



SECRETARIAT WORKING PARTY

TASK-FORCE
ON THE
" INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFERENCE "

WORKING PARTY SECRETARIAT

JF/bo/256/96

Luxembourg, 31 October 1996

No 30
BRIEFING
ON
THE TOURISM AND THE 1996 IGC

(First update)

PE 166.461
Or. FR

These briefings have been drafted by the Parliament Secretariat Task Force on the Intergovernmental Conference. Their purpose is to gather together, in an organized, summary form, the proposals and suggestions which the authorities in the Member States, the Union's institutions and specialist commentators have put forward on the issues likely to be on the IGC/96 agenda. Briefings will be updated as negotiations proceed.

Already out:

1. The Court of Justice
2. The Commission
3. The Court of Auditors, ESC and COR
4. Differentiated integration
5. The common foreign and security policy
6. The role of the national parliaments
7. The hierarchy of Community acts
8. Codecision procedure
9. CJHA
10. European citizenship
11. WEU, security and defence
12. Public services
13. Social policy
14. The European Parliament
15. The European Council
16. The Council of the European Union
17. The budget and the IGC
18. The IGC and transparency
19. Subsidiarity and the allocation of powers
20. The Union's legal personality and external representation
21. Commitology
22. Fundamental rights
23. The IGC and the democratic nature of the Union
24. The coherence of the external action of the EU under the first (Community) and second (CFSP) pillars
25. The 1996 IGC and the effectiveness of the Union
26. Europol
27. The IGC and the Schengen Convention
28. Combating fraud
29. Energy
30. Tourism and the IGC
31. Economic and social cohesion
32. European environment policy and the IGC
33. The common agricultural policy and the IGC
34. Civil protection
35. Ending sex discrimination
36. Enlargement of the EU
37. Employment and the IGC
38. The IGC and Economic and Monetary Union
39. Asylum and immigration policy

**BRIEFING
ON
TOURISM AND THE 1996 IGC**

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. SUMMARY	5
II. AGENDA FOR THE CONFERENCE	6
III. POSITIONS OF THE EU INSTITUTIONS	
1. THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT	
- Resolution on the functioning of the TUE, 17 May 1995	6
- Resolution on Parliament's opinion on the convening of the IGC (DURY/MAIJ-WEGGEN)	6
- Public hearing on the Green Paper (20 July 1995)	7
- SARLIS report on the Commission Green Paper	7
- PARODI report	8
2. THE COMMISSION	
- Report on the operation of the TEU, 10 May 1995	8
- Green Paper on the role of the European Union in the field of Tourism	8
- Commission report on the possible integration of energy, tourism and civil protection into the Treaty (3 April 1996)	10
3. THE COUNCIL	
- Report on the operation of the TEU, 10 April 1995	10
- Council of Ministers responsible for tourism, meeting of 13 May 1996 .	10
- Report of the Italian Presidency (Florence, 17 June 1996)	11
- Address by the President of the Council of Ministers responsible for tourism to Parliament's Committee on Transport and Tourism (22 July 1996)	11
4. THE REFLECTION GROUP	
- Report of the Reflection Group for the 1996 IGC (Messina, 2 June 1995/ Brussels, 5 December 1995)	11
5. THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS	
- Opinion on the Commission Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism	11
6. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE	
- Opinion on the Commission Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism	12

IV. POSITIONS OF THE MEMBER STATES

Belgium	14
Denmark	14
Germany	15
Greece	16
Spain	16
Italy	17
Luxembourg	17
Austria	18
Finland	18
United Kingdom	19
Netherlands	19
Portugal	19
Ireland	19
France	20
Sweden	20

V. THE INDEPENDENT ORGANISATIONS

a) Organisations taking part in the Commission's industry-consultation meetings	20
b) COAST (Co-ordinated Action for seaside towns): a response to the Green Paper	23

VI. TABLES: POSITIONS CONCERNING THE TOURISM POLICY

- The Member States	24
- The organisations	25

GENERAL REFERENCES	26
-------------------------------------	-----------

**BRIEFING
ON
TOURISM AND THE 1996 IGC**

I. SUMMARY

The state of discussion on the community policy on tourism shows that the question is still being approached with considerable caution and indecision. Although tourism is "constitutionally" (Art. 3t, Decl. No 1) recognized as an object of the future revision, it does not seem to be given the attention it deserves by most of the 1996 IGC "participants".

However among EU institutions the Commission's Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism seeks to increase the awareness of all concerned of the Union's role in promoting tourism, with a view to the 1996 Conference. The Green Paper identifies *four possible developments* as a basis for the formation of views:

1. *Reducing or eliminating specific Community actions in the field of tourism.*
2. *Retaining the current framework and level of intervention.*
3. *Strengthening Community action via the existing Treaty.*
4. *Establishing a common policy on the basis of a specific title in the Treaty.*

On several occasions, Parliament has come out clearly in favour of the last. The Committee of the Regions, however, does not believe that it is necessary to amend the current legislative basis or to give the EU more powers in this area. The Economic and Social Committee has a totally different position and even proposes a new Title to be added in the Treaty. Finally, the Reflection Group does not see the need for the Community to assume any further responsibilities.

Regarding the Member States positions, most of the opinions that are expressed call for political recognition of Community action on tourism, both in terms of substance (by strengthening resources) and in terms of form (by including a specific title in the Treaty), while complying with the principle of subsidiarity. Only Denmark, France and Sweden have not expressed any definite opinion. The comments of the other Member States range from a minimalist approach (D, UK) to a maximalist approach (B, IRL, FR, I). Although it has not come out in favour of the latter position, one Member State (L) indicates that it would make no objection. There is reason to wonder whether, if certain guarantees can be given, the position of some other countries could be revised upwards, either to option 3 (NL) or option 4 (FIN, P). This does not seem to be the case at present for two other countries (E, A).

Finally, regarding the positions of different organisations it can be observed that none of these organisations was explicitly in favour of option 1 or 2. Although five organisations did not say they were in favour of any of the options proposed, it should be noted that three of them (EUROCHAMBERS, ECTAA, HOTREC) gave a fairly clear idea of the approach they would like to be adopted. Five other organisations were in favour of an "option 5" proposed by ETAG, "favouring the stronger position for tourism proposed in Option 4 with some reservations regarding the use of new powers for regulation or control". Almost all the contributions

reflected a wish to strengthen Community action on tourism. A majority called for political acknowledgement of this action by the inclusion of a specific title in the Treaty, while respecting the principle of subsidiarity. The case for a European competence/Treaty article on Tourism issues (Option 4 as outlined in the Green Paper) is also supported by the COAST (Co-Ordinated Action for Seaside Towns) network.

II. AGENDA FOR THE CONFERENCE

According to article 3 of the Treaty on European Union:

"For the purposes set out in article 2, the activities of the Community shall include, as provided in this Treaty and in accordance with the timetable set out therein ... (t) measures in the spheres of energy, civil protection and tourism".

However according to declaration No 1 annexed to the Final Act of the TEU the question of introducing into the Treaty establishing the European Community Titles relating to the spheres referred to in article 3(t) of that Treaty will be examined, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article N(2) of the TEU, on the basis of a report which the Commission will submit to the Council by 1996 at the latest.

III. POSITIONS OF THE EU INSTITUTIONS

1. THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

- Resolution of 17 May 1995 on the functioning of the Treaty on European Union with a view to the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference - implementation and development of the Union (Bourlanges/Martin report, A4-102/95):

The Parliament, after having recognised that the Union must strengthen its existing policies, considers that there should be more effective policy-making in a number of other key fields: tourism, in its European aspects, should form a separate and distinctive common policy with a separate legal basis in the revised Treaty.

- Resolution on Parliament's opinion on the convening of the IGC and evaluation of the work of the Reflection Group and definition of the political priorities of the European Parliament with a view to the Intergovernmental Conference (DURY/MAIJ-WEGGEN, 13 March 1996, A4-68/96)

Parliament states that tourism should be incorporated in the Treaty as an individual and separate field of common policy within the context of the internal market.

- Committee on Transport and Tourism:

Public hearing on the Commission Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism (Brussels, 20 July 1995)

The Committee on Tourism held a public hearing on the Commission Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism. Representatives of 12 organisations in this sector had come to this hearing to give their opinion on a future Tourism policy in the EU. The Committee is in favour of a Chapter on Tourism in the Treaty after the Intergovernmental Conference in 1996. Several reports on tourism in the Community have been adopted in the past two or three years.

Report on the Commission's Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism (A4-16/96, 25 January 1996)

The rapporteur (Mr Sarlis) considers that tourist "industry" constitutes an important sector of the economy at local, regional, national and Community level. Tourist enterprises employ approximately 9 million workers in the Member States of the European Union. Tourism as a service industry accounts for an estimated 5,5% of GDP in the European Union. Tourist activities may have an adverse effect on the natural environment, of the locality as well as on local communities. The proper use of public property is mainly a matter of ensuring that local, regional and national authorities introduce proper regulations.

According to the rapporteur, the Commission's Green Paper conclusions in the form of the four options which the Commission proposes (without taking a position itself), are well-founded although criticisms could be made of certain points of the analysis. The problem lies on the fact that there is no Community policy on the tourist industry. The European Parliament has always been a firm supporter of greater Community intervention in the tourism sector and the inclusion in the Treaty of a Community tourism policy. The need for such a policy is not in question, given not only the serious problems facing the tourist industry, but also the importance of this economic activity for harmonious, lasting balanced and environment- friendly economic development and economic and social cohesion. The lines of action for the common tourism policy could be as follows:

- (a) ensuring the competitiveness of the tourist industry
- (b) creating favourable conditions for the development of Community tourist enterprises
- (c) taking initiatives to harmonize working conditions
- (d) promoting cooperation between all those involved in tourist activities
- (e) coordination of national measures by the Member States
- (f) introducing the possibility of concluding agreements between the EC and third countries or international organisations
- (g) contributing to research and financing for tourist infrastructure on the basis of criteria to be determined in advance.

- PARODI report on the Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Community measures affecting tourism in 1994 (2 October 1996, A4-0297/96)

Parliament again urges the need for a legal base for tourism to give it the necessary institutional legitimacy. It also calls for the creation of a subcommittee to the Committee on Transport, to examine the wide range of issues relating to this sector.

It rejects the idea of excessive harmonization of tourism but expresses a preference for 'coordination and closer cooperation between the European institutions, the national, regional and local authorities, the industries in the sector, and those representing the socio-economic interests of tourist-consumers and workers in the industry'.

The general responsibility for integrating tourism into other Community policies would rest with the Commission. This should be done by setting up units in the Commission services which contribute to the development of tourism (agriculture, transport, environment, social policy, competition, small and medium-sized enterprises, etc.), with the task of monitoring the application of the principles of a tourism policy at European level.

2. THE COMMISSION

- Report on the operation of the TEU (10 May 1995)

The Commission considers that the main issue during the Conference will not be an increase in the Union's powers. On the contrary the main focus will have to be on ways of improving decision-making mechanisms. The second part of this report regarding the effectiveness and consistency of the Union's policies does not contain any proposals for a possible implementation of other areas of community activity or a future extension of EU powers.

- The Commission Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism (COM(95)97- C4-157/95)

The Green Paper concentrates on three main areas:

- it describes the actions currently being carried out by the Community in the field of tourism and the instruments it already possesses for this purpose;
- it makes a more in depth examination of the added value brought by the implementation of a policy at Community level, highlighting in particular the reasons which inspire and justify Community action to encourage tourism and basic objectives which can be pursued by Community action in this field:

- .strengthening economic and social cohesion;
- .important contribution to achieving sustainable growth;
- .contributing to the promotion of the European identity;

.contributing to the management of structural and technological changes and to the development of tourism SMEs;
.creation of added value through a consistent approach in policies and instruments;
.tourism and respect for the principle of subsidiarity;

- it outlines the likely trends defining the future role of the Union, according to the four possible options:

- a) Tourism could continue to benefit from measures under the various Community programmes without the need to draw up a specific action programme.
- b) Maintenance of the present framework and level of intervention.
- c) Strengthening of Community action on the basis of the existing Treaty.
- d) Towards a Community tourism policy.

To be more analytical, the Green Paper identifies these four possible ways in which the EU can develop its future role regarding tourism as following:

a) The first option comprises the reduction or elimination of specific Community action in the field of tourism. Tourist satisfaction would be guaranteed by measures taken under other Community policies. This option excludes de facto any form of coordination since there would be no specific reference framework for tourism.

b) The second option entails maintenance of the current framework and level of intervention. As things stand at present, the Community does not have a specific legal basis for tourism policy. It can therefore only base its action on Article 235, as was the case with the Community Action Plan to assist tourism of July 1992. This Action Plan however is of limited duration and scope. This second option thus leaves unresolved the question of the Commission's political authority in the field of tourism, confirms the status quo and limits the aims and scope of cooperation. It also recognises the experimental nature of the Community's Action Plan.

c) The third option calls for a strengthening of Community action via the existing Treaty. The Action Plan has not been sufficient to mobilize the full potential for tourism so the Community can only stimulate tourist activities by a strengthening of existing measures in sectors which may have an impact on tourism (regional development, consumers, business, environment and culture). Political legitimacy in the field of tourism will still be out of the question although instruments currently in operation will be bolstered in terms of resources, if not objectives. What is lacking with this option is something which can only be given by political legitimacy, via more closely coordinated measures in order to give Community action a higher profile and create a multiplier effect for the added value of each of the separate policies.

d) Finally, the fourth action is to lay the foundations for a Community tourism policy. Such a policy would not aim to subvert national and regional policies but would make it possible to lay down Community guidelines in order to secure a convergence of objectives and actions. A Community tourism policy would also give the Commission a greater right and political legitimacy:

- * to act more decisively when decisions are taken on other policies affecting tourism, and
- * to take action to promote coordination at Community level or to satisfy the specific needs of tourism.

Political legitimacy derives from the insertion in the Treaty of a specific Title containing an adequate legal basis that defines the nature, scope and objectives of a Community tourism policy.

- Commission report on the possible integration of energy, tourism and civil protection into the Treaty (3 April 1996)

The report reveals the Commission's concern to avoid giving the impression that it is seeking new powers. It does not take a position and confines itself to setting out the arguments of those who advocate amending the Treaty, those who want better coordination of Community activities that affect tourism, and those who think that the present level of Community intervention in the field of tourism is adequate.

The Commission appears to think that it is not a question of devising common policies for tourism as such but that Union action should be based on cooperation between the Member States - with very close cooperation in some cases - as formulation of a common policy would have a considerable institutional and budgetary impact.

3. THE COUNCIL

- Report on the operation of the TEU (10 April 1995)

The Council simply refers to tourism as a provision which, in the context of Article N.2 of the TEU, is expressly concerned by the IGC agenda according to the Declaration No 1 annexed to the TEU Final Act. The report contains no further references regarding tourism or any other suggestions for new possibilities of Community action in this particular sector.

Tourism was mentioned only as a provision, which under Article N.2 of the EU Treaty and Declaration No. 1 annexed to the final act of the EU Treaty, should appear on the 1996 IGC agenda. There was no further reference to tourism and no suggestion about further possibilities for Community action in this field.

- Meeting of the Council of Ministers responsible for tourism on 13 May 1996 in Brussels

The Ministers recognize the need for the Commission to coordinate Member States' activities and to support the tourist industry, in view of its importance. When asked individually for their views on the 'Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism' they made no official comment on the options put forward by the Commission.

- Report by the Italian Presidency of the Council (Florence summit, 17 June 1996)

This again states that the incorporation of a special legal basis for tourism in the Treaty should remain on the IGC agenda. Nevertheless tourism is omitted from the conclusions of the Presidency, which is a further indication that this subject is of secondary importance for the Intergovernmental Conference.

- Address by Mr Enda Kenny, President of the Council of Ministers responsible for tourism, to Parliament's Committee on Transport and Tourism

Ireland favours legal recognition of tourism in the Treaty. This view is not shared by the majority of Member States, which, taking a realistic view of possible IGC results, are falling back on maintenance of the present legal framework. There does seem to be recognition, however, of the need for better coordination of tourism with other Community policies (such as regional matters, transport, consumer protection, the environment and agricultural structures).

4. THE REFLECTION GROUP

- Report of the reflection group for the 1996 IGC (Messina, 2 June 1995 / Brussels, 5 December 1995)

The group as a whole estimates that there is no question for the Community to take over any supplementary tasks but to accomplish successfully the responsibilities already assumed. The group, according to the first declaration annexed to the TEU Final Act, has examined the possibility to incorporate in the common policies the spheres of energy, tourism and civil protection; although many members consider that a specific common policy in one or another of these sectors could present a great interest, the group has reached (by majority) the conclusion that it should be more appropriate just to plan a reinforced cooperation between member states in these fields.

Finally, one member estimates that article 3 t) should be abolished.

5. THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS

Opinion of the Committee of the Regions on the Commission Green Paper on the role of the Union in the field of tourism (COM(95)97 final)

The COR:

- supports the idea of setting transparent and coordinated guidelines for those tourist activities which are carried out at EU level;
- recommends the establishment of a basis to ensure that the Union takes greater account of the specific interests in the area of tourism in connection with planning and implementation of other Community policies;

- does not believe that this necessarily requires amending the current legislative basis or giving the EU more powers in this area;
- believes that the Commission Green Paper can be construed as a step towards giving tourism the attention it deserves in the EU's political decision-making processes;
- calls on the Commission to submit practical proposals as regards objectives and resources for the Union's contribution to tourism;
- urges the Commission to base its report, to be submitted to the Council in conjunction with the 1996 IGC, on the principles of partnership, complementarity and subsidiarity and stresses the local authorities' responsibility and potential in action to develop tourism;
- believes that the proposals contained in section C III (strengthening Community action via the existing Treaty) constitute the soundest basis for the Commission's future work, since option C III gives a clear political signal that the present legal basis (article 3t in the Treaty of the European Union) is adequate for the Union to reach all of the above mentioned goals;
- calls for the COR to be involved in further work on developing objectives and resources relating to the Union's role in tourism.

6. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE

Opinion on the role of the Union in the field of tourism - Commission Green Paper (OJ No C 301, 13.11.95, p. 68)

CONCLUSIONS

In the European Union tourism plays a fundamental role not only at the socio-economic level, as a factor for integration among peoples and among the differing geographical conditions in the Community, it is the vehicle par excellence for strengthening the European identity; and it contributes to the defence and promotion of European values on the international scene. Tourism remains one of the main sources of new jobs, and is a decisive factor for restoring the socio-economic balance among the Community regions. As regards sectoral interdependence, the growth of tourism has a multiplier effect in the other economic sectors linked with it: agriculture, industry, craft industries, trade, transport, etc.

Europe is still the world's main tourist market, but this position is really threatened by ever-increasing international competition from the newly emerging areas of world tourism, whose growth rates are considerably higher than those of the Community. However, European and international tourism offer significant opportunities for growth. The growth potential on a Community scale will be achieved provided that the European tourist system as a whole becomes more competitive as regards qualitative standards, local structure, diversification of supply to cope with trends in

the needs and motivation of a tourism demand which is ever more sophisticated and less stereotyped.

The Green Paper sets out with sufficient clarity what is stake at Community level, in all its aspects, and calls for a precise response to formulate a European tourism policy capable of meeting the challenge.

Measures taken so far at European level have been an inadequate response to the needs of the sector, as they were partial, of limited duration, not fully thought out for the medium and long term, and not fully integrated with the new Community reality. The lack of a specific legal basis in the EC Treaty has acted hitherto as a brake on Community initiative on tourism. The above comments on the added value which the Community can give to the development of tourism would leave no doubt as to the need for a fully-fledged, effective Community policy on tourism, as spelt out in option IV of the Green Paper. The ESC, in line with the views expressed in the past and most recently in its Opinion of 15 September 1994, reaffirms the need for a Community tourism policy to be given an adequate legal basis as well as a separate Title in the Treaty: this must be done at the latest at the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference. On the basis of Option IV of the Green Paper the Commission should, in agreement with the Member States and in conjunction with organizations representing enterprises, trade unionists and consumers, define the whole framework, guidelines and coordinating measures which, alongside autonomous initiatives, are needed to ensure that the most important activities engaged in as part of a Community tourism policy are effective in achieving the objectives of the Union, whilst at the same time complying with the principle of subsidiarity.

In order to make a practical contribution to the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference, the Committee proposes that the following new title be added to the Treaty:

Tourism

1. The Community and the Member States shall be responsible for creating the necessary preconditions for maintaining and improving the competitive capacity of the Community tourism sector. To that end, their action shall aim to: -

- achieve close coordination between Community and Member State policy in the tourism sector;

- develop joint measures by the Community tourism sector is able to stand up to worldwide competition;

- strike a balance between the interests of the industry and those of the consumer, with due regard for the principle of sustainable development predicated on conservation of the cultural and national heritage.

2. In order to achieve the aims set out in paragraph 1 above, the Commission shall ensure that tourism policy is integrated and coordinated with all aspects of Community policy.

III. POSITIONS OF THE MEMBER STATES

BELGIUM

Government policy paper to the Belgian Parliament on the 1996 IGC

The government thinks that the revision of the Treaty should not involve the abolition of any field of activity of the Union or of specific sectors like civil defence, energy and tourism. At the request of the Belgian Communities and Regions, it will in due course be putting to the IGC specific proposals to amend the Treaty articles on education, professional training, young people, culture and the media, public health, environmental policy, transport policy and, possibly, tourism and sport.

Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

In the case of Belgium, only Option 4 would provide a legal basis for defining the framework of a specific European tourism policy and for its implementation.

DENMARK

Agenda for Europe: the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference. Report of the Danish Foreign Ministry, June 1995

The Danish paper referring, generally, to the matter of EU competences proposes the preparation of a "catalogue of powers" that would set out in the Treaty an exhaustive list of the powers of the EU and the Member States.

Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

In the case of Denmark, in view of the fact that the matters considered in the Green Paper should be discussed at the IGC in 1996, the Danish government reserves the right to change its points of view. The country nevertheless that responsibility for tourism, with regard to the principle of subsidiarity, is primarily a national matter, although it acknowledges that there are certain horizontal areas for which it would be desirable for the European Union to undertake measures.

GERMANY

a. Basic positions of the Federal Government with regard to the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference

The Federal Government regarding the principle of subsidiarity declares that at the 1996 Conference it will work towards a precise definition of the respective areas of competence of the EU and the Member States. The coalition agreement refers to

tourism as an example of an area where existing Community powers need to be examined for their compatibility with the principle of subsidiarity.

b. Basic positions of the German Lander

The German Lander claim for a clear separation of powers between the EU and the Member States as well as for a compilation of a list of responsibilities per subject area for the EU. They also consider that future action by the EU should only be on the basis of clearly defined powers and responsibilities. The broadly defined list of objectives of the EU should be replaced by a list of powers relating to specific fields. Another possibility, as a compromise between these two lists, would be a list of duties relating to the specific powers defined in the Treaty.

c. Basic positions of the parties and of the groups in the Bundestag Manifesto of the CDU/CSU Group in the Bundestag of 1 September 1994

The document proposes the drawing-up of a quasi-constitutional document based on the model of a "federal state" and the subsidiarity principle, which should describe clearly the division of powers between the European Union, the Member States and the Regions and define the Union's fundamental values.

- Discussion document of the Steering Committees of the CDU/CSU Group on "more rule of law at European level" of 13 June 1995.

The document discussing the subsidiarity principle affirms that this principle should be observed and applied as regards both planned legislation and questions of procedure. Some of the powers conferred on the European Union by the treaties should be examined in the light of the subsidiarity principle and, if appropriate, transferred back to national level.

d. Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

Germany, in favour of Option 2, considers that the national and regional levels are the most suitable for ensuring a balance between public and private interests in the field of tourism. The country feels in this regard that tourism has a definite regional dimension in that its development depends on the specific regional differences of tourist destinations. The main role of a European policy on tourism should be to take this point into account with regard to existing Community policies, along the lines of coordination and integration of actions.

GREECE

- Document: "Towards a citizens' Europe-democracy and development", memorandum for the 1996 IGC

As far as the common policies are concerned, the Greek Government considers that one of the outstanding needs in this field is to establish new policies.

- Conclusions of the inter-ministerial committee of the Greek Government

The Greek Government considers that the European integration is in need of stability and credibility. In other words it needs social and political legitimacy. In this context and always in view of the problem of resource allocation-Greece believes that common policies should be developed in new sectors such as tourism and energy.

- Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

Greece believes that it is Option 4 that should be chosen, not only because the other options limit the role of the Union and let it take only isolated and fragmented measures, but also because it would lead to a more global approach which could cover the social aspects of tourism as well(i.e unemployment). A common tourism policy should be complementary to the measures of the Member States which should take account of national characteristics. Greece proposes a specific title in the Treaty for balanced consideration of the three poles.

- Memorandum of 24 January 1996 by the Prime Minister, Mr SIMITIS

This unreservedly endorses incorporation of a title specifically relating to tourism in the Treaty.

SPAIN

- Spain and the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference Document on the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference: starting points for a discussion

The Spanish text raises the question of incorporating new powers in the fields of energy, tourism and civil protection. No positions are anticipated in this respect, but it seems likely that Spain, while continuing to advocate a joint energy authority, will remain unconvinced of the need for a Community Tourist policy.

- Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

Referring to the opinions voiced during the meetings with the relevant circles, Spain excludes Option 4 but states its support for maintaining the present situation with greater horizontal coordination with other EU policies, such as taxation, transport, infrastructure, etc.

ITALY

- Italian Government statement of 23 May 1995 on the Intergovernmental Conference to review the Maastricht Treaty

Regarding the possibility of including among the common policies the other sectors already mentioned in the Treaty, the Italian Government feels that the Union should not be given too many areas of responsibility, but rather that flexible use should be made of the subsidiarity principle, which could be more clearly defined so as to avoid an excessive amount of regulation not only in the Union but also in the member states. However, the Italian Government does not believe it is advisable to draw up a list of exclusive competences.

- Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

Italy feels that there is a need for a sound reference framework which only Option 4 could provide through the introduction of a Community tourism policy. In the view of Italy, Option 3 is a solution which is feasible only if a second action plan is drawn up. The country feels that it is essential to focus on the long-term strategic objectives in order to solve the structural and not merely short-term problems of tourism. Italy believes that it would be a good idea to examine whether and with what instruments it would be possible to exercise a formal specific competence with regard to tourism as for education and culture.

- Final motion by the Italian regions at the round table on 'Tourism - a European resource', held on 9 May 1996 as part of European tourism week

The Italian regions proposed to the European Parliament the introduction of a specific title in the Treaty, which, while respecting the principle of subsidiarity, would set out a policy for the sustainable development of autonomous, multidisciplinary and multidimensional tourism.

LUXEMBOURG

a. Luxembourg Government memorandum of 30 June 1995 on the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference

The Luxembourg Government memorandum referring to general matters connected with the deepening of the Union considers that there is no need to grant the Union any new powers when the Treaty is reviewed.

b. Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

Luxembourg is in favour of strengthening Community action on the basis of the existing Treaty and considers that such action would make it possible to give proper regard both to the growing economic impact of the sector and to its specific horizontal nature, two aspects of vital importance in this context. However, it will in

no way oppose Option 4 which could have definite repercussions on the future of tourism in Europe in legal, financial, psychological and political terms.

AUSTRIA

- a. Guidelines (of the Austrian Government) on the subjects likely to be dealt with at the 1996 IGC

The Austrian Government referring to the functioning of the Community pillar and with regard to granting new powers to the Union believes that Community powers in the field of tourism are not necessary.

- b. Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

In the case of Austria, Option 3 would be supported provided that there is no change in the Treaty. The country voices the concern that Option 4 might lead to new regulations which do not take into equal consideration the needs of the industry and other concerns, such as consumer protection.

FINLAND

- a. Memorandum of the Foreign Ministry of 18 September 1995 on the views of the Finnish Government concerning the 1996 Intergovernmental Conference

On tourism, the Finnish Government believes coordination should be stepped up in the Community framework, initially by making use of existing instruments and resources. It calls for special attention to be given to cooperation on commercialization through out the EU and for cooperation with neighbouring areas, giving special attention to protection of the environment and the cultural heritage when implementing tourist policies.

- b. Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

Option 4 has been the subject of serious consideration in Finland, which sees a clear need to strengthen the role of tourism in the policies of the Union, which especially entails a stronger coordinating role for the Commission. Finland nevertheless feels that a thorough analysis and discussion of the implications of Option 4, especially the financial aspects, should be carried out. Furthermore, Finland wishes to emphasise the need to keep decision-making powers in the national sphere with regard to questions on basic tourism policy issues.

UNITED KINGDOM

Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

For the United Kingdom, none of the four options outlined in the Green Paper quite corresponds to its view. It certainly could not accept the creation of a formal Community competence in the tourism field or any increased activity under the Tourism Action Plan. The United Kingdom could not agree to additional Community powers in the field of tourism, nor does it see any need for a specific Community policy on tourism. The only concession on the part of the United Kingdom is that it believes that the primary responsibility for tourism must lie at national level and regional/local level but recognises that there is a role for the Community to play in safeguarding the interest of the industry.

NETHERLANDS

Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

For the Netherlands, the Member States are primarily responsible for tourism policy. The Netherlands is not in favour of actual expansion of the Treaty in the field of tourism and is against the introduction of a special paragraph on tourism. It does not consider it advisable to increase Community actions in the field of tourism but rather to strengthen existing measures affecting tourism and, for this purpose, to secure additional financial resources.

- Communication 'Between Madrid and Turin: Dutch priorities on the eve of the 1996 IGC', presented in March 1996

This sets out the Netherlands' opposition to incorporation into the Treaties of new policies, such as energy, tourism and civil defence.

PORTUGAL

Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

For Portugal, the legal basis has to guarantee the strengthening of Community action on tourism, which requires the coordination of policy between the Commission and the Member States.

IRELAND

Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

For Ireland, strengthening existing measures and increasing funding for them would serve only to highlight the inadequacy of the current legal framework. The country

considers that the Community should exercise a specific competence as regards tourism along the lines of the competencies acknowledged for other policy areas which are the subject of detailed provisions in the existing Treaty. In principle, Ireland is open to discussing with partners the modalities of the inclusion of a title on tourism in a revised Treaty.

FRANCE

Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

France considers that it is premature to offer any judgement on the four scenarios proposed in the Green Paper. Assessment during the three-year plan must make it possible for the first actions to be evaluated and for clear lines of action to emerge. It is only thereafter that consideration can be given to significantly reinforcing the level of European action.

SWEDEN

Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper - Summary of contributions by ministers responsible for tourism in the member states of the Union

Sweden shares the view of the Danish government regarding all the above mentioned matters.

V. THE INDEPENDENT ORGANISATIONS

a. Summary of contributions made by the organisations participating in the Commission's consultation meetings with the tourist industry

Ref: Consultation on the basis of the Green Paper-A step further towards recognition of Community action to assist tourism, European Commission / Directorate General XXIII, Forum on European Tourism-Brussels, 8 December 1995.

ACI (Airports Council International) welcomes the Green Paper but does not comment on the options and does not take any position.

IRU "would favour more consultation and debate before indicating a clear preference" for an option. However, IRU believes that "existing means should be better deployed to obtain a better coordination and cooperation between the Commission services active in the field of tourism".

EUROCHAMBERS considers that, "while Community policies and instruments can, through a coherent approach, create added value for tourism, tourism itself-through its multi-disciplinary nature-also constitutes added value for most European Union policies". However, this organisation "reserves its opinion on the various options proposed until the comprehensive study on tourism, or more precisely on the cost of 'non-tourism', has been carried out". Nevertheless, "the possibility of a reduction or

elimination of specific Community actions should be ruled out straightaway, since it runs counter not only to the underlying principles of tourism itself but also to the interests of tourism enterprises, employees in the sector and European tourists and citizens as a whole".

ECTAA members "are not in a position to subscribe to any of the proposed options". As far as option 3 is concerned ECTAA feel that they are "given no guarantees as to whether this option will contribute to the achievement of their goals and therefore reserve their final position". As far as option 4 is concerned ECTAA members "cannot commit themselves to the principle of a new article in the Treaty without knowing in advance what would be its content".

HOTREC (Hotel and Restaurant Council) is of the view that the information at its disposal is not sufficiently complete to allow it to select among the four options proposed. Nevertheless, this organisation considers that "an article formulated along the lines of Article 130 and which clearly incorporates three basic conditions (consideration of the tourism industry's views, a reduction in the amount of regulation, and the provision of aid to the tourism industry in order to increase durable economic growth and jobs) might perhaps be acceptable". This opinion is accompanied by the provision that "the concerns of the industry must be the driving force behind any action taken within the framework of such an article".

IFTO (International Federation of Tour Operators) believes that there is a need to "differentiate the roles and responsibilities for EU, national, regional and local levels". IFTO proposals assuming that "the principle of subsidiarity is particularly important to enable tourism to be successful locally", appear to lie between option 2 and option 3.

"It is unclear what added value would be given by seeking an EU tourism policy (option 4), as such **EFCO** (European Federation of Camping site Organisations) would propose that an appropriate administrative structure could be achieved through option 3, strengthening Community action via the existing Treaty. However considerable investment of resources and political will are both necessary if this is to be achieved".

CEMr, through supporting option 3, is "strongly in favour of a reinforcement of EU policy on tourism and tourism-related Community activities on the basis of the well established existing legal framework".

FEG, is of the opinion that option 3 "could be an intermediary state before reaching the 4th alternative". Concerning promotion, **ETC** "can only express interest in a general increase in further joint action which may develop out of option 3 in the Green Paper. ETC members are certainly in favour of EU support, but in compliance with the principle of subsidiarity, recognising that they are responsible for maintaining their own share in a competitive world market. In other aspects of the Green Paper, ETC subscribes to the views expressed by **ETAG**". **ETAG** (European Tourism Action Group) urges that "tourism should be fully recognised as a major economic and social force by the EU and in the Treaty". But, while option 4 in the Green Paper "might best lead to action in this direction", **ETAG** members conclude that consideration should

be given to a 5th option that "would look forward to a strengthening of European action in support of tourism on the basis of full industry consultation and cooperation, the removal of constraint and regulation, and a move towards public/private sector partnership in collective action".

EFCT (European Federation of Conference Towns) is of the opinion that "even by strengthening Community action via the existing treaty, tourism initiatives seem to remain 'passive' rather than 'active'. Under these circumstances, option 3 has no chance to signify any improvement for the tourism industry as a whole". EFCT is convinced that "tourism should become fully recognised in the treaty as a major economic and social force and looks at next year's IGC to endorse this. However EFCT supports ETAG's 5th option".

IATM (International Association of Tour Managers), FECTO (Federation of European Cities Tourist Offices), EUFED also support the 5th option proposed by ETAG. The ICCA (International Congress and Convention Association) European Council puts forward the view that "Tourism should be included in the revised Maastricht Treaty planned for 1996".

ETOA (European Tour Operators Association) would advocate the 4th option. The reason for this is that ETOA does not consider that any of the other options will help to raise the profile of tourism, which is necessary if the industry is to gain the support and recognition it deserves. Nevertheless this position is subject to certain provisos. IAPCO (International Association of Professional Congress Organizers) favours option 4 which "poses the question of greater EU action in favour of tourism. It asks whether there could be a Community policy which is complementary to that of the Member States and also sets the norm for the other actions dealing with tourism". EUROGITÉS, although not expressly advocating option 4, "urges that the gap left in the Treaty of Rome, corrected by the Maastricht Treaty, be made good without delay via the setting up of an authority with the means to carry forward a genuine Community tourism policy.

For EUROTER (Tourisme en Europe Rurale) "option 4 seems to offer the best framework with the social, cultural and economic dimension which the tourism phenomenon has taken on; this dimension in itself provides justification for introducing a recognition of the field of tourism into the Treaty".

EUROPARKS "follows option 4, the more so as it seems to be the only option that eventually will lead to inclusion of an article on tourism in the new treaty".

BITS Europe also supports option 4. "Given the international character of tourism due to the cross border nature of its activities", the European Tourism Liaison Committee (ECF-IUF/CTWUEC/EURO-FIET) believes that "the problems can only be dealt with at European or international level". Moreover, since "many tourists from other continents regard their visit as being to Europe rather than to a number of separate countries", there is a case for looking at tourism from a European point of view as well as from the point of view of each country. Therefore, ETLC "welcomes the European Commission's commitments to the sector and endorses its initiative to fully incorporate tourism in the revised Treaty" at the IGC of 1996.

For WTTC (World Travel and Tourism Council), option 3 "would not guarantee that Travel and Tourism's growth and job creation potential would be adequately reflected in general EU policy making or within the work of EU institutions. The strengthening of an ad hoc action plan for tourism cannot deliver this potential without the existence of an overall EU strategy for tourism". Thus "option 4 is the preferred approach: Travel and Tourism should be included in the Treaty on European Union in a meaningful way, with due regard for the principle of subsidiarity".

AIT/FIA believes that option 4 "will be the only way to achieve real added value to the policy efforts in the field of tourism made by the Member States, the tourism industry and tourism organizations". For this organization: "More than ever before the Commission has an important complementary role to play in coordinating, encouraging and supporting national and regional tourism policies within the Union. This can only be done if this complementary role, and the resulting measures to develop general strategic economic and social priorities in the field of tourism are based on a Community tourism policy, rooted and safeguarded in a specific and separate legal title in the treaty.

EUTO (European Union of Tourist Officers) is of "the unshakeable opinion that nothing less than a specific title in the Treaty should be given to tourism. Competence to act in all aspects relating to tourism, having regard to the principle of subsidiarity, is the declared objective of EULT". Moreover, EUTO strongly urges that the "Community develops a tourism policy" and stresses the "need for the national policies to be coordinated and given a common sense of direction. EUTO is of the firm opinion that this very necessary leadership can only be given, must be given, by the Union.

b. COAST (Co-Ordinated Action for Seaside Towns): The role of the Union in the field of tourism-A response to the Green Paper, June 1995, p.6.

The COAST network supports the following measures and actions with respect to the Green Paper on the Role of the Union in the field of Tourism: A. The case for a European competence/Treaty article on Tourism issues (Option IV as outlined in the Green Paper) B. The case for increased financial resources to be devoted to tourism issues by the European Commission C. The case for greater coordination at a European level over Community action in the field of tourism. This should be achieved by promoting a more unified approach between the different DGs in respect of tourism through agreed tourism policies, strategy and Action Plans. D. Strong support should be given to recognition of the fact that tourism deserves special consideration as an industry undergoing structural change yet possessing great potential for economic growth and new employment opportunities. E. Traditional coastal resort areas should be targeted for specific assistance through an integrated approach to regeneration to overcome the complex range of issues and problems to which they are subject as tourist areas.

VI. TABLES: POSITIONS CONCERNING THE TOURISM POLICY

A. The Member States

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Not stated
A			X		
B				X	
D		X			
DK					X
E		X			
F					X
FIN			X		
GR				X	
I				X	
IRL				X	
L ¹			X		
NL		X			
P			X		
S					X
UK		X			

¹ Luxembourg has indicated that it will in no way oppose Option 4

The options

1. Tourism benefits from the various Community programmes no need for a specific action programme
2. Maintenance of the present framework
3. Strengthening of Community action on the basis of the existing Treaty
4. Towards a Community tourism policy

B. The organisations

OPTION ORGANISATION	1	2	3	4	OTHER
ACI					X
AIT/FIA				X	
BITS				X	
CEMr			X		
ECTAA					X
EFCO			X		
EFCT				X	
ETAG				X	
ETC			X		
ETLC				X	
ETOA				X	
EUFED				X	
EUROCHAMBERS					X
EUROGITES				X	
EUROPARKS				X	
EUROTER				X	
EUTO				X	
PECTO				X	
FEG			X	X	
HOTREC					X
IAPCO				X	
IATM				X	
ICCA				X	
IFTO		X	X		
IRU					X
WTTC				X	

GENERAL REFERENCES

1. Treaty on European Union: Declaration n. 1 on Civil Protection, Energy and Tourism

"The Conference declares that the question of introducing into the Treaty establishing the European Community Titles relating to the spheres referred to in Article 3(t) of that Treaty will be examined, in accordance with the procedure laid down in Article N(2) of the treaty on European Union, on the basis of a report which the Commission will submit to the Council by 1996 at the latest. The Commission declares that Community action in those spheres will be pursued on the basis of the present provisions of the Treaties establishing the European Communities.

2. Treaty on European Union: Article 3

"For the purposes set out in Article 2, the activities of the Community shall include, as provided in this Treaty and in accordance with the timetable set out therein: ...t) measures in the spheres of energy, civil protection and tourism".

* * * * *

For further information concerning this note, please contact Mr Stefan KRAUSS or Mr Javier FERNANDEZ, Task-force 1996 IGC, tel.: 4102 (Lux) - 4916 (Str)