economic and Financial Section*

Excise duties  
[COM(89) 551/525/526/527 final]

*Industry Section*

Article 85(3) exemptions in the insurance sector  
[COM(89) 641 final]

Social economy  
[SEC(89) 2187 final]

*Transport Section*

Dimensions of road trains  
[COM(89) 573 final]

*Agriculture Section*

Protective measures against organisms harmful to plant life  
[COM(89) 646/647 final]

Marketing of young plants other than vegetable seeds  
[COM(89) 649 final]

Marketing of reproductive material of ornamental plants  
[COM(89) 650 final]

Marketing of reproductive material of fruit plants  
[COM(89) 651 final]

**OWN-INITIATIVE WORK***Regional Development Section*

Tourism year

*External Relations Section*

EEC/EFTA relations

**July 1990 Plenary Session****OPINIONS***Social Affairs Section*

Social developments in 1990

*Transport Section*

Relations between the Member States and the railways: public service

[COM(89) 564 final]

Air-transport links with third countries

[COM(90) 17 final]

**OWN-INITIATIVE WORK***Economic and Financial Section*

Mid-1990 economic situation

*Section for External Relations*

Last stage of the GATT/Uruguay Round negotiations

**OTHER WORK***Environment Section*

Environmental policy — a fundamental aspect of economic and social development (Supplementary Opinion)

*External Relations Section*

Relations between the Community and the countries of Eastern Europe (Information report)

**September 1990 Plenary Session****OTHER WORK**

13th Council Directive on company law concerning takeover bids (Supplementary Opinion)

**Later or as yet undecided Plenary Sessions****OPINIONS***Environment Section*

Tourism — Five-year programme  
[COM(88) 363 final]

Environmental protection in the Mediterranean (Medspa)  
[COM(89) 598 final]

Protection of natural habitats  
[COM(88) 381 final]

Environment framework programme (Step-Epoch)

*Industry Section*

Information technology — Esprit II  
Communications technology — RACE

*Energy Section*

Measurements and tests

Marine science and technologies

Biotechnology

Agricultural and agro-industrial research

Life sciences and technologies for developing countries

Non-nuclear energy sources

Nuclear fusion safety

Human capital and mobility

**OTHER WORK**

*Agriculture Section*

Agricultural aspects of the Uruguay Round (Supplementary Opinion)

*External Relations Section*

GATT/Uruguay Round (Information report)

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS AND BROCHURES

### Available from the ESC

#### *General documentation*

The other European Assembly (CES 89-003)  
Leaflet on the ESC

#### *Opinions and studies*

Europe and the new technologies (1986) (ESC 89-004)  
Disadvantaged island regions (July 1988) (ESC 88-009)  
Basic Community social rights (Opinion) (February 1989)  
Horizon 1992: The ESC supports the removal of fiscal frontiers (July 1988)  
(8 Opinions)  
Target date 1992: The ESC supports 'the new-frontier Europe' (June 1988)  
(7 Opinions) (ESC 88-010)

### Available from Gower Publishing Co. Ltd, 1 Westmead, Farnborough, Hants GUI 47RU

Community Advisory Committee for the Representation of Socio-Economic  
Interests (UKL 8.50)  
European interest groups and their relationship to the Economic and Social  
Committee (UKL 25)

### Available from Delta Publications, rue Scailquin 55, 1030 Brussels

The economic and social interest groups of Portugal (BFR 350)  
Action by the European Community through its financial instruments  
(Brussels, 1979) (BFR 425)  
The economic and social interest groups of Greece (BFR 350)  
The right of initiative of the ESC (BFR 400)

### Available from Kogan Page Ltd, 120 Pentonville Road, London N1

Directory of European agricultural organizations (UKL 39)

### Available from the EC Publications Office

Bulletin (monthly) (per issue: ECU 4.25. Annual subscription: ECU 30.50)  
Annual Report 1988 (ECU 8.50)  
Effects of the CAP on the social situation of farmworkers in the European  
Community (Brussels, 1987) (ECU 3.40)  
European environment policy: air, water, waste management (Brussels,  
1987) (ECU 3.50)  
Community rail policy (ECU 7.40)  
EEC maritime transport policy (Brussels, June 1986) (ECU 3.40)  
EEC air transport policy (October 1985) (ECU 5.50)  
GATT — towards a new round (Opinion) (Brussels, 1986) (ECU 2.20)  
Competition policy (ECU 3.40)  
Europe and the new technologies (Brussels, 1988) (ESC 87-020) (ECU  
18.50)

Venta y suscripciones • Salg og abonnement • Verkauf und Abonnement • Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές  
Sales and subscriptions • Vente et abonnements • Vendita e abbonamenti  
Verkoop en abonnementen • Venda e assinaturas

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

**Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad**

Rue de Louvain 42 / Louvainseweg 42  
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel  
Tél. (02) 512 00 20  
Fax 511 01 84  
CCP / Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Autres distributeurs / Overige verkooppunten

**Librairie européenne /  
Europese Boekhandel**

Avenue Albert Jonnart 50 /  
Albert Jonnartaan 50  
1200 Bruxelles / 1200 Brussel  
Tél. (02) 734 02 81  
Fax 735 08 60

**Jean De Lanroy**

Avenue du Roi 202 / Koningslaan 202  
1060 Bruxelles / 1060 Brussel  
Tél. (02) 538 51 69  
Téléx 63220 UNBOOK B

**CREDOC**

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34  
Bte 11 / Bus 11  
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

**J. H. Schultz Information A/S**

**EF-Publikationer**

Ottillavvej 18  
2500 Valby  
Tlf. 36 44 22 66  
Fax 36 44 01 41  
Girokonto 6 00 08 86

BR DEUTSCHLAND

**Bundesanzeiger Verlag**

Breite Straße  
Postfach 10 80 06  
5000 Köln 1  
Tel. (0221) 20 29-0  
Fernschreiber:  
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595  
Fax 20 29 278

GREECE

**G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA**

International Bookstore  
Nikis Street 4  
10563 Athens  
Tel. (01) 322 63 23  
Télex 219410 ELEF  
Fax 323 98 21

ESPAÑA

**Boletín Oficial del Estado**

Trafalgar, 27  
28010 Madrid  
Tel. (91) 446 80 00

**Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.**

Castelló, 37  
28001 Madrid  
Tel. (91) 431 33 99 (Libros)  
431 32 22 (Suscripciones)  
435 36 37 (Dirección)  
Télex 49370-MPLI-E  
Fax (91) 275 39 98

Sucursal:

**Librería Internacional AEDOS**

Consejo de Ciento, 391  
08009 Barcelona  
Tel. (93) 301 85 15  
Fax (93) 317 01 41

Generalitat de Catalunya:

**Librería Ramba dels estudis**

Ramba, 118 (Palau Moja)  
08002 Barcelona  
Tel. (93) 302 65 35  
302 64 62

FRANCE

**Journal officiel**

**Service des publications  
des Communautés européennes**  
26, rue Desaix  
75727 Paris Cedex 15  
Tél. (1) 40 58 75 00  
Fax (1) 40 58 75 74

IRELAND

**Government Publications Sales Office**

Sun Alliance House  
Molesworth Street  
Dublin 2  
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

**Government Stationery Office**

**EEC Section**  
6th floor  
Bishop Street  
Dublin 8  
Tel. 78 16 86  
Fax 78 06 45

ITALIA

**Licosa Spa**

Via Benedetto Fortini, 120/10  
Casella postale 552  
50125 Firenze  
Tel. (055) 64 54 15  
Fax 64 12 57  
Telex 570466 LICOSA I  
CCP 343 509

Subagenti:

**Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU**

Via Meravigli, 16  
20123 Milano  
Tel. (02) 80 76 79

**Herder Editrice e Libreria**

Piazza Montecitorio, 117-120  
00186 Roma  
Tel. (06) 679 46 28/679 53 04

**Libreria giuridica**

Via 12 Ottobre, 172/R  
16121 Genova  
Tel. (010) 59 56 93

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

Abonnements seulement  
Subscriptions only  
Nur für Abonnements

**Messageries Paul Kraus**

11, rue Christophe Plantin  
2339 Luxembourg  
Tél. 499 98 88  
Télex 2515  
CCP 49242-63

NEDERLAND

**SDU uitgeverij**

Christoffel Plantijnstraat 2  
Postbus 20014  
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage  
Tel. (070) 78 98 80 (bestellingen)  
Fax (070) 47 63 51

PORTUGAL

**Imprensa Nacional**

Casa da Moeda, EP  
Rua D. Francisco Manuel de Melo, 5  
1092 Lisboa Codex  
Tel. (01) 69 34 14

**Distribuidora de Livros Bertrand, Ld.**

**Grupo Bertrand, SARL**

Rua das Terras dos Vales, 4-A  
Apartado 37  
2700 Amadora Codex  
Tel. (01) 493 90 50 - 494 87 88  
Telex 15798 BERDIS  
Fax 491 02 55

UNITED KINGDOM

**HMSO Books (PC 16)**

HMSO Publications Centre  
51 Nine Elms Lane  
London SW8 5DR  
Tel. (01) 873 9090  
Fax GP3 873 8463

Sub-agent:

**Alan Armstrong Ltd**

2 Arkwright Road  
Reading, Berks RG2 0SQ  
Tel. (0734) 75 18 55  
Telex 849937 AAALTD G  
Fax (0734) 75 51 64

SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA

**OSEC**

Stampfenbachstraße 85  
8035 Zürich  
Tel. (01) 365 51 51  
Fax (01) 365 52 21

ÖSTERREICH

**Manz'sche Verlags-  
und Universitätsbuchhandlung**

Kohlmarkt 16  
1014 Wien  
Tel. (0222) 531 61-0  
Telex 11 25 00 BOX A  
Fax (0222) 531 61-81

TÜRKIYE

**Dünya süper veb ofset A.Ş.**

Naribahçe Sokak No. 15  
Cağaloğlu  
İstanbul  
Tel. 512 01 90  
Telex 23822 DSVO-TR

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**UNIPUB**

4611-F Assembly Drive  
Lanham, MD 20706-4391  
Tel. Toll Free (800) 274 4888  
Fax (301) 459 0056  
Telex 7108260418

CANADA

**Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd**

61 Sparks Street  
Ottawa  
Ontario K1P 5R1  
Tel. Toll Free 1 (800) 267 41 64  
Ottawa Region (613) 238 89 85-8  
Telex 053-4936

JAPAN

**Kinokuniya Company Ltd**

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome  
Shinjuku-ku  
Tokyo 160-81  
Tel. (03) 354 01 31

**Journal Department**

PO Box 55 Chitose  
Tokyo 156  
Tel. (03) 439 01 24

SVERIGE

**BTJ**

Box 200  
22100 Lund  
Tel. (046) 18 00 00  
Fax (046) 18 01 25

AUTRES PAYS

OTHER COUNTRIES

ANDERE LÄNDER

**Office des publications officielles  
des Communautés européennes**

2, rue Mercier  
L-2985 Luxembourg  
Tel. 49 92 81  
Télex PUBOF LU 1324 b  
Fax 46 85 73  
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/700

**EN**

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg

Single copy ECU 4.25

Annual subscription ECU 30.50



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

L-2985 Luxembourg



EX-AA-90-003-EN-C