



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT  
Directorate General for Research  
General Studies Directorate

RESEARCH AND DOCUMENTATION PAPERS

**THE EUROPEAN YEAR OF THE  
ENVIRONMENT 1987-88**

**EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT  
AN ASSESSMENT**

Series: Environment,  
Public Health and  
Consumer Protection N°

**13**

---

13 - 1988

## Preface

This booklet has been compiled to mark the end of the 1987/88 European Year of the Environment (EYE) and is intended as a supplement to No 10 in this series (Manual of the European Parliament on the Year of the Environment). It contains the background material to the draft report of the European Parliament's Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

To form its own picture of what was achieved during the European Year of the Environment, the committee invited the Steering Committee and the chairmen of the national committees to a round table meeting on 22 March 1988. Part 1 of this booklet contains the most important statements made at this meeting.

On 21 June 1988 the chairmen of the environment committees of the national parliaments of the Member States met the members of the European Parliament's Committee on the Environment to take stock of the EYE from a parliamentary viewpoint and to lay the foundations for forward-looking cooperation among these parliamentary committees. A summary of the statements made at this meeting is to be found in Part 2.

This publication concludes with the resolutions adopted by the European Parliament on the Year of the Environment and by the Council of Ministers to mark the end of European Year of the Environment.

Elfi SCHÖNER  
Director

The following have so far appeared in the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection Series:

- No 6 Resolutions of the European Parliament in the field of environmental protection, public health and consumer protection (1979-1984)
- No 7 Community directives on the environment: their application and the opportunities for supervision by the European Parliament
- No 8 Environment and Agriculture, Summary of a Hearing in Brussels on 16-18 September 1985
- No 9 The policies of the Member States towards combating the drugs problem within the Community
- No 10 1987 - 1988 European Year of the Environment
- No 11 Community policy concerning the management of dangerous waste
- No 12 The health systems of European Community countries

#### Abbreviations

SOC Socialist Group  
PPE Group of the European People's Party  
(Christian-Democratic Group)  
ED European Democratic Group  
COM Communist and Allies Group  
LDR Liberal and Democratic Reformist Group  
RDE Group of the European Democratic Alliance  
ARC Rainbow Group: Federation of the Green-Alternative European Link  
DR Group of the European Right  
NI Non-attached

B Belgium  
D Federal Republic of Germany  
DK Denmark  
F France  
GR Greece  
I Italy  
IRL Ireland  
L Luxembourg  
NL Netherlands  
P Portugal  
E Spain  
UK United Kingdom

The compilation of this publication was the responsibility of Hans-Hermann KRAUS, Principal Administrator in the Department for Social Affairs and Environmental Questions of Directorate-General IV (Research) of the Secretariat of the European Parliament.

16 September 1988

The European Parliament as an institution accepts no responsibility for the contents of this document.

## Contents

### Part 1

	<u>Page</u>
Round table meeting of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, the Steering Committee and the chairmen of the national committees on 22 March 1988	5
1.1 Extract from the welcoming speech by Mrs Weber, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection	7
1.2 Summary of the statements	9
1.3 Extract from the closing statement by Mr F. Roelants du Vivier, rapporteur	23
1.4 List of participants	25
1.5 Evaluation of the questionnaire circulated in preparation for the meeting	27

### Part 2

The committee's meeting with the chairmen of the environment committees of the national parliaments of the Member States of the European Community on 21 June 1988	31
2.1 Welcoming address by Lord Plumb, President of the European Parliament	33
2.2 Summary of the statements	37
2.3 List of participants	49

### Annexes

Annex 1 Resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 18 February 1986 on the Year of the Environment, 1987/88	
Annex 2 Resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 16 September 1988 on the basis of the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection; rapporteur: Mr F. Roelants du Vivier	
Annex 3 Resolution adopted by the Council on 3 May 1988	
Annex 4 Questionnaire circulated in preparation for the meeting of 22 March 1988	



Part 1

Round table meeting of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, the Steering Committee and the chairmen of the national committees on 22 March 1988



1.1 Extract from the welcoming speech by Mrs Weber, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection

Interest today focuses on two aspects:

- Firstly, we should consider how, after the Year of the Environment, certain initiatives and projects are to be assisted financially with Community resources or, as is more likely, by local, regional and national authorities.
- Secondly, we should consider how the initiatives, suggestions, findings and projects that have emerged during the Year of the Environment can continue to have an impact and remain in existence.

I believe it is in all our interests that the European Community's environment policy should continue to benefit from the European Year of the Environment in the future. A wide range of outstanding projects have after all been supported and assisted, as the exhibition organized by the Commission to mark the end of the Year of the Environment has shown. There has been an incredibly strong commitment on the part of all those involved in these projects, as the reports from the Member States prove.

Once again the impression we gained is that the "grand policy" - and by this I mean the decisions taken in the Council of Environment Ministers - is lagging behind the commitment of the general public.

If we want to ensure that the Community's environment policy makes real progress, effective and clear decisions must be taken under the "grand policy". There must be no sitting back, on the grounds that there has been a Year of the Environment, and the many small-scale activities must not be used to justify present and future inaction and indecision.

Our committee's rapporteur, Mr Roelants du Vivier, who incidentally also compiled the questionnaire, will be drawing up a report for Parliament based on our discussions today, and it will, of course, be available to the members of the other committees. In June we shall be organizing a further round of discussions with the chairmen of the environment committees of the national parliaments in the Community, because we feel close co-operation is urgently needed under the Community's environment policy.





## 1.2 Summary of the statements<sup>1</sup>

### Denmark

A wide variety of projects had been undertaken, and valuable experience had been gained particularly from those aimed at schools and young people. Schoolchildren and young people had a wealth of ideas and were highly committed. An above-average proportion of them had participated in the various activities, and they themselves had put together interesting information and work material.

In general, Denmark had relied on local strategy, i.e. on making individual members of the public aware of environmental problems in their immediate vicinity and mobilizing them to take action. However, there had also been activities and initiatives above the local level that had similarly been highly successful. The Blue Flag initiative, for example, had been a great success in the environment and tourism sphere.

### Spain

Like Denmark, Spain set great store by informing and educating young people, especially schoolchildren. An attempt was made to teach them what the environment consisted of and what problems its protection posed. The "Young People and the Environment" had project formed part of this education campaign. It had enabled children from eleven countries in groups of 25 to visit the Donana national park. Besides attending various information meetings, they had been able to observe the complexity of ecosystems at first hand, with the help of specially trained supervisors. The children had spent a total of five days together. They had collected a good deal of information and had also had many opportunities to exchange views.

Besides the "Young People and the Environment" project, many other events had been organized. They included seminars and colloquies arranged in cooperation with France. The radio and press had participated in the EYE and ensured that some information was passed on to the public.

### France

Over 1000 projects had been organized, mostly concentrated in the provinces. By comparison, there had been few activities in the Paris area, partly because, unlike the regional media in the provinces, the mass media in the Paris area had given little or no support to the campaigns. Without the support of the television, it was very difficult to increase public awareness.

---

<sup>1</sup> The names of the participants are listed under 1.4 (page 25).  
Italy's national committee did not send a representative.

The law on nature conservation measures passed on 20 July 1987 could be described as a legislative initiative taken during the EYE. The EYE had been a success not only at national but also at European level. France had been involved in over 150 transfrontier projects, which had enabled contact to be established with other committees.

The award of the blue Europe flag for clean beaches and marinas had been a great success in France.

### Greece

The national committee's main aims had been to inform, increase the awareness of and mobilize the Greek public. A wide range of subjects and problems had been addressed. A mobile exhibition on the state of the forests in Greece had been organized, for example. A volunteer corps had been formed in the Athens area to fight forest fires.

The aluminium recycling project organized by the Association of Aluminium Manufacturers had also been well received.

The radio and press had participated very actively and were particularly strong in their support for the noise abatement campaign.

However, small projects were important as well as large ones. They had enabled many classes that had participated in activities to gain experience. These activities had been a psychologically very important means of increasing public awareness.

### United Kingdom

The United Kingdom gave three examples to illustrate its contribution to the EYE.

For the first time an industrial congress had considered environmental problems. An environment competition had attracted over 500 contestants. A British Trust had been sponsored by industrial associations. Many other projects had been undertaken, organized not only at regional and national level but also with other countries.

### Ireland

Here again, many of the activities and initiatives had been concentrated on schools and young people. These activities had been very well received, as over 50 000 letters had shown.

An outstanding activity had been the Wild Animal Week.

The EYE had also had a favourable impact in agriculture, now that its role in the pollution of the environment was recognized.

The year had also been a success inasmuch as it was aimed at people who were very interested and motivated others. The public had also had direct contact with the European Community, which had helped to improve its profile and image.

### Luxembourg

The most pressing task in Luxembourg had been the introduction of environmental advisers. Advisers has been appointed for households, agriculture, industry and the crafts to organize conferences and educate the public. Particular account was to be taken of consumers' interests. In all, satisfactory results had been achieved in this area.

### Netherlands

A Rhine Conference held in the Netherlands had been attended by over 200 people. It had given rise to a constructive dialogue, in which industry had also been able to state its views.

The most successful projects, however, had been those organized nor officially but by schoolchildren, for example. The EYE had been a success, partly because of the Commission's strong support.

### Portugal

The end of the EYE was not the end of a project: it was only the beginning. Two goals had been set in Portugal. The first had been to educate the public and had been very successful, since the media had given the education campaign strong support. They had helped it to reach even remote parts of the country.

The second goal had been to strengthen the environmental protection policy. This had been so successfully achieved that even the President had pledged his support for the environment. A number of laws concerning noise abatement, the protection of water and waste disposal had also been passed.

Campaigns had also been undertaken by schools, universities and associations. Coordination between the various city fathers and those responsible for the campaigns had been very good. A number of exhibitions and competitions, in which industry had also participated, had proved successful.

The EYE had been a success in Portugal primarily because it and the various activities had been taken seriously.

## Belgium

The Belgian industrial association had devoted a congress to the contribution which enterprises might make to the protection of the environment. This would have been completely impossible in the past and had been one of the most important achievements in Belgium.

Two other positive items could be added:

Firstly, the standing of a number of European bodies had improved considerably in Belgium during the EYE where the protection of the environment was concerned.

Secondly, the Commission's Directorate-General XI had shown itself to be extremely flexible, to a degree that was almost inconceivable when the rest of the European Community's bureaucracy was considered. Many of the Commission's Directorates-General were still not in any way concerned with the EYE. Another major change in the Community's decision-making process was the metamorphosis at the EIB, which now played a significant role in the financing of environmental projects.

## Federal Republic of Germany

Environmental policy in the Federal Republic had hitherto been viewed more from the national angle. To give this important area a European dimension, the slogan for the EYE had been "With Europe - for the environment". All projects assisted financially had therefore been of a transfrontier nature. The funds had gone principally to campaigns run by environmental associations and youth organizations.

A very important programme, undertaken by the German environmental associations, had enabled 80 young foreigners to spend a month in the Federal Republic to gain practical experience of nature conservation. As there had been a similar programme in the United Kingdom, it had been possible to exchange participants between the two programmes. This had fostered the hope that the grassroots organizations could make a joint attempt in the future to strengthen the European environment policy.

In addition to the activities of the environmental associations, mention should be made of the considerable involvement of industry, the crafts and the trade unions. They had engaged in transfrontier activities by holding seminars and publishing information leaflets.

In all, the EYE had been successful. The contacts between European associations had been particularly important, and they could be stepped up in the future.

### European Environmental Bureau (Mr Scoullos)

Although the EYE had not been a failure, expectations had immediately run high when it was first announced. It was to be more than one of the years constantly proclaimed by the United Nations in support of various causes, since the Community was able to enact legislation. But a European environmental protection policy had not been adopted, and this must be regarded as a serious failing.

The European Environmental Bureau had now been working in the field of environmental protection for 14 years. The EYE had helped to bring the environment to the attention of large sections of the population. Successful exhibitions had been held in Belgium, France, the United Kingdom, Greece, Luxembourg and Portugal, and the vast majority of the programmes had had the support of the members of the European Environmental Protection Bureau.

Unfortunately, environmental protection organizations and associations were not yet able to call on the services of such mass media as the radio and television regularly and on a large scale to get their message across. The individual national committees had played a particularly important role during the EYE.

Prince Charles had given his support particularly to the fight against acid rain and the pollution of the North Sea. In Belgium and France a very great effort had been made to increase public awareness of environmental issues and to encourage action. It was to be hoped that the people of other countries could be similarly mobilized, especially where industry and the protection of the environment against industrial pollution were concerned. To accelerate the progress of certain projects, a number of task forces had been set up.

The work of the Council of Environment Ministers during the EYE had been very disappointing in that none of the urgently needed legislation had been passed.

The European Environmental Bureau felt that, even though the EYE had come to an end, projects should continue. To finance them, the creation of special environment funds might be considered.

### European Trade Union Confederation (Mr Rath)

The European Trade Union Confederation had to gauge the success of the EYE both by actual progress towards a European policy on the environment and by the success achieved in increasing workers' awareness of transfrontier environmental problems in Europe.

In the first respect, the EYE had largely been a failure. In the case of one of the focal themes, "Work and the Environment", even a very modest pilot programme proposed by the Commission had been delayed, delayed again and eventually deprived of any meaning.

In the trade unions' own activities the main themes had been work and the environment, industrial safety and environmental protection, and transfrontier problems. The more successfully the awareness of trade unionists was increased - and for the most part European, transfrontier activities were undertaken to this end - the clearer it became that there was a growing discrepancy between what needed to be done to protect the environment and the instruments available for this purpose, especially in the area where the workers might bring practical influence to bear on the implementation of environmental protection policy, i.e. at plant level. At this level in particular workers and their representatives still had very little influence. With the help of experts workers' representatives were therefore to establish what environmental policy was pursued by the employers.

A survey of the unions of chemical workers and of the ETUC's own members had revealed that most representatives still had no idea which plants were exposed to what dangers, e.g. were or might be affected by the 'Seveso directive'. This was a major shortcoming. Although there was now a great deal of information material on the European directives and national environmental legislation, there was very little information on how, in practical terms, regulations on environmental protection should be observed at sectoral and plant level. This was a serious deficiency, and steps needed to be taken to improve the information disseminated at the very levels at which the public could influence the implementation of environment policy.

#### Union of Industries of the European Community - UNICE (Mr Kroon)

Given the wide variety of industries in Europe, it was virtually impossible to arrive at a uniform position that was endorsed by, say, the paper, cement and paint industries.

In general, it could be said that the greater the awareness of environmental issues, the greater the willingness to react. Trade associations, like oil and chemicals, two important sectors of industry, were trying to reduce pollution and opening their plants to the public to show what was being done.

Even before the EYE industry had realized that it was the main source of pollution, and even without the EYE it would have done some of the things that were now being ascribed to the EYE. Otherwise, industry welcomed the fact that agriculture had also been drawn into the debate in the past year, because industry had long been regarded as the only source of pollution, whereas it was now clear that agriculture also polluted the environment.

Industry welcomed the contacts that now occurred at local, regional, national and Community level between the various bodies and agencies, UNICE having pointed out on several occasions that early consultations on draft legislation were essential.

Industry would like to be a partner, so that progress might be made in the protection of the environment in the future.

### Economic and Social Committee (Mr K. Boisseree)

The Economic and Social Committee had made the European Year of the Environment the focus of those of its advisory and other activities which concerned environment policy. This had seemed all the more reasonable as it had had to consider the Community's fourth action programme during the year. Particular attention had been paid to cooperation among the interest groups in the protection of the environment.

Mention must be made in this context of two projects which the committee had tackled during the EYE and which were expected to continue. It had considered the serious problems in old, densely populated industrial areas, many of which faced major and often transfrontier environmental problems. This was true, for example, of the old industrial area encompassing the Saarland, Lorraine, Luxembourg, the Belgian Province of Luxembourg and Rhineland Palatinate. The Economic and Social Committee had organized two interprofessional conferences to discuss this region. The various occupational groups, the regional governments, the environmental associations and the general public had been invited to consider whether some form of cooperation at interregional, pre-parliamentary level should be institutionalized in this area. This project had been completed inasmuch as an interregional environmental council, which would manage without any additional bureaucracy or organization, had recently been set up in Metz. Advantage had been taken of the intergovernmental institutions already in the city.

The aim of this interregional environmental council was, firstly, to bring about cross-border environmental awareness and education in this region. Young people in particular had been involved in the project. Initiatives must also be developed with a view to establishing joint transfrontier nature conservation areas. Although there was already a large nature reserve in this region, others should follow.

The second project concerned comparable problem regions in southern Europe and especially the northern Spanish region with Bilbao as its centre. This was an old industrial region with a wide variety of political and environmental problems. The aim here had been to involve the various professional and interprofessional organizations in creating a model for the promotion of environmental awareness. The main problem, however, was to strike a balance between environment policy and employment policy. This aspect had been considered with the local environmental associations and Members of the European Parliament from this region and had led to a provisional conclusion being drawn. Much the same had been done in the Naples area. Here the issue had been the conflict between industry, the environment and tourism, a situation which appeared hopeless in some respects, but in which cooperation among the various groupings might help. Here again, the committee's work had been supported by Members of the European Parliament.

As a follow-up measure, the Community should concern itself with education and information on environmental protection more than it had done in the past. The cooperation among professional groupings and interest groups, especially within the framework of the Community's environmental policy models, should also be continued and expanded.



### European Investment Bank - EIB (Mr Helmut Bergmann)

The EIB's task was not only to help economically weaker regions with their economic development but also to encourage European integration, not only through the establishment of Community-wide industrial enterprises but also through the protection of the environment.

The EIB did not subsidize projects, but financed up to 50% of the costs with low-interest loans. The possibility of financing more than 50% of projects where industry's environmental protection efforts exceeded what was recommended might be considered in the future.

The EIB encouraged environmental protection at two levels: firstly, preventively, i.e. the environmental impact of any project was a decisive criterion in the examination procedure; both the EIB's staff of engineers and its Board of Directors, Management Committee and Board of Governors were extremely conscious of this aspect.

Secondly, the EIB financed projects designed to improve the environment. In 1984 the Board of Governors had designated environmental protection as a European task. Since that time loans for projects devoted entirely to the protection of the environment had almost doubled each year: 157m ECU in 1984, 360m ECU in 1985, 700m ECU in 1986 and 1 600m ECU in 1987, making a grand total from 1984 to 1987 of 2 817m ECU.

The Bank had financed such diverse projects as urban and industrial effluent purification in the Po, Arno and Tiber regions of Italy, the improvement of water supplies in southern Europe, the prevention of air pollution, especially by such flue gases as NO and SO<sub>2</sub>, afforestation and erosion control in many areas, fire prevention by satellite, the cleaning of super-tankers in European ports, and the recycling and incineration of waste. Global loans had also been granted to banks for the sole purpose of financing energy conservation projects.

Clearly, many of these projects were being implemented under the international agreements on the prevention of the pollution of the Mediterranean, North and Baltic Seas. During the EYE the EIB and the World Bank had jointly commissioned a very extensive and detailed study of the pollution of the Mediterranean, so that the two banks might know on what they should concentrate their investments.

In all the projects the Bank had cooperated with the Commission, and especially its Directorate-General for the Environment, Consumer Protection and Nuclear Safety.

### Commission of the European Communities, Directorate-General XI (Mr Brinkhorst)

The Council of Ministers had adopted a resolution in which it welcomed the activities undertaken during the EYE and expressed the view that national and Community activities must continue.

The Single European Act had undoubtedly led to progress in the integration of the environment policy into the other policies referred to in the Treaty. The greater right to a say granted to the European Parliament by the Single Parliament was also to be welcomed, of course. The fourth action programme would be a test for the European Parliament's work in the next few years.

The integration of the environment policy into the Community's other policies, e.g. the agricultural and regional policies, would undoubtedly pose problems, especially with regard to the Community's southern Member States. They must realize that the economic development which the northern countries had undergone in the 1960s and 1970s had inevitably caused environmental problems. Changing this was one of the tasks for the European environment policy.

During the EYE the Commission had had numerous contacts with environmental groups in the Community. However, activities had not been confined to the Community, but had included Switzerland's national committee, for instance. There had also been contacts with developing countries, as at the conference on environmental issues held in Dakar.

Outstanding achievements had been the Rhine Conference organized by the Dutch national committee, NETT (Network for Environmental Technology Transfer) and the appointment of environmental counsellors.

Various activities should continue even though the EYE had come to an end. In the future, the completion of the internal market and the closing of the income gap between North and South should not be regarded as the central issue, with the environment policy seen as no more than a support measure.

**Mrs Jackson (MEP, ED/UK, Member of the British national committee)**

Mrs Jackson felt that the preparatory phase for the Year of the Environment had not been long enough. As a result, the national committees had not had enough time to organize themselves.

It had not been possible during the EYE to transfer responsibility for environmental issues to the European from the national level. The Commission had not provided the British national committee with enough information material and support. It should draw up a clear statement enumerating the activities that would be continued. She was thinking in particular of the Blue Flag and the clean beaches.

The need for attention to be drawn to environmental problems even in the classroom was something that had been learned during the EYE. In Britain the authorities were therefore in the process of drawing up a new school curriculum in which environmental issues would be a permanent fixture.

**Mr Ulburghs (MEP, NI/B)**

Mr Ulburghs was afraid that the Commission's plans were impracticable.

The growth of leisure activities was bound to lead to the destruction of the environment. The example of Belgian Limburg spoke for itself: coal mines had been closed there, and there were now gigantic leisure projects, the argument being that they created jobs. But the dangers inherent in a policy of this kind were not appreciated. All these activities should be properly channelled and curbed.

He supported the environmental organizations, whose members were often seen as trouble-makers at spectacular events.

**Mrs Bloch von Blottnitz (MEP, ARC/D)**

The Dutch Environment Minister had established for a five-year period a foundation to which DM 50 000 p.a. would be made available for transfrontier environmental protection projects with Eastern Europe. This initiative could be imitated at Community level, with a foundation established for individual projects and financed by the European Parliament and/or the Commission.

Funds should be made available for the continuation of projects which the environmental associations considered worth supporting.

The state of the environment today was clear proof that it was no longer necessary to take stock: what was needed now was action.

**Mrs Schleicher (MEP, PPE/D)**

Mrs Schleicher felt that, by and large, the EYE had been successful. But she wondered how far the countries that had only recently joined the Community (Greece, Spain and Portugal) could benefit from the experience they had gained during the EYE and continue their work.

In future the Commission must make the data it received from the individual Member States available to the general public.

**Mr Bombard (MEP, SOC/F)**

Private enterprises had contributed FF 20m to the EYE, while the French Government had provided FF 10m, FF 5m of which had, however, come from the Community. Another FF 3m had been spent on the Environment Ministry's promotional activities, although it had not benefited environmental measures directly.

Mr Bombard complained that, although an important Act had been passed on 7 July 1987, during the voting on the Bill the Environment Minister had rejected an amendment which had had unanimous support and called for aids to forest areas destroyed by fire. The Minister had said there was already a forest code that provided sufficient protection. This was certainly true of state-owned forests, but they accounted for only 18% of the total. The other 82% was in the hands of private owners, who would not now receive any aids if their forests were destroyed by fire.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen (MEP, PPE/NL)**

Mrs Maij-Weggen felt that the public were more aware of the environment than the Council. This was evident from the disappointing results of the meetings of the Council of Environment Ministers. It was a questionable undertaking to refer back each time to a group which in any case knew what was important. It was also dangerous to increase awareness without following up with practical activities. There was a danger that Europe's whole environment policy would lose credibility as a result.

As regards the possibility of financing environment-friendly projects, she referred to an earlier proposal for the establishment of a European environment fund. There would still be time later to consider how a fund of this kind could be integrated into another, existing Community fund.

In recent years, she felt, the environmental organizations had achieved more than the national governments. They therefore deserved a special mention.

**Mrs Lentz-Cornette (MEP, PPE/L)**

Mrs Lentz-Cornette regretted that the Commission had not yet submitted to the European Parliament an accurate account of expenditure on the Year of the Environment.

Referring to what the EIB representative had said, she welcomed the fact that projects would be the subject of environmental impact studies, but the question was how much would have to be spent on these studies before projects were actually implemented. Although the environmental regulations were accompanied by very detailed conditions, with which she agreed in principle, it had to be asked if the EIB was not going too far in this respect.

**Mr Collins (MEP, S/UK)**

Mr Collins complained about the lack of cooperation between local or regional authorities and Members of the European Parliament. The national bodies had not sought contact with the MEPs. He himself had then approached the committee in Scotland and learned that because of a shortage

of funds very few projects had been launched. The success that had nevertheless been achieved here and there could probably be attributed to the good work done by the local communities themselves, although they had had little support.

In all, Mr Collins felt that the success of the EYE had been patchy, and he was sceptical about the future.

**Mrs Banotti (MEP, PPE/IRL)**

The public must exert enough pressure to make the politicians at last realize that they must take the environment seriously. In her own country awareness of the environment was less pronounced than anywhere else in the Community, which did not mean that people were indifferent to the state of the environment. It simply meant that they accepted it as it was. It was only when one disaster followed another that the public realized things could not go on as they were.

A positive feature was that the people had played an active part in the activities of the environmental organizations. They had also realized that as citizens they could submit complaints to the Commission and the Committee on Petitions. It would be interesting to know how much advantage was taken of these opportunities for making complaints or submitting petitions and what increase there had been in the number of complaints from non-governmental organizations.

In Ireland there had been an interesting project during the EYE. It had been called 'coastal observation' and had involved a network of schools and individuals throughout the country recording the main causes of pollution over a period of ten days. The Commission had been so impressed by this project that it had recommended other Member States to do the same. It would be interesting to hear on this occasion what had become of this venture.

**Mrs Diez de Rivera Icaza (MEP, NI/E)**

Mrs Diez particularly stressed the role of the non-governmental organizations (NGOs), since they had made a crucial contribution to increasing public awareness.

The questionnaires sent out in preparation for the meeting had not been fully answered by some respondents. The NGOs' information campaign should be supported by the Commission in the future.

Mr Vittinghoff (MEP, SOC/D)

The campaigns conducted by the Commission, the national committees and the environmental organizations to increase awareness had had an impact on the public. On the other hand, it had proved impossible to increase the awareness of the various governments.

The project known as 'Job creation through environmental measures' had still not been approved by the Council of Ministers, although it could have created jobs. The role played by industry should be taken into account, but he felt that too much attention was paid to it.

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection received too little information. It was extremely important to know, for example, what opinions the consultative committees set up under various directives had delivered on Commission proposals, so that they might be used by rapporteurs in their draft reports.

Mrs Belo (MEP, SOC/P)

The public in Portugal were only gradually becoming conscious of the link between industrialization and environmental protection. It was extremely important for the public to be provided with educational material and detailed information on the effect environmental problems had. The initiatives so far taken were only a beginning, and they must be stepped up in the future.

The Blue Flag had been the most successful campaign in Portugal during the EYE.

Belgium

The representative of the Belgian national committee mentioned a foundation with an initial capital of Bfrs 350m. It was to continue measures launched during the Year of the Environment and to finance new activities.

Commission of the European Communities, Directorate-General XI  
(Mr Brinkhorst)

The Commission commented on the previous statements as follows:  
The exchange of information between DG XI's task force and the national committees had been commendable, not least because the task force had had numerous meetings. Many projects and initiatives would continue in the future, and it was hoped that they would have the active support of the European Parliament. Campaigns to increase awareness, however, would not be continued, since they had been confined to the EYE.

The Member States must be urged to make information on the environment more accessible to the public. The only answer to the criticism that the politicians in power had not taken the decisions expected of them was to elect different politicians. The Commission at least could not do anything about it. It was a good idea to incorporate environmental protection in the structural funds, especially as the resources earmarked for these funds until 1992 had been doubled. DG XI still had 2.8m ECU available for 1988. Administration had accounted for 6.7% of expenditure, which was quite acceptable for an action of this scale.

### 1.3 Statement by Mr Roelants du Vivier, rapporteur

The European Parliament can rightly congratulate itself today on the presence here of all those who made the European Year of the Environment possible. It is really fortunate that we are all able to meet in the democratically elected European parliamentary institution to discuss and, above all, to evaluate the last twelve months of work and action.

The first to state their views here were the national committees. They placed particular emphasis on reasons for feeling satisfied, which I shall recall. But let there be no mistake: what is not said counts just as much as what is said. I shall revert to certain aspects on which an eloquent silence was maintained.

What has been said is that, first of all, the response from the general public, the non-governmental organizations and particularly young people to the European Year of the Environment was good, indeed exceptional. Dare we say that is what we expected? It must also be mentioned that the welcome was enthusiastic. Particular reference was made on several occasions to the exchanges of young people: could this be a portent of something like Erasmus exchanges with the emphasis on the environment? Such an initiative would undoubtedly be fortunate at a time when, in relative terms, exchanges of students are less numerous in the Community than they were in Erasmus's day. Industry's participation in the efforts made during the European Year of the Environment was also emphasized. This is a new and important element, which should be given its due.

But then there is everything that was not said.

The favourable impact the European Year of the Environment had on decision-makers and, strangely, on Ministers (and not just Environment Ministers by any means) was mentioned only by Portugal, which seems to be the notable exception in this respect. Otherwise, some disappointment, even outright disappointment, could be deduced from the courteous silence. Something else that was not mentioned was the virtual failure of the European Year of the Environment to have any impact on the application of Community law in the various Member States, either in terms of its conversion into national legislation or as regards its application in practice. Here too - as we know from our informal contacts with the various organizations - there was disappointment.

The non-governmental organizations have given us some additional information. The European Environmental Bureau, for example, has told us of its disappointment with the action taken by the Council of Ministers. The account the chairman of our committee has just given us of the Council's last meeting certainly does not contradict this point of view. The European Environmental Bureau also emphasized the financial hopes. It knows that in this respect Parliament has always supported the role played by the NGOs.



The Economic and Social Committee referred to the importance for the environment policy of transparency and information. We can only agree with the ESC in this respect, and I hardly need say that this concern has long been shared by our committee.

The Union of Industries of the European Community, apart from expressing its satisfaction that it was now recognized that agriculture also causes pollution - which perhaps leads us to regret the absence of the farmers' associations, because they might have thrown the ball back into UNICE's court - gave us something to think about: the more the public is on the alert, the more quickly industry adapts. But it is to be hoped that a message of this kind does not lead people to believe that industry is sensitive only to immediate reactions. Let us hope that, where the environment is concerned, it takes a long-term view.

As for the European institutions, mention should be made not only of the list of activities undertaken by the Economic and Social Committee but also of the importance of the European Investment Bank. Do we not dream when we hear that between 2 000 and 3 000m of its liquid assets available in the form of loans benefit the environment each year, when the appropriations for the environment account for 0.09% of the Community's budget? We will, of course, be told: 'You are forgetting the Community funds.' Certainly, there is the EAGGF, the ERDF, the ESF and so on, but the integration of the environment into these financial instruments is a long way off. Be that as it may, to return to the European Investment Bank, let us remember that it does not, of course, grant loans unless it is asked. And there are countries that ask for nothing. Why? This is a question that could be put to the EIB or to the authorities in those countries.

The Commission of the European Communities said straight away that the EYE should be regarded as a point of departure for subsequent activities, thus agreeing with a view generally expressed. It also stressed that a dialogue in which numerous parties engage was essential in an exercise like the establishment of a genuine, integrated environment policy.

Yes, the European Year of the Environment has not been a futile exercise. It is more widely accepted that the environment policy knows no frontiers - a feeling that has become increasingly widespread among the public, as the Eurobarometer shows, although there is still some national resistance to be overcome. The European Year will also act as a stimulus through the ideas and projects that have been launched. The NETT programme, the '1 000 communes pour l'Europe' project and the Blue Flag awarded to the cleanest European beaches will have an impact and repercussions in the future.

But above all, all of you here have referred to an essential element, and one that the European Parliament has emphasized on several occasions: the need for the environment to be integrated into the Community's various policies. With the single market of 1992 soon to be with us, it is all the more essential as it arises here from a general consensus.

1.4 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE ROUND TABLE MEETING HELD  
IN BRUSSELS ON 22 MARCH 1988 TO MARK THE END OF THE  
EUROPEAN YEAR OF THE ENVIRONMENT, 1987-1988

---

- Belgium  
- Mr Hubert DAVID State Secretary for the Environment,  
Brussels
- Denmark  
- Mr Jesper JARMBEK Head of Division, Ministry of the  
Environment, Copenhagen
- France  
- Mr Alain BOMBARD Representative of the National Committee  
for the European Year of the Environment,  
Neuilly sur Seine
- Germany  
- Mr Meiners Association for Environmental Questions,  
Bonn
- Greece  
- Mr G. SCHIADARESSIS Hellenic Committee for the Protection of  
the Environment, Athens
- Ireland  
- Dr Yvonne SCANNELL Environmental Awareness Bureau, Dublin
- Italy  
-
- Luxembourg  
- Mr René SCHMITT Ministry of the Environment, Luxembourg
- Netherlands  
- Mr Schelto PATIJN Secretariat of the National Committee for  
the European Year of the Environment, The  
Hague
- Portugal  
- Dr Tomas ESPIRITO-SANTO Director-General for the Quality of the  
Environment, Lisbon
- Spain  
- Mr Angel BARBERO MARTIN National Committee
- United Kingdom  
- Professor Ron EDWARDS Secretariat of the National Committee for  
the European Year of the Environment,  
London

.../...

- Mr SCULLOS                                   European Environmental Bureau, Brussels
- Mr RATH                                       European Trade Union Confederation,  
Brussels
- Mr G. KROON                                 UNICE, Brussels
- Dr Klaus BOISSEREE                       Member of the Economic and Social  
Committee, Düsseldorf
- Mr Helmut BERGMANN                      European Investment Bank, Luxembourg
- Mr BRINKHORST                            Commission of the European Communities,  
DG XI, Brussels

## 1.5 Evaluation of the questionnaire circulated in preparation for the meeting of 22 March 1988<sup>1</sup>

### Most important projects (1.1)<sup>2</sup>

Of the projects implemented in the Community, particular emphasis needs to be placed on those dedicated to information and education on the environment. If there is to be an efficient environment policy, the public and employers must first be taught to be conscious of the environment, since a great deal of money will otherwise be wasted on combating the consequences instead of being spent on establishing the causes. If influence is brought to bear on the polluters, irreparable damage to the environment can be avoided later. Moreover, the costs will be lower in the long term, since the consequences of pollution will be lessened.

As the right attitude towards the environment will not make an impact for some considerable time, youth projects are also particularly important. On the one hand, awareness of the environment becomes far more firmly implanted in the minds of young people; on the other hand, there is a multiplier effect in that young people pass on the right attitude they have towards the environment to subsequent generations.

### Specific legislative measures taken during the Year of the Environment (1.2)

The impact of the EYE as regards the introduction of legislation and regulations designed to protect the environment differed widely in the various Member States. This is due both to the different levels of development and the lack of understanding of the need for legislation to prevent pollution and to cumbersome bureaucracies incapable of reacting quickly. An added factor is that effective solutions to environmental problems also have major financial implications. Adequate government funds are therefore essential for the implementation of environmental projects, but enterprises also need sufficient capital to be in any kind of position to respect guide values. The European Investment Bank has an increasingly important role to play in this context.

---

1 The following national committees and organizations answered the questionnaire: Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, Portugal, Spain and the United Kingdom, the Economic and Social Committee, the European Trade Union Confederation and UNICE.

2 The figures refer to the questions in the questionnaire (see Annex 4). Reference is made only to those questions which prompted more detailed answers. It would be impossible to list all the national projects in this pamphlet. More detailed information can be obtained from: Directorate-General XI of the Commission - Task Force for the Year of the Environment - 200, rue de la Loi, B-1049 Brussels.

### Joint projects with neighbouring countries (1.3)

All the Member States implemented projects jointly with neighbouring countries, albeit to varying degrees. This was, however, partly due to natural conditions, e.g. the geographical positions of Britain and Greece. Many of the joint projects were of limited importance. Most consisted of youth exchange programmes and school trips to neighbouring countries. The EYE did, however, mark the beginnings of international cooperation in this respect. There is a general desire to see this cooperation continue in the future, not least because it is appreciated that environmental problems and damage do not stop at national frontiers.

### National statistics and databases on environmental subjects (1.4)

How advanced statistics and databases on environmental subjects are in the various Member States chiefly depends on the general level of development of the data and computer network and the size of the Member State. Consequently, databases and statistics differ quantitatively and qualitatively. Countries like the Federal Republic of Germany and Luxembourg have fewer problems with the structuring and collection of data and information than other Member States. As a rule, however, there are local and regional databases held by regional authorities, institutes, local and provincial authorities and parastatal institutions.

### Reaction from the public (3.1)

The reaction from the public to the special activities during the EYE was roughly the same in all the Member States. It was positive in all cases.

Transfrontier activities justified the Community approach, since it enabled local and national bodies to coordinate their efforts where they had environmental problems in common. A European attitude was evident in this context, and this is important for Europe, particularly in view of 1992.

On the other hand, exchanges of news and information on the national campaigns were rare at European level.

### Measures to increase awareness (3.2)

The answers concerning measures taken by the mass media to increase awareness were all roughly the same. As a rule, a distinction must be made between regional/local and national reporting.

National news programmes and the press reported on EYE activities only on special occasions. Producing television programmes on specific topics is difficult because they must be well structured and of a high quality. This often means a very long preparatory period. The regional and local media,

on the other hand, were far more successful. They broadcast and published numerous interviews and reports. A valuable contribution was also made by the exhibitions, awards, competitions, etc., which were well received by the public. The only problems here concerned organization, as in Belgium, where poor organization meant that the campaign involving the blue beach flag had to be abandoned.

#### Financial aspects (4.1)

Relative to their size, the Member States all had approximately the same financial resources available. Some Member States called for an increase in funds. The participation of private sponsors in the funding of projects was welcomed. It was felt that running expenses should have been better regulated. What is important in this connection is that any additional fund-raising does not lead to conflict with other, established voluntary organizations.

#### Follow-up to the EYE (5)

Opinions differ on whether an organizational structure should be maintained at national and European level after the EYE. Some Member States, e.g. Belgium, France, the United Kingdom and Spain, do not consider it necessary for the organization to be maintained at European level in view of the many initiatives and organizations that will continue after the EYE. Other Member States, Greece, Ireland and Luxembourg, for example, feel organizational structures should be retained at European level to improve and facilitate the coordination of activities at national and international level.

All the Member States agree that the projects which have already been launched should continue after the EYE. However, the environment policy should form a more integral part of the European Community's decision-making processes, and the European Parliament should take particular advantage of its right of initiative and its means of exercising control.



Part 2

The committee's meeting with the chairmen of the  
environment committees of the national parliaments of  
the Member States of the European Community on 21 June 1988





2.1 Welcoming address by Lord Plumb,  
President of the European Parliament

---

Madame Chairman, firstly, thank you very much for your welcome. I am delighted to be here today with the chairmen and representatives of the national parliaments. It is very appropriate that we discuss the important issues of environmental affairs.

Madame Chairman, business is one thing but making progress can be another. I believe that in the European Community we mean business and we make progress. We will only continue to make that progress if we work together with the national parliaments, so that we each understand each other's point of view. This is particularly true when we consider the elements of the very dynamic development of the European Community in economic and political terms.

I was in Luxembourg yesterday for a conciliation procedure with the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Council. We reached an agreement there which allows us to take a further step forward, on budget control and on the operation of the Single Act. This was the Inter-Institutional Agreement, which was agreed by the Commission, the Council and the Parliament. This is a real success story, which follows on from other successes of the past few months. Many referred to the Structural Funds, to the importance of spending money efficiently, particularly in the area of developing our rural areas and in the environmental sector.

I believe that one of the most important committees in this House, or, indeed, in any national parliament in the future, is going to be the Environment Committee. Environmental matters are going to be of over-riding importance in the years to come. This is evident just from reading the daily newspapers, which show the great concern there is over the way society is looking after itself.

- We in the Parliament have often acted as a catalyst on environmental issues, for example, the Parliamentary initiative on Canadian seals is one of many which springs to mind.

I see Stanley JOHNSON there on my right and I shudder because I remember the 3,000 letters that I had on that particular issue. Whatever my commercial instincts told me at that particular time, after receiving 3,000 letters, there was no way that I could vote for the continuation of that particular trade with Europe.

That is, of course, the power of the lobby and that was the effect that it had. We in the European Parliament need the support of national parliaments in our common role as initiator of environmental legislation and in exerting pressure, where necessary, on our respective government.

I believe even greater coordination between parliaments, such as today's meeting, is highly desirable. I commend you, Madame Chairman for taking this initiative, and I hope more committees will be cooperating in this way.

Furthermore, we know that good dialogue on environmental issues is important for the future in the European Community and indeed worldwide. The week before last, I spent three days in the United States and I think we must have talked more about environmental issues than any other subject.

The Single European Act, as you know, has placed environmental policy within the Treaty itself. Now Madame Chairman, if you will forgive me, I am going to make a suggestion for your consideration. I wonder if you might consider the launching of a new joint initiative in the field of environment and public health policy. As we approach the summer holiday period, given that standards have already been set in this area but are not always applied, I feel that it is high time that we set up a Community fund for cleaning up Europe's beaches.

I might even suggest that some of the football hooligans could be employed in cleaning up those beaches. I could suggest that some of them be cleaned up along with some of the dirt and the filth on the beaches but it might be better if they were employed in helping to clean up those beaches, but I would certainly be grateful if you could consider this idea and let me know your views.

It is a simple one: it does not require a vast amount of capital, but it is something that is real, it is something that is of importance and concern to our citizens. It would let them see that Europe and the European Parliament, in taking that initiative, are actively involved in doing something in the public interest.

Madame Chairman, I give you and your Committee my best wishes for a very successful joint meeting between friends and colleagues from the national and European Parliaments.



## 2.2 Summary of the statements<sup>1</sup>

### Mrs Weber, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (MEP, SOC/D)

Mrs Weber said that the significance of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection was apparent from the fact that it was responsible for a large proportion of the work in Parliament that was governed by the new procedure provided for in the Single Act. As much of European legislation concerned environmental issues, consumer protection and health, almost half of all reports were dealt with by the cooperation procedure.

Environmental protection was becoming so important an area that joint action was urgently needed. This was also increasingly demanded by the public. The public must be told what the European Community was doing to protect the environment. The only reports in the press concerned aspects of national interest.

How important a decision was, who had taken it and how much democratic control there had been was not mentioned.

A particularly important factor in this context was the lack of democracy in the Community's legislative procedure. Parliamentary control was needed and effective public participation was essential, especially where environmental issues were concerned. This, however, presupposed democratic organization of the procedures.

A resolution recently adopted by the European Parliament on the lack of democracy in the Community had criticized the progressive transfer of power from Parliament to bureaucracies and governments. This was no longer in keeping with the democratic foundations the Member States had struggled to lay.

### François Roelants du Vivier, rapporteur (MEP, ARC/B)

Mr Roelants du Vivier began by outlining the first motion for a resolution on the conclusions drawn with respect to the EYE.

Parliament had had to be on the alert during the EYE to ensure that the promises announced were actually kept. The Commission had made great efforts to disseminate information, and the Council had also made many promises. But the EYE had not been marked by a great deal of progress in the introduction and development of Community legislation on the environment. Efforts to increase the awareness of the public, trade unions and industry

---

<sup>1</sup> A list of all the participants can be found on page 49 (section 2.3). The national parliaments of the following Member States were not represented: the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Ireland and the Netherlands.

had been very successful. The rapporteur felt, however, that this could only be seen as a start within a genuinely integrated environment policy, which was enshrined in the fourth action programme.

The Council of Ministers had sadly made no progress during the EYE on such major environmental problems as air and water pollution and waste. The education of the public, who were for the most part already highly vigilant when it came to environmental problems, must be accompanied by efforts to increase the awareness of the politicians in the Council of Ministers, since they alone could ensure that significant progress was made.

The role played by the national authorities in preparing documents for decisions by the Council and in enforcing Community law and converting it into national legislation must also be emphasized. It had not yet been incorporated in national legislation everywhere, and its enforcement in the Community was therefore far from perfect.

The Commission needed in particular to pursue a policy of disseminating information on and increasing awareness of environmental issues. It was of the utmost importance in this respect for more attention to be paid to environmental problems in school and vocational training curricula. The Commission was also asked to continue the "clean beaches" campaign and the development of the network for "clean technologies".

More work also needed to be done on integrating environmental aspects into other European policies, especially the agricultural and employment policies.

To complement the existing national foundations, the Commission should establish a European foundation for the environment or a secretariat to coordinate the activities of the various national foundations. It should also support the efforts of the regional and local authorities financially to ensure that projects continued.

As regards relations between the European Parliament and the national parliaments, there should be closer cooperation particularly on environmental issues so that the introduction of a genuine environment policy would also depend on and be supported by national, regional and local authorities.

**Mrs Jackson (MEP, ED/UK)**

Speaking as a member of the national EYE committee, Mrs Jackson said that one problem had been that no instructions had been received from the Commission on the form the EYE should take. Where the environment was concerned, the British Parliament was very European in its outlook, there being a special standing committee in the House of Commons to consider Community directives.

As regards the EYE, Mrs Jackson referred to paragraph 12 of the motion for a resolution and proposed that it should be established what financial resources were available in the Community budget to assist environmental projects. She felt a better endowed Community environment fund should be set up to finance environmental improvements.

Mr Avgerinos (MEP, SOC/GR)

Mr Avgerinos referred to the importance of measures to increase awareness of the environment and reported that a new, aggressive phase of environmental protection had just begun in Greece, with the public no longer willing to put up with the increasingly serious problems and the delays in action to solve them.

Mr Avgerinos also proposed that it should be considered what contribution the environment policy could make to solving the other two major problems, i.e. balanced development of the regions and unemployment.

Mrs Llorca Vilaplana (MEP, ED/E)

Given the different ways in which environmental problems were treated by the Member States (some adopted a very general approach, others had special ministries and took administrative action), there was a need for a supra-national level which could develop initiatives not only at European but also at national level. Referring to the President's proposal concerning the cleaning of beaches, Mrs Llorca felt that the location of all beaches in Europe should be accurately recorded.

Mr Jones (House of Commons, UK)

Mr Jones said that, as a result of initiatives in the media and Parliament, the public was very interested in environmental issues, and the EYE had made a great contribution in this respect.

The British parliamentary committee was not only responsible for environmental issues, but also considered public tasks of the local authorities. Although this meant that not much time was available for environmental questions, the acid rain problem had been discussed at length in recent years, and such international subjects as nuclear waste, water pollution, the disposal of normal waste and CFCs had also been considered.

Addressing the rapporteur, Mr Jones stressed the important role of education, on which the British committee had placed the emphasis. He did not think it right for schools to have a new subject known as "environment" and advocated the treatment of environmental aspects in the context of traditional subjects.

As regards the "clean beaches" campaign, Mr Jones referred to the difficulty of laying down appropriate criteria, since the number of people using beaches and the time they spent on them differed. The Committee on the Environment should play an active role in the establishment of criteria.

Mr Jones concluded by saying that sufficient attention should be paid to environmental aspects after the EYE.



Mr Barthel (Chambre des Députés, L)

Mr Barthel felt that the EYE had been successful on the whole, owing in particular to the efforts to make the public, industry and the trade unions more aware of the problems. One of the focal areas of activity had been education and vocational training. Thanks to the initiatives taken by private associations, it had been possible to set up ecological units to give practical advice on such aspects as the budget and agriculture, with a view to changing attitudes.

The transformation of Community directives and laws into national legislation and their actual application should be monitored more closely.

Mr Gaibisso (MEP, PPE/I)

Mr Gaibisso felt that meetings at the trouble spots in the countries concerned would have been preferable to this round table discussion. Detailed information could then be obtained and influence brought to bear on the spot.

Mrs Auken (Folketing, DK)

Mrs Auken welcomed the efforts to increase cooperation between the European Parliament's Committee on the Environment and the national parliaments. Where the EYE was concerned, it should be remembered that, as the debate on the environment in Denmark had begun 20 years ago, the activities during the EYE had not been so conspicuous. Such environmental movements and organizations as the Nature Conservation Confederation, with the sports organizations and the Church one of the largest associations in Denmark, had a high standing and engaged in a permanent dialogue with the Members of the Danish Parliament. With the direct participation of the public, a first step towards democratic control of Parliament and greater openness had thus been taken.

Mrs Auken called for the EYE to be continued in countries where the public could still be mobilized. In Denmark's case, however, work of a different kind was needed.

In Denmark strict democratic control over the conversion of Community laws and directives into national legislation was exercised by the Market Committee, which kept a very close eye on all European decisions. It ensured that representatives of the associations were heard before decisions were taken in the parliamentary committees.

Mrs Auken asked the European Parliament's Committee on the Environment for its support in the following respects:

1. Member States' legislation should be permitted to go further than Community directives provide. Efforts to improve the environment in the Member States must not be obstructed with references to distortions of competition.

2. International cooperation in environmental matters should extend beyond the Community. Denmark was already cooperating closely with Sweden, Norway, Finland and Iceland within the Nordic Council. Only alliances of this kind could lead to a constructive environment policy.

**Mr Guterres (Assembleia da República, P)**

The conclusion to be drawn from a review of the EYE must be that there was a 'total legislative void' at institutional level.

In Portugal itself a framework law on the environment enabling the Government to take action on specific aspects of the environment by means of implementing regulations had now been passed. As regards actual measures and activities, applications had been received for some 300 projects, of which it had been possible to finance 83%. As a result of the information campaigns conducted by the media - especially the television - the response from the public had been very good, and the local authorities too were taking a growing interest in the environment.

There were still serious shortcomings in cooperation at European level. Hence the great interest in closer cooperation shown at parliamentary level.

**Mrs Schleicher (MEP, PPE/D)**

At meetings with associations - and especially with young people - during the EYE reference had constantly been made to the importance of transfrontier environmental measures, and much was expected of the work being done at European level. It should be noted, however, that there were frequent disappointments, particularly at national level, owing to the impossibility of finding adequate solutions to transfrontier problems. Mrs Schleicher therefore asked how far international arguments were addressed in the national committees and how far this had been done during the EYE. Other questions concerned the transmission of information, the involvement of the national committees in the EYE and contacts between MEPs and the national parliaments.

**Mr Anastassakos (Vouli Ton Ellinon, GR)**

Mr Anastassakos said that cooperation, through the exchange of documents, for example, between the Greek Committee on Economic Affairs, which was responsible for environmental matters, and the European Parliament's committee had not been very close. He also explained that, under the Greek Parliament's new Rules of Procedure, the environment policy was combined with the programming and development of the economy, since these spheres were, of course, closely linked. Mr Anastassakos pointed out that, given

the heavy dependence of its economy on tourism, Greece must pay particular attention to environmental problems and protect its cultural heritage.

The EYE had enhanced initiatives which had already existed at national level and given them a new dimension. It had been a huge success in terms of creating awareness, and the continuation of such programmes would be greatly welcomed.

The conclusions drawn from the EYE concerned long-term strategies which must be pursued in cooperation with the non-governmental organizations and associations in particular.

The EYE campaign had led to the establishment of voluntary organizations to fight forest fires. Environmental protection had also taken on a different dimension in the media. Special mention should also be made of the activities of the local and regional authorities, particularly on the coast. They had arranged numerous events at which experts had given talks. Measures to combat air pollution in Athens had had the support of 90% of the population.

Mr Anastassakos criticized the motion for a resolution drawn up by the European Parliament's Committee on the Environment for being too vague and too modest in many respects and called for a stronger protest and more vigorous demands.

He concluded by suggesting that the Community's environment policy should also be coordinated with respect to the sanctions that might be imposed, so that the public might know that real action was being taken to protect the environment.

Mrs Diez de Rivera (MEP, NI/E)

Mrs Diez welcomed Mr Roelants du Vivier's proposal for the creation of a European environment fund, since it could be used to assist activities in financially weaker countries.

As regards the protection of the seas, Mrs Diez criticized the excessive emphasis on the North and Baltic Seas, when the Mediterranean was equally threatened by serious pollution.

The 'clean beaches' campaign should be a permanent fixture in view of the important part played by tourism in the southern countries, rather than a campaign limited to one year.

A list of possible sanctions against countries that did not comply with Community legislation should also be compiled.

Mr D'Addario (Camera dei Deputati, I)

Efforts to protect the environment had produced very favourable results in recent years, and long overdue action had now been taken. The lack of political stability and serious environmental disasters (earthquakes, floods) had slowed progress in the environmental sphere slightly. During the EYE the Italian Parliament had not considered launching a campaign. Although the European initiative had provided an impulse, it had not been translated into practical measures.

It was clear, however, that public awareness had grown, and the Greens had won seats in Parliament for the first time. An institutional innovation had been the creation of an Environment Ministry in 1986.

It had been agreed under the three-year environment programme that efforts should be concentrated on two aspects:

- protection of the soil in view of its effect on bodies of water,
- pollution in conurbations.

A law to protect nature reserves and maritime areas was also under discussion, and the establishment of 10 to 16 new nature parks was planned.

Even though Italy had not enforced the European environment directives perfectly (of 102 laws and directives, only 48 had been incorporated in national legislation), financial resources had been approved under the three-year programme for rehabilitation measures and for what had been classified as high-risk areas.

The directive on the disposal of dangerous substances and the prevention of atmospheric pollution had been amplified, and notification of industrial activities was now required. The parliamentary debate had revealed the need for standards to govern hazardous activities and for the effect of dangerous substances and pollutants on the environment to be considered.

Another aspect of considerable importance was the supply of dangerous, and especially radioactive, substances to third countries.

As for cooperation between the European Parliament and the Italian Parliament, it must be said that the directives did not really get through to the decision-makers. Although a law passed in 1983 required directives submitted to the Foreign Ministry to be forwarded to the Environment Ministry, this was seldom done.

Mrs Tongue (MEP, SOC/UK)

Referring to Mrs Auken (Denmark), Mrs Tongue emphasized the need for unilateral activities, particularly in view of the more stringent environmental standards introduced by Japan and the USA. She criticized the hesitancy with which the Council of Ministers was taking decisions on the key subjects of large incinerators, motor vehicle exhaust gases and the ozone layer and regretted that during the EYE the Council had taken no decisions on aspects to which the public attached so much importance.

The deficiencies in the monitoring and enforcement of Community directives had attracted increased public attention. Press reports of cases where the Member States were failing to comply with Community directives were becoming more frequent. The governments must realize that signing agreements also meant providing financial resources for the implementation of certain measures. She felt a Community environment fund should be established to assist poorer countries.

To ensure better democratic monitoring, a Community inspectorate should be formed.

**Mr Triana (Congreso de los Diputados, E)**

Mr Triana explained that he was the chairman of the parliamentary committee responsible for industry, energy, public works, transport, tourism and communications. The committee's supplementary tasks included the monitoring of the work of the nuclear power station safety board, a government body having sole power to lay down standards for the construction and operation of nuclear power stations and to set radiation limits. The board forwarded a detailed report to the committee every six months.

In recent years the public and Parliament had clearly been taking environmental issues more seriously. A great deal of legislation had been enacted in Spain. A Water Act passed three years ago ensured effective control of the discharge of industrial and household effluent into watercourses. The Senate had also passed a law to protect coasts and beaches. New legislation on road transport would also pay close attention to environmental problems. The use of natural gas in households, industry and public transport vehicles had been encouraged by the energy plan adopted in 1984, which enabled natural gas to be regarded as an energy used by ultimate consumers.

The enforcement of Community directives and their transformation into national legislation was proceeding satisfactorily, since the committee kept a very close eye on these aspects.

**Mrs Banotti (MEP, PPE/IRL)**

Mrs Banotti regretted the absence of the Irish representative, attributing this to the 'collapse', so to speak, of awareness of environmental issues after the EYE. The only bureau for environmental studies in Ireland had been closed after the EYE.

The programme during the EYE, on the other hand, had been very successful, and many projects had been implemented with limited financial resources. In view of Ireland's strong agricultural bias, it had had to be accepted that much of the pollution occurred in the rural areas. The national committee had given particular encouragement to programmes directed at the rural population.

Five years ago a European environmental study had shown that there was less awareness of the environment in Ireland than in any other Community country. The destruction of the environment that had become obvious to the

public in recent years had, as it were, forced environmental awareness on them. The high nitrate content and chemical pollution of the lakes and rivers, which were, of course, one of the main tourist attractions and one of the economy's principal resources, due to agriculture and industry had, for example, killed many fish.

As for pesticides, the pollution of beaches, acid rain and the ozone layer, the extent of the damage being done had become apparent only in recent years. The closure of the bureau for environmental studies meant that there was now no appropriate body to cooperate and coordinate activities with the European Parliament.

#### Mr De Groot (Chambre des Représentants, B)

Mr De Groot reported that a parliamentary committee of inquiry had been set up to consider the problems associated with the transport and storage of nuclear materials. Its task was to detect offences and to cooperate with the Federal Republic in submitting proposals aimed at preventing such offences from occurring in the future.

The protection of the seas was another of the main issues, and efforts were being made to prevent the discharge of wastes. The aim here was to cooperate with neighbouring countries with a view to improving monitoring and thus the quality of sea water.

Mr De Groot emphasized the importance of preventive environmental measures and called for close cooperation among the national committees so that a cohesive policy might be established to tackle transfrontier environmental problems.

#### Mr Elliott (MEP, SOC/UK)

Summarizing activities during the EYE, Mr Elliott said that, while it had had a favourable impact in many countries by enabling local problems to be tackled, little progress had been made with the major environmental issues. It was nevertheless gratifying that the public was taking a greater interest in the environment and that environmental issues had therefore become more important.

A serious problem was the quality of drinking water. According to the latest information, there might be a link between the aluminium content of water and the growing incidence of Alzheimer's disease. This was alarming since many water authorities used aluminium salts to treat water and the aluminium content was very high in some areas.

Mr Elliott complained that many of today's environmental problems might well have been alleviated, monitored more efficiently and solved more cheaply if action had been taken earlier. Closer cooperation among the national committees, through an exchange of documentation and annual meetings for instance, was desirable.

Mr Collins (MEP, SOC/UK)

Although the EYE had triggered a process of growing awareness in Britain, Mr Collins felt that the governments had made little progress in solving the major environmental problems. As regards the organization of the EYE, communication with the local and regional authorities and with the MEPs had been inadequate.

The content of the environment policy was overly determined by the agricultural, financial and other policies. He felt that the EYE had achieved little, since it had not been possible to convince the governments of the need to take the environment policy seriously.

Mrs Squarcialupi (MEP, COM/I)

Mrs Squarcialupi called for proposals for a continuation of the contacts among the parliaments.

Even at this stage the national parliaments should debate the fourth action programme and the measures arising from it. Community standards should be taken into account by the national parliaments even as they were being established. Only then could there be increased awareness of the need for effective Community standards.

Mr Guterres (Assembleia da República, P)

Portugal would like to see closer cooperation with the European Parliament in five areas: the pollution of the rivers (at international level), the monitoring of nuclear power stations near frontiers, limits on emissions of SO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, especially from coal-fired power stations, the destruction of the ozone layer, the co-financing of national parks and the protection of the cultural heritage. There should be an exchange of documents between the European Parliament and the national parliaments, and a joint meeting should be held once or twice a year to discuss specific topics.

Mrs Belo (MEP, SOC/P)

Mrs Belo felt that further meetings of this kind should be held, but with a set agenda, so that the national parliaments could be informed of the work of the European Parliament's committee.

Mr Anastassakos (Vouli Ton Ellinon, GR)

Mr Anastassakos proposed that some kind of declaration of principle on the protection of the environment should be drawn up at European level in cooperation with the national committees and made binding on all the Member States.

**Mr Roelants du Vivier (MEP, ARC/B)**

Summarizing the meeting, the rapporteur said that environment policy was construed differently because of the different governmental structures.

Another important point was that the power of control was increasingly being withdrawn from the European and national parliaments and was now almost entirely confined to the Council. Joint monitoring of European legislation and its subsequent enforcement was therefore needed.

It was proposed that an annual meeting with representatives of the national parliaments should be held in the capital of the country having the Presidency of the Council. In the meantime information should be exchanged through the Institute for European Environmental Policy.

**Mrs Weber, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (MEP, SOC/D)**

Mrs Weber supported the proposal for regular meetings, although they should be held under parliamentary auspices and actual agendas relating to specific problems should be drawn up.



Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or header, which is mostly illegible due to blurring and fading. Some faint characters are visible.



2.3 LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE MEETING HELD IN BRUSSELS ON  
21 JUNE 1988 TO MARK THE END OF THE  
EUROPEAN YEAR OF THE ENVIRONMENT 1987-1988

Belgium

Mr DE GROOT

Chairman of the national environment  
committee

Denmark

Mrs AUKEN

Vice-chairman of the national environment  
committee, member of the EEC Committee

France

Germany

Greece

Mr ANASTASSAKOS

Chairman of the national environment  
committee

Ireland

Italy

Mr D'ADDARIO

Member of the national environment  
committee

Luxembourg

Mr BARTHEL

Chairman of the national environment  
committee

Netherlands

Portugal

Mr GUTERRES

Chairman of the national environment  
committee

Spain

Mr TRIANA

Chairman of the Committee on Industry,  
Public Works and Services

United Kingdom

Mr JONES

Member of the national environment  
committee



Tuesday, 18 February 1986

(b) Doc. A2-205/85

## RESOLUTION

## on European Environment Year 1987

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the decision of the European Council meeting on 30 March 1985 in Brussels to declare 1987 European Environment Year <sup>(1)</sup>,
  - having regard to the European Community's previous action programmes on the environment of 1972, 1978 and 1982 <sup>(2)</sup>,
  - having regard to the document 'Ten Years of European Environment Policy' published by the Commission of the European Communities in March 1984,
  - having regard to the document 'European Parliament Resolutions on Environmental Protection (1979-1984)' <sup>(3)</sup>,
  - having regard to the Commission's work programme for 1985,
  - having regard to the document 'Community guidelines on environmental protection: the European Parliament's monitoring powers' <sup>(4)</sup>,
  - having regard to the second annual report to the European Parliament on monitoring the application of Community law in 1984 <sup>(5)</sup>,
  - having regard to its resolution of 21 October 1985 on monitoring the application of Community law <sup>(6)</sup>,
  - having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr Schmid and others on the embodiment of environmental protection in the EEC Treaty (Doc. 2-1273/84),
  - having regard to the international agreements on environmental protection to which the European Community or its Member States have acceded,
  - having regard to Oral Question with Answer No 0-54/81 by Mrs Weber on 'Global 2000' and 'Global 2000 — Time to Act' calling for practical measures in response to the reports findings,
  - having regard to the resolution adopted on 18 April 1985 calling for the European Parliament to offer advice to the European Environment Summit in May 1985 and the OECD meeting in June 1985 <sup>(7)</sup>,
  - having regard to the report by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. A2-205/85),
- A. deeply concerned at the worsening environment crisis, the growing threat to life through the over-exploitation of natural resources and the intolerable pollution of air, water and soils, the extinction of numerous species of animal and plant life and the inestimable damage to human health,

<sup>(1)</sup> EC Bulletin No 3/85, p. 11.<sup>(2)</sup> OJ No C 112, 20. 12. 1973, p. 1; OJ No C 139, 13. 6. 1977, p. 1; OJ No C 46, 17. 2. 1983, p. 1.<sup>(3)</sup> European Parliament, Research and Documentation, series on Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, No 6, 06-1984.<sup>(4)</sup> Ibid. No 7, 09-1985.<sup>(5)</sup> COM(85) 149 final — Doc. C2-40/85).<sup>(6)</sup> OJ No C 343, 31. 12. 1985, p. 8.<sup>(7)</sup> OJ No C 122, 20. 5. 1985, p. 128.

Tuesday, 18 February 1986

- B. having regard to the wealth of literature and information on these numerous forms of environmental destruction which already forms a substantial basis for debate and for possible decisions,
  - C. having regard to the European public's steadily growing awareness of the environment and the increasing willingness to make sacrifices for the sake of environmental protection,
  - D. whereas, given the present and immediately foreseeable unacceptably high level of unemployment in the European Community, the full potential of environment policy must be developed to create new secure jobs for the future,
  - E. whereas the Council and the Commission have declared that we should finally put our own house in order regarding the environment,
  - F. profoundly concerned that
    - although the problems are acknowledged — the political will is still lacking to take major preventive decisions in environment policy,
    - environmental interests are still not adequately taken into account when taking other policy decisions,
    - the present institutional situation will continue to dictate compromise decisions based on the lowest common denominator,
    - the directives adopted for the protection of the environment are belatedly and loosely incorporated into national law,
    - in many Member States, the structures for implementing environment policies are inadequate,
1. Welcomes the European Council's adoption of the Commission's proposal to declare 1987 Environment Year;-
  2. Insists, however, that this year should not be allowed to turn into a 'year of declarations and pronouncements' or a year in which the respective governments enthusiastically celebrate the 'achievements' of their national environment policies, but should mark the beginning of a more serious approach by the competent institutions of the EEC and national governments to the most pressing problems in particular;
  3. Reiterates the need for environmental problems to continue to be tackled at European level and for environmental aspects to be integrated with other Community policies;
  4. Demands that the European public's hopes that the European Community finally demonstrate and use its powers in the field of environmental protection are not frustrated and that Environment Year will be a year of decision making and action to achieve a distinct improvement in the environment;
  5. Calls for the attainment of the following objectives by the end of 1987:
    - the *de facto* incorporation of environmental interests into the other Community policy-making areas, as decided by the Heads of Government, without provision of appropriate procedures,
    - an improvement in Community and national legislation,
    - a distinctly improved environment,
    - a well-informed and involved public;
  6. Calls for environmental protection to be finally embodied as a common Community policy in the EEC Treaty by the end of 1987 and for the institutional reforms to bring about a genuine involvement of the European Parliament in the decision-making process;

Tuesday, 18 February 1986

7. Calls on the Member States to accelerate the incorporation of Community directives into national law; considers it imperative, in this regard, that national penalties for breaches of environmental legislation be more uniformly and vigorously applied;
8. Expects the Council and the Commission to have created by the end of Environment Year the financial and technical arrangements to enable the public to receive up to date and comprehensive information on the environmental situation in general and on planned and implemented measures, in particular via audio-visual media;
9. Calls, in addition to environmental impact assessments, for the establishment in the European Community of a basic Directive on freedom of information for the public, similar to the US Freedom of Information Act, to ensure that decisions taken by the authorities which have repercussions on the environment are open to public scrutiny;
10. Calls on the Council, the Commission and the European Investment Bank henceforth to finance or support only those projects which have passed an environmental impact assessment even before the EEC Directive is enacted;
11. Calls on the Council and Commission to give high priority to environmental problems in all negotiations and agreements with Eastern European countries and Third World countries;
12. Suggests using the occasion of Environment Year to develop practical cooperation between Western and Eastern Europe on crossborder environmental protection projects. In this respect recommends investigating the potential for Eureka and other agencies to sponsor a project to clean up one of the rivers which cross from East to West, e.g. the Elbe;
13. Calls on the Council and the Commission to set up an environment fund (possibly with the EIB).
  - to clear up existing pollution,
  - to support pilot projects to eliminate severe pollution,
  - to train environment experts,
  - to finance information projects, particularly in the audio-visual field;these measures should also serve to create secure jobs for the future in environmental protection;
14. Calls on the Council and the Commission, in each month of Environment Year to support a selected environmental project in a different Member State, to serve as a model, with the object of
  - improving the environment in practical terms,
  - increasing public awareness of environmental issues and giving the public opportunity for democratic participation in decision-making,
  - giving practical expression to Environment Year in each Member State,
  - improving cooperation with industry, trade unions, environmental groups, the public and the mass media,
  - creating jobs in the context of environment policy,
  - taking advantage of voluntary associations and their activities;The following could serve as model projects (in particularly deprived areas): construction of a local sewage treatment plant, designation and establishment of a trans-frontier nature reserve, training schemes for staff employed by monitoring bodies, teaching of environment-conscious consumer behaviour, retraining schemes for workers with jobs involving environmental and health hazards, environment-conscious building;
15. Expects the Commission and the Council to draw up a survey by the end of 1986 on the achievements of Community environment policy to date measured in terms of the objectives of the third action programme and the decisions of the Council; this survey should clarify for the public what has been achieved and what remains to be done at a legislative and a practical level;

Tuesday, 18 February 1986

16. Calls on the Council and the Commission to draw up and adopt by the beginning of 1987:
- a plan of action to determine how and by what date the shortcomings in environment legislation and its implementation should be eliminated,
  - an emergency environment programme for 1987,
  - a fourth action programme for 1987-1991 with the following priorities: environmentally acceptable farming and soil conservation, decrease in air pollution; environmentally acceptable alternative energy sources, protection of groundwater, lakes, rivers and seas in the Community, rehabilitation of hill and mountain areas in a run-down state, environmentally acceptable waste management, conservation of flora and fauna, promotion of economical technologies and non-pollutant forms of production, targeted environmental research (e.g. climate research, energy saving);
17. Decides not to participate in Environment Year 1987 should the Council intend to use it merely as a cover for its failure to act and is not prepared to provide adequate financial resources or appropriate and practical measures to translate the above demands into practice;
18. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission.
-

RESOLUTION

on Environment Year

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr COMPASSO on Environment Year (Doc. B 2-1835/87),
- having regard to the report of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. A 2-161/88),
- A. mindful of its resolution of 18 February 1986 congratulating the Council on having, on a proposal from the Commission, designated the year 1987/88 as 'European Environment Year' (EEY) (1),
- B. hoping, however, on that occasion, the EEY would be characterized by decisions and measures designed to achieve a genuine improvement in the state of nature and the environment,
- C. mindful of its resolutions of 10 March 1988 on the application of Community law on improving the quality of air and water (2),
- D. having regard to the outcome of the meeting with the Steering Committee and the national EEY Committees held on 22 March 1988, and of the meeting between the Chairmen of the committees of the national parliaments with responsibility for environmental issues and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection of the European Parliament, held on 21 June 1988 with a view to drawing up a balance sheet for EEY,

(1) OJ No. C 68, 24.3.1988, p.49

(2) OJ No. C 94, 11.4.1988, pp. 151 et seq.



1. Welcomes the success of European Environment Year in increasing the awareness of both the general public through initiatives at grass-roots level, and industrial and trade union circles;
2. Welcomes in particular the commitment shown by environmental associations and many local and regional authorities;
3. Welcomes the fact that all social groups in all the EC countries contributed both ideas and financial support to the planning and implementation of events and measures, although the practical arrangements made by the Commission left much to be desired;
4. Stresses that the exhibition held at the Commission in Brussels in March 1988 to mark the end of European Environment Year provided a good overview of the many and varied measures and events in all twelve Member States;

Stresses that the projects begun during European Environment Year must be completed and that the feasibility of implementing proposals and initiatives for new projects put forward during Environment Year should be carefully scrutinized;

- Council

6. Regrets that during European Environment Year the Council was unable to adopt more firm legislative proposals, some of which have been under discussion in the Council for years and which would be capable of exerting a tangible effect on the quality of the environment and on employment;
7. Reiterates the idea, expressed by several chairmen of national committees at the meeting of 22 March 1988, that activities to increase awareness should be directed not only at the general public but above all at the national governments' representatives on the Council, and the national governments in the case of environmental problems which can only be resolved at national and international level, so as to enable decisions to be made which lead to significant progress in the improvement of the environment;
8. Stresses the important role which should be played by national parliaments and administrations to ensure the effective application of Community law, and requests each Member State to monitor the application of such law in its territory;

- Commission

9. Calls on the Commission, in particular, to develop its policy of increasing the awareness of young people for the environment and of incorporating the study of environmental problems into the curricula of schools and vocational training institutes;
10. Calls on the Commission to send the exhibition on the results of European Environment Year to all EC countries as a travelling exhibition;
11. Calls on the Commission to submit an initial assessment of its "blue flag" campaign and, if the results have been encouraging, to extend it;

12. Considers that to date the criteria for the "Blue Flag" campaign seem to have been more appropriate for beaches in more heavily developed resorts which are used by very large numbers of bathers; considers furthermore that these criteria militate against those wishing to avail themselves of the attractions of some of the more remote and unspoiled beaches of the Community which because of these very features and lack of development in the vicinity are particularly appealing;
  13. **Calls on the Commission, therefore, to bring forward initiatives with regard to the "Blue Flag" campaign aimed at promoting the remote and unspoiled beaches of the Community,**
  14. Calls also on the Commission to support the "information network on clean technologies";
  15. Stresses that the inclusion of the environment in all Community policies and, in particular, in the common agricultural policy, transport policy and in Community measures regarding employment should find greater expression in practical initiatives and considers that adequate financial assistance for practical initiatives should be provided;
  16. Notes that provisions have been made for setting up a certain number of national foundations for the environment following European Environment Year, and calls on the Commission to study the possible means of setting up a European Foundation for the Environment, or at least a European secretariat which would liaise between the various national foundations;
  17. Calls on the Commission to support, by financial aid where necessary, the efforts of regional or local bodies to extend European Environment Year by means of measures which are capable of making a genuine contribution to the protection and/or improvement of the environment and which can serve as a stimulus or example for further initiatives;
- European Parliament and Member State Parliaments**
18. Hopes for closer collaboration with the committees of the national parliaments responsible for environmental issues, since the enforcement of an effective environment policy depends not only on central decisions but, above all, on national, regional and local parliaments and administrations;
  19. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission and the Parliaments of the Member States.



## I

*(Information)*

## COUNCIL

## COUNCIL RESOLUTION

of 3 May 1988

on the close of the European Year of the Environment

(88/C 129/01)

THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES,

*Referring* to the decision of the European Council of 29 and 30 March 1985 designating 1987 as the 'European Year of the Environment' and to the Council resolution of 6 March 1986 on an action programme for that year (\*);

*Noting* that, following adoption of the Single Act, environment protection policy has become a fully established policy of the European Community;

*Thanks* the Commission and all those who have contributed, under the aegis of the Steering Committee and the National Committees, to ensuring the success of the European Year of the Environment;

*Welcomes* the impact made by, and response to, the European Year of the Environment in the Community, enabling awareness to be increased among a large number of those in positions of responsibility in administrations, industry and trade unions, local authorities and associations and also a broad spectrum of European public opinion, particularly young people;

*Is pleased* that events were organized around practical projects and in a decentralized way, thereby enabling numerous regional and local bodies in the Community to participate;

*Notes* with interest the efforts made to encourage in particular, European, multinational or bilateral projects and to involve the business world in the European Year of the Environment;

*Takes note* of the initiatives to encourage the submission and implementation of projects with an environmental aspect which may be eligible for the various Community Funds;

*Notes* with satisfaction that some non-member countries were involved in the European Year of the Environment and that the Commission carried out information, education and awareness projects directed at developing countries;

*Hopes* that the information and awareness activities undertaken during the European Year of the Environment will have follow-on effects well beyond it and bring benefits and practical progress for the protection of the environment and of the world in which we live;

*Calls on* the Commission to take account, in the continuation of its information and education efforts, of the experience gleaned during the European Year of the Environment, of the need to cooperate with the Member States and of the advisability or not of associating with other interested bodies;

*Emphasizes* in this connection that, if Community environmental policy is to progress in both its framing and its implementation, there is a need for greater convergence of interests and attitudes on the importance of environmental problems on the part of public opinion and the sectors concerned in all Member States;

*Calls on* Member States to continue to strive towards the objectives which gave birth to the European Year of the Environment, in cooperation with the groups concerned and the Commission

(\*) OJ No C 63, 18. 3. 1986, p. 1



Luxembourg, 23 January 1988

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SERVE AS A BASIS FOR  
A REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENT YEAR 1987 - 1988

Introduction

In its resolution of 18 February 1986, the European Parliament welcomed the Council's adoption of the Commission's proposal to designate 1987 European Environment Year (EEY). Parliament hoped in particular that Environment Year would be a year marked by decisions and measures taken to achieve a significant improvement in the state of nature and the environment. It also insisted that the year 'should not be allowed to turn into a "year of declarations and pronouncements" or a year in which the respective governments enthusiastically celebrated the "achievements" of their national environment policies, but should mark the beginning of a more serious approach by the competent institutions of the EEC and national governments to the most pressing problems in particular'.

It would be very useful to draw up a review of this Environment Year and learn as much as possible from it with a view to further action. As a basis for this review, the parliamentary committee concerned has drawn up this questionnaire to compile and exchange information on experiences, criticisms and suggestions in connection with events and achievements which marked Environment Year. It is addressed to people who held positions of particular responsibility in this area.

The replies will be incorporated in a report which is to be submitted to the European Parliament and distributed as widely as possible. As the questionnaire is to be sent to people with very different sorts of responsibility, it is broad in scope. It is, therefore, possible that certain questions only concern certain recipients of the questionnaire.



QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Projects carried out during EEY

- 1.1 What were the major projects carried out during EEY, and were they, in your opinion, a success, or a failure?
- 1.2 Were any specific legislative measures or regulations which made a significant contribution to solving environmental problems enacted during this year in your country?
- 1.3 What projects and other activities were organized jointly by your country and neighbouring Community countries, in border regions in particular? Can you give details of the outcome?
- 1.4 In your country, are there any  
 - statistics,  
 - databases on environmental subjects available? If so, can you give details?

2. Contacts made during EEY

- 2.1 Did you have any contacts with other national committees?      yes      no
- 2.2 Did you have any dealings with European institutions, in particular the European Parliament?      yes      no
- 2.3 Did you seek and obtain support from Members of your national parliament?      yes      no
- 2.4 Were you able to establish contact with non-Community countries?      yes      no



2.5 Have you any proposals to make regarding the improvement of relations between local, regional, national and international authorities as well as NGOs, industry and the trade unions?      yes      no

3. Other aspects of EEY

3.1 Have you any observations to make on the following questions:

- How did the public react to particular activities undertaken during EEY - did they feel particularly motivated?
- Did EEY further European integration? Was its organization at Community level justified?
- Were programmes of youth exchanges organized during EEY? Have you any particular remarks to make regarding these programmes?
- Were any specific legislative measures or regulations which made a significant contribution to solving environmental problems enacted during this year in your country?

3.2 Have you any remarks to make regarding measures designed to increase public awareness of the problems:

- by the media: television, radio, films (e.g. Eurovision 1987), written press?

- by other means: logos, exhibitions, trade fairs, leisure parks, blue flag for clean beaches, prizes and competitions?

#### 4. Financial aspects

4.1 Can you give details of the amount and source of the funds made available to you for Environment Year (financial contribution from the Community, private financing and others)?

4.2 Have you any proposals to make regarding other means of funding?

#### 5. Follow-up to EEY

5.1 At the end of EEY, would you like to see an organizational structure maintained, both at European and at national level, similar to that set up in the form of the committees?

5.2 What projects might be dealt with in the follow-up to EEY?

5.3 Any other measures?

5.4 In your opinion, what role should the European Parliament play in future in the campaign against pollution in Europe?

