

Opinion on the proposal for a Council Directive on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to carcinogens at work (sixth individual Directive within the meaning of Article 8 of Directive 80/1107/EEC)

(88/C 208/13)

On 15 January 1988, the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 118 A of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

The Section for Social, Family, Educational and Cultural Affairs, which was responsible for preparing the Committee's work on the subject, adopted its Opinion on 18 May 1988. The rapporteur was Mr Etty.

At its 256th plenary session (meeting of 2 June 1988), the Economic and Social Committee adopted the following Opinion by 94 votes to 8, with 15 abstentions (vote recorded).

1. Introduction

With the rise in the use of chemicals and technology, the exposure to carcinogens of workers and the population at large poses a growing threat to human life. It is therefore crucial to adopt effective measures against these substances. Attempts to register cases of occupational cancer in the Member States have been piecemeal and the incidence of unreported cases can therefore be assumed to be several times higher than indicated by official figures. This conclusion can be drawn from recognized epidemiological research. Carcinogenic substances usually also have a mutagenic effect. In the case of certain carcinogens there is speculation as to possible damaging effects on embryos and fertility.

1.1. Effective action against cancer risks in the work environment is not only of considerable importance for a large proportion of the labour force and for many employers but also because it can have an indirect impact on health protection for society at large.

1.2. The Committee welcomes the introduction by the Commission of a legal instrument, the draft Directive of 10 December 1987, to combat cancer hazards at the workplace. This step is in line with the request made by the Committee in its May 1985 Opinion on occupational cancer.

1.3. The draft Directive does not however do sufficient justice to workers' health protection requirements, given the serious threat of work-related cancer. It lags far behind the proposals made by the Economic and Social Committee in May 1985 (OJ No C 188, 29. 7. 1985). In this context reference should be made to the Committee's Opinion on the 'Limit Value Directive' of June 1987.

The principal weaknesses of the draft Directive are listed below:

- There is no legally binding, comprehensive ranking for the preventive measures to be adopted; the preventive aims are in fact considerably watered down by exemptions.
- No provision is made for banning exposure to carcinogenic substances or for mandatory substitution of safe or less dangerous substances; it would be technically preferable for prohibitions to be included in this Directive, rather than the banning Directive.
- No maximum limits for exposure to carcinogens are laid down, nor is there an injunction to reduce current levels by using state of the art technology; sharp disparities between the Member States are therefore inevitable on this central issue.
- There are no arrangements for dealing with the increased risk created by multiple carcinogens, although they are typical of the working environment of a large number of workers.
- There is no provision for a Community-wide standardized procedure for measuring and analysing the scale of exposure to carcinogens.
- The proposal does not provide for mandatory measuring of carcinogenic levels; this is imperative, in the light of the threat to human life.
- No provision is made for involving employers and workers in decision-making on measures to be adopted at plant or intercompany level; employers and workers should also be involved in the appropriate EC bodies in order to ensure a rapid classification of carcinogens based on the latest scientific findings; reference should be made here to the Committee's Opinion on the 1988 framework Directive (CES No 454/88).

- The preventive requirements which the draft Directive imposes on Member States are fragmentary; this applies in particular to (a) official monitoring of observance of legislation on registering carcinogens and related illnesses (b) arrangements for putting protective legislation into practice, e. g. by setting up measurement and analysis centres and providing information on health hazards, in particular in order to help small business.

These eight criticisms are dealt with in detail in the 'specific comments'.

1.4. Given these shortcomings, the draft Directive is not calculated to harmonize existing conditions in this area while maintaining the improvements, as provided for by Article 118 a of the EEC Treaty. The Directive in fact paves the way for distortions of competition since its non-mandatory provisions are liable to lead to wide variations in safety levels between the Member States. It must be remembered that minimum requirements within the meaning of Article 118 a play a crucial psychological role in the development of industrial health and safety standards and the relevant legislation in the individual Member States. In fact, there is a danger that the tendency to harmonize legislation in the EC will lead to the erosion of high safety standards and the substitution of lower safety levels commensurate with EC minimum requirements.

2. Comments on the explanatory memorandum

The Directive is confined to '1st and 2nd category' carcinogenic agents (p. 11 pp.). This is indefensible if workers' health is to be fully protected. It would be much more logical to include '3rd category' carcinogens, where their carcinogenic effect has been demonstrated in experiments on animals. There can be no justification for waiting several decades to check whether these substances also cause cancer in humans. Epidemiological research into cancer in humans should only be considered as scientific back-up for bacterial short-term tests and experiments on animals, insofar as such experiments are necessary.

3. Specific comments

3.1. Article 1 (Objective)

Appropriate (separate) provisions on the prevention of work-related cancer must be introduced to give all maritime transport workers and air transport workers the same legal protection as other workers are afforded by the present draft Directive.

3.2. Article 2 (Definition)

It should be specified that the Directive also applies to the handling of products whereby carcinogenic agents may be released. The Directive should also contain provisions covering carcinogens not listed in Annex I or II but classified as carcinogenic by the producer or importer. In such cases Member States, producers or importers should be required to inform the Commission immediately that the product is classified as carcinogenic. The Commission should in turn be required to carry out an appropriate assessment procedure without delay.

3.3. Article 3 (Assessment)

Article 3 should be headed: 'Field of application, registration and assessment of risk'. This change is necessary since, in the practice of industrial health protection, the process of registering a risk (e. g. the nature and concentration of carcinogens) is quite distinct from the assessment of the health hazard.

3.3.1. The wording of Article 3 (1) in all official Community languages should make it perfectly clear that the Directive applies to activities in which workers either are actually exposed or may be exposed to carcinogens in the course of their work.

3.3.2. A new paragraph should be inserted requiring employers to establish the nature and scale of risks of exposure to carcinogenic substances. Employers should have to record and establish, by means of regular measurement, the level of carcinogen concentration at the workplace or in the work environment. Article 4, 2 (d) concerning the use of adequate measurement procedures for carcinogenic agents falls short of health protection requirements on two counts: (1) 'measuring' is referred to as one of several courses of action which can be applied 'as appropriate'. (2) the measuring requirement is curtailed by the suggestion that measurement procedures are necessary 'in particular for the early detection of abnormal exposures'. In order to assess cancer risk, measurements must, however, always be carried out where there is the slightest indication of carcinogens being released. It can be assumed that carcinogens are generally present in far higher concentrations in a work environment than in the environment at large. Carcinogen concentration should also be measured even when they are below certain limits. This is necessary because there is the possibility that the cancer risk increases when workers are exposed to more than one carcinogen.

3.3.3. A standardized measuring and analysis procedure should be introduced for all Member States.

This is essential if health and safety standards are to be harmonized on the basis of this Directive. Concrete measures could be outlined in a third annex.

3.3.4. Risk registration should also cover exposure via, for example, the skin and not only via respiratory tracts.

3.3.5. Risk assessment is to be endorsed but details should be given. In addition to the nature and extent of exposure, account should also be taken of the duration and the combined effect of several carcinogens.

3.3.6. Employers should be required to keep written records of all aspects of registration and assessment of risks.

3.4. *Preliminary comments on Articles 4 to 9*

Articles 4 to 9 should provide for prevention proper i.e. the absolute prevention or reduction of work-related cancer risks. As they stand however, the provisions do not meet workers' health and safety requirements, given the scale of the threat which carcinogens pose. The large number of derogations (use of the qualification: 'insofar as is reasonably practicable'), the lack of a mandatory ranking of protective measures, the absence of maximum limits for carcinogen concentrations at the workplace and the fact that preventive measures are not mandatory for Member States almost totally undermine the protective objectives of Articles 4 to 9. There is a gross discrepancy between the aim of affording protection and the fact that the measures designed to achieve this end are not sufficiently binding.

3.5. *On Article 4 (Measures for the prevention of exposure)*

3.5.1. The heading of Article 4 should be amended to read as follows 'Prevention or reduction of exposure'.

3.5.2. The protective aim indicated in the heading of Article 4 and described in Article 4 (1), i.e. the prevention of the exposure of workers to carcinogens, is to be welcomed. Since the measures proposed to achieve this aim are however not mandatory, they are unsuitable.

3.5.3. The prevention or reduction of the exposure of workers to carcinogens is contingent on whether this is 'reasonably practicable'. [Art. 4 (1) and (2)]. Contrary to the Commission's statement, this does not automatically follow from the 'Guideline Directive on the protection of workers from the risks related to exposure to chemical, physical and biological agents at work (80/1107/EEC)' on which the Directive is based. Article 3 (1) of the Guideline Directive does permit Member States to decide whether the exposure of workers to

carcinogens is to be completely avoided or kept at as low a level as is 'reasonably practicable'. Consequently, Article 4 (14) stipulates that the use of industrial materials can, where necessary, either be limited or totally banned where the use of other available means does not afford sufficient protection. In view of the lethal threat posed by carcinogens, stringent rather than 'reasonably practicable' measures must be adopted. Article 3 (1) also provides an opportunity for defining what a 'reasonably practicable level' might be, either by reference to latest technological research or by devising transitional industrial processes with a lower health risk.

3.5.4. Article 4—in conjunction with Article 6—defines the level of protection to be achieved but the definition is piecemeal since it makes no reference to exposure bans for carcinogens or to maximum carcinogen concentration levels for the working environment. Legislation on statutory protective levels must take account (a) of the threat to workers' health and (b) the facts of business life. Most workers will be unprotected unless specific maximum limits for carcinogen concentrations in the working atmosphere are observed. Maximum limits are also required to avoid distortions of competition as between the Member States and different plants and sectors in Member States.

Article 4 should therefore gear protection levels to the health hazards involved. The following steps should be provided for:

- measures to prevent any exposure where this is necessary for health considerations, or is technologically practicable,
- reduction of exposure to the lowest technically practicable level in individual plants,
- establishment of maximum permissible exposure values, coupled with a requirement to reduce these maxima by specific deadlines,
- setting of a trigger threshold for the application of certain measures, e.g. compulsory use of breathing equipment,
- emergency measures in the event of permissible maxima being exceeded.

3.5.5. Article 4 does not stipulate any ranking for protective measures. In fact it leaves employers at liberty to apply the proposed measures in the light of what is reasonably practicable and 'appropriate' [Article 4 (2) in conjunction with Article 4 (1)].

Article 4 should stipulate the following mandatory order of priority for protective measures:

- a ban or restrictions on the use of carcinogenic materials, products and hazardous working procedures, including a ban on exposure,
- mandatory replacement of carcinogenic materials, products and hazardous work processes or instruments by safe or less dangerous alternatives,
- technical measures for (a) the planning, development and construction stages of new plants (b) existing plants and procedures,
- blanket establishment of exposure limit values, to be reduced gradually over defined transitional periods in line with technological progress,
- work organization measures, such as the reduction of the pace of work, shorter exposure times, training and further training; instructions on behaviour,
- personal protective equipment and hygiene measures.

The Member States should be required to ban exposure to carcinogens where this is necessary to protect workers' health. This would not be at odds with the banning Directive since it also covers manufacture. Harmonization of legislation would also be promoted if the issues addressed by the banning Directive were tackled in the present draft Directive. In addition, a distinction must be drawn between (a) a blanket exposure ban under an EC Directive—such as the ban on the four substances—and (b) the separate requirement for the Member States to use exposure bans as a flexible instrument for action in specific cases.

3.5.6. The objective of protecting workers from exposure to carcinogens [Article 4 (1)] is to be welcomed. The requirement to use closed systems should however be geared to technological progress. Appropriate transitional periods could be considered for adjusting old plants to technological progress.

Closed systems are aimed, first and foremost, at the manufacturing industry, i.e. essentially the chemical industry. The use of closed systems in the user industries or user firms, including craft undertakings, is a much more difficult proposition. It should be borne in mind in this respect that many more workers are exposed to carcinogens in user industries than in manufacturing industries.

Closed systems will not protect all workers concerned from exposure. Malfunctions may occur and even where closed systems are used, the vast majority of

exposures to carcinogens occur during repairs, cleaning or maintenance work.

3.5.7. Employers should be required, using available technology and other in-plant facilities including work organization, to reduce exposure as far as possible, irrespective of maximum permissible values for carcinogen concentrations in the working atmosphere. The draft Directive on limit values also requires individual employers to endeavour, irrespective of maxima, to achieve the lowest possible exposure of workers. It is assumed that individual sectors and plants have completely different technical and work organizational facilities.

3.5.8. Maximum limits for carcinogenic concentrations in the working atmosphere should be laid down and must not be exceeded. These maxima should be linked to technological progress and tapered off over a transitional period. To achieve this, industry should be required to develop technology, including working instruments, to permit maximum levels to be reduced accordingly.

3.5.9. Article 4 should link permissible exposure levels (including zero-exposure) to the scale of the cancer risks [see page 30 (bottom) and page 31 (top) of the ESC recommendation]. The ultimate objective must be to prevent all cancers as far as possible. It is however clear that this objective can only be achieved gradually, taking account of priorities and the scope for reduction. Immediate blanket implementation would require the closure of very many industrial-commercial undertakings.

3.5.10. Employers should be required to draw up a programme, normally a written programme, for action against carcinogenic substances, embracing short, medium and long-term measures and the volume of investment required. Workers or their representatives should be involved in drafting the programme. A written programme designed to identify all cancer risks and preventive measures is a *sine qua non* not only for a systematic campaign against these health hazards but also to enable the competent national bodies to fulfil their supervisory role.

3.6. *Article 5 (Information for the competent authorities)*

Article 5 relegates the Member States to a purely passive role in combatting occupational cancer risks, since

employers are merely required to supply the competent authorities with certain information, if requested.

Given the scale of the threat from carcinogenic work materials, the Member States or the competent authorities must play an active role in protecting workers' health. They should ensure that employers and workers are adequately informed as to the risks. The Directive must therefore make it compulsory for employers to supply the competent authorities with information. This is the only way for the Member States to reverse the present situation and enable them to assess the scale of cancer risks in the working environment and, on the basis of such identification, to pursue a tight, effective and assertive national campaign against such risks. This is crucial, not only as regards legislation, but also for the fulfilment of national supervisory duties, the implementation of research projects and the development of on-the-job assistance for both employers and workers' representatives. Such assistance is necessary since in the industrial nations, approximately 75% of the workforce is employed in small and medium-sized undertakings. Unlike larger concerns, small and medium-sized employers do not have industrial safety departments capable of tackling the entire range of problems involved in protecting workers against carcinogens. They should therefore be provided with appropriate advice by the competent bodies.

In addition to the data listed in Article 5, employers should be required to supply the following information to the competent authorities:

- a copy of the firm's programme for registering occupational cancer risks and taking preventive action,
- information on involvement of workers,
- information on industrial processes in which carcinogens are produced, albeit unintentionally as far as manufacturers or users are concerned (*cf.* Annex II).

3.7. Article 6 (*Abnormal exposure*)

3.7.1. In the first line of Article 6, the word 'unforeseeable' should be deleted.

There is no apparent reason why the protective measures provided for in Article 6 should only apply to unforeseeable malfunctions. If a thorough safety analysis is carried out, malfunctions can in most cases be predicted.

3.7.2. Article 6 does not require employers to prevent malfunctions which create abnormal levels of exposure. Employers should however be obliged to carry out safety analyses so as to enable them to prevent or reduce abnormal exposure to a minimum by adopting appropriate protective measures.

3.7.3. Article 6 does not define 'abnormal exposure'. Such a definition is however essential (a) for protecting workers' health and (b) for harmonizing conditions in the Member States whilst maintaining the improvements which have been made (*cf.* Art. 118 a of the EEC Treaty).

We should recommend defining abnormal exposure as exposure in excess of the maximum authorized limit value (which may, in the case of particularly dangerous carcinogens, be zero exposure).

3.7.4. Employers should be required to inform the competent authorities and workers about such malfunctions without delay.

3.7.5. Article 6 should entitle workers (a) to refuse to work in the event of given maximum exposure limits being exceeded, and (b) to lodge complaints with the competent authorities if the employer does not rectify the situation without delay.

3.8. Article 7 (*Maintenance work, etc.*)

3.8.1. Article 7 is intended to provide protection to workers engaged in activities which lead to abnormal levels of exposure but are not covered by Article 6. There is no reason why the workers concerned e.g. those engaged in maintenance, repair and cleaning work, should not enjoy the same health protection as workers affected by malfunctions. It should be borne in mind that this type of the work is frequently carried out by temporary staff or other outside staff.

For this reason, not only Article 6 (b), but also Article 6 (a) and (c) should apply.

3.8.2. The comments made on Articles 3, 4, 5, and 6 also apply here.

3.9. Article 8 (*Access to areas*)

Article 8 should stipulate that, in addition to workers, other persons, such as inspectors working for the competent authorities, should have access to the areas in which the activities defined in Article 3 (1) take place.

3.10. Article 9 (*Protective clothing and equipment*)

3.10.1. The heading should be amended to read: 'Hygiene measures, protective clothing and equipment'.

The qualification in point 1, 'where this is reasonably practicable' is clearly at variance with the need to protect the health of workers as regards: the provision of areas for taking meals, appropriate protective clothing and equipment, separate storage of working/protective clothing and street clothes, appropriate and adequate washing facilities, storage of protective equipment and the checking, repairing and cleaning of such

equipment. (The German version makes no reference to the cleaning of protective equipment and clothing.)

These requirements to be met by employers must be defined as absolute necessities. Exceptions are unacceptable in this area which constitutes the weakest link in the chain of protective measures. Furthermore, all the obligations should be positively drafted i.e. employers should have to provide areas in which workers can eat and drink without being exposed to carcinogens. The wording should stipulate clearly that employers are required to adopt the said measures and that workers are required to adhere to them.

3.11. *(Information and training)*

3.11.1. Employers should be obliged to involve workers in decision-making (*cf.* ESC Opinion of 1985) on protective measures. The heading of Article 10 should accordingly be amended to read as follows: 'Participation, Information and Training of Workers'.

3.11.2. Article 10 (1) gives the misleading impression that workers have a specific responsibility—in addition to employers' responsibility—for the measures to be taken in the cases listed. It should be specified that employers have sole responsibility for application of these measures in the workplace. This does not mean that employers may not delegate certain duties to workers but, in that event they must also delegate the requisite authority.

3.12. *Article 11*

A new paragraph should be added requiring employers to draw up a complete plant list of exposure conditions at individual work places or in individual working areas. This information constitutes the basic requirement for assessing the risk to the health of the workers concerned and for providing the health surveillance stipulated in Article 12.

3.12. *Article 12 (Health surveillance)*

3.13.1. The health surveillance to be carried out by the authorities (paragraph 1) should also apply to persons who were involved in work involving cancer risks but have since left that work (e.g. pensioners). This is necessary, as it is well known that the majority of occupationally induced cancers break out after being dormant for between 10 to 35 years after exposure. This means that most of the people affected will already have ceased to be involved in the dangerous activities

concerned by the time they begin to suffer from the disease.

3.13.2. The second sentence of Article 12 (2) gives the misleading impression that hygiene and individual measures can be implemented directly on the basis of medical check-ups. In view of the delayed action effect of carcinogens, this will be possible only in exceptional circumstances, i.e. when check-ups reveal preliminary signs or symptoms of cancer.

3.14. *Article 13 (Record keeping)*

3.14.1. The records to be kept should include measurements of levels of exposure at work places or areas, together with a description of the conditions of exposure. This information provides the vital basis of assessment for determining the link between cancer and exposure to carcinogens.

3.14.2. The period for which records have to be kept should be extended to 40 years, as cancers may occur even more than 30 years after exposure.

3.15. *Article 14 (National statistics)*

This provision should be broadened to require Member States to keep systematic records of cases of occupational cancer (*cf.* the Economic and Social Committee's Opinion of 1985). This would substantially reduce the percentage of undiagnosed cases of occupational cancer which are not recognized and thus do not figure in the national statistics.

The statistics should also cover notified cases of occupational illnesses (suspected cases).

3.16. *Annex I and Annex II (List of carcinogenic agents, industrial processes)*

Annex I lists only a fraction of the substances classified as carcinogenic on the basis of scientific findings in individual EC Member States and other countries.

The aim must therefore be to complete the list in Annex I as soon as possible.

3.17. *Annex II*

The main purpose of Annex II should be to list the carcinogenic substances or compounds which are not in circulation and which are usually undesired, but unavoidable, by-products of technical processes. The main emphasis should be placed on listing the carcinogenic agents; the technical or industrial processes associated with these agents should serve as illustrations of the type of hazard encountered in the work environment. There is no real point in listing whole branches

of industry as being associated with carcinogens and consequent health risks, as in done in Appendix II.

The aim must therefore be to compile the most comprehensive possible list of individual carcinogenic substances or compounds. Where it is not absolutely clear which substance (or substances) in a compound is the carcinogen, tracer components should be used, such as benzopyrene in respect of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

A clause should be drawn up making it possible to extend the Directive to cover technical processes where there is a risk of cancer but no carcinogenic substance or compound can be identified.

EC-level workers' representative bodies should be given the right to participate in the work on extending Annexes I and II. We would refer here to the discussions on the EC draft Directive on limit values for non-

carcinogenic substances. Responsibility for extending the list of carcinogenic substances in Annex I must not be confined to directorate general (DG) XI, as has previously been the case. DG V should at least be entitled to participate in the work on an equal footing. Steps must also be taken to enable international scientific findings on carcinogenic substances to be assessed as quickly as possible.

3.18. *Annex III [Practical recommendations for the health surveillance of workers, as referred to in Article 12 (7)]*

The information to be made available to the doctor and/or competent authority should cover not only the workers concerned but also the exposure conditions in the firm. Details of exposure conditions would make it considerably easier to monitor workers' health.

Done at Brussels, 2 June 1988.

The Chairman
of the Economic and Social Committee
Alfons MARGOT

APPENDIX 1

to the Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee

The following amendments, having received at least a quarter of the votes cast, were rejected in the course of the discussions:

Introduction

Delete final sentence ('In the case (...) and fertility.').

Reason

In spite of the 'speculation' referred to in this sentence, there is no firm evidence of damaging effect on embryos and fertility unless the actual organs of reproduction are affected by cancer.

Results of voting

For: 31, against: 77, abstentions: 5.

Point 2

Delete and re-word the paragraph as follows:

'The Committee notes that the Commission intends adding to categories 1 and 2 as evidence from its evaluation programme (currently at the rate of one evaluation per week) gives reason for inclusion as a risk of cancer. Category three remains as a group of substances which may give rise 'to possible carcinogenic effects but in which the available information is not adequate for making a satisfactory assessment.'

Reason

Categories 1 and 2 in the Commission proposals concern substances (a) 'known to be carcinogenic to man' and (b) 'which should be regarded as if they are carcinogenic to man'.

These are the only levels which are realistic to cater for within the terms of a Directive dealing with carcinogens in the workplace—animal experiments are removed from this concept.

Results of voting

For: 34, against: 72, abstentions: 8.

Point 3.5.2.

Change last sentence to read:

'Since the measures proposed are however not mandatory they may not encourage achievement of this objective.'

Reason

Self-explanatory.

Results of voting

For: 29, against: 77, abstentions: 12.

Point 3.5.5.

Change the second paragraph as follows, and add the subsequent three indents:

'Article 4 should stipulate the following additional mandatory protective measures:

— The employer shall determine if the carcinogen can be replaced so far as is reasonably practicable

- by a substance which is not hazardous to health,
- if not, then by a substance less hazardous to health,
- if not, then by a less carcinogenic hazard to health.

The employer shall inform the result of the research to the competent authority if required to do so.

— If replacement (substitution) of the carcinogen by a non- or less-hazardous substance is not possible, the employer shall ensure manufacture and use of the carcinogen takes place in a closed system, as far as is reasonably practicable.

— If it is not possible to use a closed system, the employer shall ensure that the exposure of workers is reduced to as low a level as is reasonably practicable, and shall provide appropriate and adequate protective clothing.'

Reason

The actions of the employer toward the health and safety of the workers in his control are not clearly enough defined. It is desirable that both sides of industry know where they stand.

Results of voting

For: 32, against: 74, abstentions: 9.

APPENDIX 2

to the Opinion of the Economic and Social Committee

The following members, present or represented, voted for the Opinion:

Mr/Mrs/Miss: Amato, Arena, Ataide-Ferreira, Beltrami, Beretta, Bernasconi, Bleser, Boddy, Bredima-Savopoulou, Breyiannis, Briganti, Lobo-Brandão R. Cal, Carroll, Cavazzuti, Ceyrac, Christie, Clavel, Collas, Cortois, Curlis, van Dam, Dassis, Delhomenie, De Tavernier, Dos Santos, Drilleaud, Droulin, Dunet, van Eekert, Etty, Eulen, Flum, Forgas, Frandi, Gayetot, Geuenich, Giacomelli, Glesener, Gomez-Martinez, Hammond, Hilken, Houthuys, Hörsken, Jaschick, Jenkins, Kitsios, Laka-Martin, Larsen, Laur, Lojewski, Löw, Luchetti, Maddocks, Mainetti, Margalef-Masia, Martin-Almendro, Martin-Castella, Mourgues, Muhr, Muller, Muñoz-Guardado, Murphy, Nielsen B., Nielsen P., Nierhaus, Nieuwenhuize, Noordwal, Orsi, Perrin-Pelletier, Petropoulos, Polyzos, Proença, Pronk, Proumens, Raftopoulos, Rangoni-Machiavelli, Robinson, Rouzier, Săiu, Schmitz, Schnieders, Schöpges, Silva, Spijkers, Städelin, Tixier, Tukker, Vallejo-Calderon, Vanden Broucke, Velasco-Mancebo, Vercellino, Wick, Yverneau, Zufiaur-Narvaiza.

The following members, present or represented, voted against the Opinion:

Mr/Mrs/Miss: Fresi, Gardner, Lancastre, Moreland, Poeton, Rolão-Gonçalves, Storie-Pugh, Tamlin.

The following members, present or represented, abstained:

Mr/Mrs/Miss: Arets, Aspinall, Boisserée, Dodd, Kenna, Kirchfeld, Kröger, de Normann, Nugeyre, Pearson, Pelletier, Salmon, Schade-Poulsen, Solari, Tiemann.

Opinion on the proposal for a Council Regulation on financial support for Portugal for a specific industrial development programme, PEDIP⁽¹⁾

(88/C 208/14)

On 29 April 1988 the Council decided to consult the Economic and Social Committee, under Article 198 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community, on the abovementioned proposal.

Given that the Council, which was asked to decide on this proposal as soon as possible, asked the Committee to give its Opinion urgently, Mr Cal was instructed, as rapporteur-general, to draw up a draft Opinion for the June 1988 plenary session.

At its 256th plenary session of 1-3 June 1988 (meeting of 3 June 1988) the Economic and Social Committee (unanimously) adopted the following Opinion.

1. Preliminary comments

1.1. When Portugal signed its Act of Accession, the Community recognized that the Portuguese economy faced special problems. A ten-year programme for the development of Portuguese agriculture was drawn up, and it was agreed that a parallel effort would have to be made in the industrial sphere in order to modernize the manufacturing sector and adjust it to the Community and international economies.

1.2. The Portuguese Government submitted a blueprint for a specific industrial development programme for Portugal, PEDIP, to the Commission in February 1986.

In October 1986 the Commission sent the Council a Communication on the PEDIP [doc. COM(86) 552 final], and at the beginning of 1987 a group of experts was sent to Portugal to identify priorities for Community aid for the period from 1988 to 1992, in line with the general approach of the outline framework Directive reforming the structural funds.

⁽¹⁾ OJ No C 120, 7. 5. 1988, p. 9.