

might be in the event of major revaluations occurring for any currency.

So far as Amendments Nos 5 and 6 are concerned, I would explain to Mr Görlach that the limits which the Commission has put in its present proposal are meant to reflect as accurately as we can the effect of the present system and therefore compensate, at an individual farmer basis for the loss of income arising from the abolition of the present VAT-based system. That is the reason for the particular limits that the Commission has adopted. They are of course limits, they are not absolute figures, because it will be up to the Federal Government to decide, on the basis of these limiting figures of the minimum and maximum amounts of compensation, what the actual figures might be, but always within the context of an overall limit of DM 2,200m which is roughly equivalent to the loss of income the farmers are suffering from the abolition of the VAT-based systems. So, there is no increase on the total amount and these particular limits correspond to the present position as accurately as we can calculate matters.

Amendment No 5 could produce an effect which the honourable Member would not wish to happen, namely that if someone had suffered a loss of only DM 1,500 the amendment would provide for compensation of DM 2,500 as an absolute minimum. I do not think that is the intention of the amendment. Therefore we believe these figures are the best we can produce in the situation and so cannot accept Amendments Nos 5 and 6. I hope the honourable gentleman will accept that explanation in the spirit in which it is intended. I understand his motivation in arguing for these amendments.

So far as Amendments Nos 3 and 4 are concerned, the Commission is very happy to accept them and they will be incorporated in the proposal.

I thank Mr Dalsass again for the work he has done on this matter.

DER PRÄSIDENT. - Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet in der Abstimmungsstunde statt.

EF's regionalpolitik og miljøet

Regionalpolitik und Umwelt

Περιφερειακή κοινοτική πολιτική και περιβάλλον

Regional policy and the environment

Politica regional comunitaria y medio ambiente

Politique régionale communautaire et environnement

Politica regionale comunitaria sull'ambiente

Communautaire regionaal beleid voor het milieu

Politica regional e ambiente

DER PRÄSIDENT. - Nach der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht (Dok. A3-170/92) von Herrn Harrison im Namen des Ausschusses für Regionalpolitik, Raumordnung und Beziehungen zu den regionalen und lokalen Körperschaften über die Auswirkungen der gemeinschaftlichen Regionalpolitik auf die Umwelt.

HARRISON (S), rapporteur. - Mr President, in Rio de Janeiro the world's leaders are considering the very future of our planet and how to resolve the dilemma of securing much-needed development while safeguarding the environment. Our own responsibility here in the Community begins at home. The new treaty, despite the current confusion over its future, places great stress on integrating the environment into all the Community's policies. Regional policy is taking on ever greater political importance, with a budget to match: ECU 125b over the lifetime of the Delors II package. Such a large sum of money can clearly be a force for good or ill in environmental terms. It is up to us to ensure it brings genuinely beneficial development whilst protecting and enhancing the environment.

I must stress that the fundamental principle underlying my report is that the environment should not be seen as an obstacle to development. On the contrary. The environment and its resources are essential for real development. Water, soil and clean air are the very building blocks of development. Wildlife depend on these same resources and enrich our environment and our lives. The structural funds cannot achieve their objective of lasting social and economic cohesion unless this environment is safeguarded.

While preparing this report I visited Greece and Spain to see Community regional development in action. I also held extensive discussions with Commission staff whom I should like to thank for their openness and cooperation. I recognise, of course, that the Commission is making great efforts to protect the environment. The structural funds are spending many millions of ECU each year on environmental projects. When the structural fund regulations were last reformed in 1988, significant steps forward were made in the environmental safeguards built into the planning process. Yet I cannot escape the conclusion after all my investigations that much remains to be done. In many cases environmental factors are incorporated into planning only at a very late stage, if at all. Member States' own environmental agencies are often not consulted on plans for structural fund programmes and projects. Environmental impact assessments can be of very variable quality. The existing direc-

tive is not on the same wavelength as the structural fund system, focusing on projects rather than whole programmes. It is not able to assess the impact of programmes. It is often very difficult for the public and even for Members of the European Parliament to obtain information on what the structural funds are doing. The people who will be directly affected by development projects are seldom asked for their views on what kind of development they want or given the opportunity to comment on plans going to Brussels.

At the Commission level, DG XI does not have enough information to enable it to assess the environmental impact of projects or programmes. It is also desperately understaffed for the massive workload facing it: 9 staff have to monitor some ECU 18b of expenditure this year. There are also serious doubts about the cost-effectiveness of some structural fund projects. The Commission does not appear to require cost-benefit analyses that cover all the relevant factors including environmental costs. I was particularly concerned during my research for this report by the planned diversion of the River Acheloos in Greece and certain irrigation projects in Spain. Both will cause serious environmental problems and in both cases there seem to be serious doubts about the assumed economic benefits.

I would note, Mr President, that it has just been announced that the Acheloos diversion is to go ahead. Indeed I understand the Commission has increased the Community contribution. This is a matter of very grave concern in view of the international outcry against this project and the serious doubts about its environmental impact and economic rationale. I urge the Commission to review its decisions. Clearly something must be done.

In my own constituency in the UK, Euro-funds may be sought by the promoters of the developing Liverpool airport and of the Mersey barrage project. Difficult choices will have to be made in each case.

In my report we make a number of proposals. We propose that the structural fund regulations which the Commission is in the process of rewriting should contain an explicit commitment to the environmentally sustainable use of natural resources. The regulations send clear signals to the Member States of the principles and purpose of regional policy. It is important that they should clearly state this fundamental objective. This principle should be put into practice through special sections in each Community support framework, setting out how sustainable development will be achieved. Substantial Community funding should be made available through this mechanism to incorporate the environment into all planning through compre-

hensive environmental impact assessment, land use planning, training, appropriate technology and so forth. This requirement can be put into practice by amending Article 8 of Regulation 4253/88 to provide a clear legal basis.

Wide consultation on structural fund planning is essential. Government environmental agencies should be consulted together with non-governmental groups. Changes to the regulations to ensure this will prevent differences in practice in different Member States.

I conclude by saying that the report also makes other proposals which I do not have time to go into. We have discussed this report extensively in the Committee on Regional Policy, Regional Planning and Relations with Regional and Local Authorities. I believe there is strong support for the proposal in Parliament with the regulations being reviewed. The time is right for Parliament to contribute to the debate. I hope the Commission will heed what we have to say.

ΡΩΜΑΙΟΣ (S). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η πορεία των αναπτυξιακών πρωτοβουλιών της Κοινότητας έτσι όπως ξεκίνησε από το 1988 με την αναδιάρθρωση των Ταμείων, είχε παράλληλο στόχο την περιβαλλοντική αυτοσυντηρούμενη ανάπτυξη. Ήταν ένας φιλόδοξος στόχος, ο οποίος λόγω κυρίως της έλλειψης ικανού θεσμικού πλαισίου και διαφορετικής αντίληψης για την ανάπτυξη και για το περιβάλλον, σε πολλές περιπτώσεις έμεινε ανεκπλήρωτος και ακόμη και σήμερα αποτελεί πεδίο αντιπαράθεσης ανάμεσα στην Κοινότητα, τα κράτη μέλη και τις περιφερειακές διοικήσεις.

Πέρα από το γενικότερο προβληματισμό, όσον αφορά τη σχέση ανάπτυξη-περιβάλλον, ούτως ή άλλως, θα εξακολουθεί να παραμένει επίκαιρος, θα πρέπει να αντιληφθούμε ότι στη σημερινή συγκυρία, οι πολιτικές πρόληψης για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος αποτελούν αναγκαίο όρο της περιφερειακής ανάπτυξης.

Οι βασικές προτάσεις του εισηγητή, που βασίζονται σ' αυτές τις διαπιστώσεις, μας βρίσκουν σύμφωνους. Είναι ιδιαίτερα θετική η αναφορά στο ψήφισμα της δεύτερης Συνδιάσκεψης του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου και των Περιφερειών της Κοινότητας. Είναι αυτονόητο ότι, οι κάτοικοι των περιοχών στις οποίες εκτελούνται τα αναπτυξιακά έργα, έχουν μεγαλύτερη ευαισθησία από τις κεντρικές κυβερνήσεις για την προστασία του περιβάλλοντος και τη λελογισμένη αξιοποίηση των φυσικών πόρων. Για να διασφαλισθεί ο αρμονικός συνδυασμός της ανάπτυξης και της προστασίας του περιβάλλοντος, πρέπει να διευρυνθεί η συμμετοχή των αιρετών εκπροσώπων της αυτοδιοίκησης σ' όλες τις διαδικασίες επιλογής και εκτέλεσης των έργων που χρηματοδοτούνται από τα κοινοτικά Ταμεία.

Στην παρούσα φάση της αναθεώρησης των κανονισμών των Διαρθρωτικών Ταμείων πρέπει να υπάρξει θεσμική ρύθμιση, ώστε τα έργα να μην επιφέρουν αρνητικές επιπτώσεις στο περιβάλλον. Όμως, πρέπει να δοθεί ιδιαίτερη προσοχή στην τελική διατύπωση αλλά και στην εφαρμογή αυτών των θεσμικών ρυθμίσεων, έτσι ώστε να μην υπονομεύεται ο βασικός στόχος των Διαρθρωτικών Ταμείων, δηλαδή η περιφερειακή ανάπτυξη. Παράλληλα, επιβάλλεται ιδιαίτερα προσεκτική αντιμετώπιση από την Επιτροπή στις μελέτες και τα στοιχεία που τα κράτη μέλη, η διοίκηση και ανεξάρτητοι οργανισμοί και ενώσεις υποβάλλουν. Συχνά, έχουν διαπιστωθεί καλοπροαίρετες μεν, αλλά και υπερβολικές κριτικές από οικολογικές και άλλες οργανώσεις και εμπλοκή ανταγωνιστικών οικονομικών συμφερόντων άλλων χωρών, ή και τοπικών αντιθέσεων. Χαρακτηριστική περίπτωση είναι, όπως ανέφερε και ο εισηγητής στην ομιλία του πριν από λίγο, το έργο της εκτροπής του Αχελώου στην Ελλάδα, για την οποία ο εισηγητής και στην αιτιολογική έκθεσή του κάνει εκτενή αναφορά. Οι έγκυρες επιστημονικές μελέτες ανατρέπουν τους ισχυρισμούς ότι η εκτροπή θα προκαλέσει αρνητικές επιπτώσεις στο βιότοπο της περιοχής, και φυσικά, δεν συμφωνώ με την προτροπή που έκανε προς την Επιτροπή για αναθεώρηση του έργου. Εμείς υποστηρίζουμε ότι έχει προηγηθεί της έγκρισης μια πολύπλευρη συνεργασία με την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή, ώστε να διασφαλισθεί η ισορροπία του οικοσυστήματος. Αυτονόητο είναι, γι' αυτό το ζητούμε, ότι η Επιτροπή οφείλει να παρακολουθήσει την απόλυτη τήρηση των οδηγιών της κατά την εκτέλεση του έργου.

Τελειώνοντας, κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω να τονίσω ότι η βιωσιμότητα των κοινοτικών πολιτικών για την περιφερειακή ανάπτυξη, δεν κρίνεται πλέον μόνο με οικονομικούς ή κοινωνικούς δείκτες αποτελεσματικότητας, η μέριμνα για το περιβάλλον διαμορφώνει φερέξής την ποιοτική εικόνα κάθε κοινοτικής δράσης για την ανάπτυξη.

ORTIZ CLIMENT (PPE). - Señor Presidente, quiero felicitar, en primer lugar, al Sr. Harrison por el excelente informe sobre la política regional comunitaria y sus repercusiones en el medio ambiente, y no solamente por el contenido de su informe, sino también por la oportunidad de su presentación y debate en este Parlamento. Oportunidad, en primer lugar, porque tenemos ya datos suficientes, en relación con la reforma de los fondos estructurales llevada a cabo en 1988 y que termina el año que viene, para examinar de qué forma hemos invertido los fondos estructurales, qué actividades productivas, en qué medios y cuáles han sido las repercusiones ambientales. En segundo lugar, la oportunidad se refleja también en que, en estos momentos, tenemos necesidad de programar de nuevo los marcos comunitarios de apoyo y los programas operativos en los países miembros, en cada una de las regiones implicadas, de cara a 1997.

Y, en tercer lugar, porque la Comunidad Económica Europea debe dar ejemplo -y así lo ha dado- en la reunión de la Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas sobre Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo, celebrada en Río. Mundialmente se reconoce que este problema no solamente incide a nivel regional, sino de países y de grandes bloques en todo el mundo.

Por otro lado, también recoge el ponente las conclusiones de la Conferencia de las Regiones de noviembre de 1991, donde se dio una gran importancia al papel de la defensa del medio ambiente en las regiones. Sí al desarrollo, sí a la utilización de los recursos naturales y de actividades productivas, pero, igualmente, con un respeto profundo hacia el medio ambiente.

En estos momentos, por parte de la Comisión, se nos argumenta que falta personal y recursos para controlar debidamente la ejecución y los impactos ambientales de las reformas estructurales establecidas. Es cierto, y así lo creemos, y no queremos establecer muchos más gastos, pero, para llevar a cabo un control y seguimiento de programas, tanto específicos como Envireg, como de aquellos que se derivan de los programas de desarrollo regional o de los fondos estructurales por medio del FEDER o del FEOGA, hace falta un mayor desarrollo y planificación de la utilización de la tierra y de su entorno. Cualquier medida que los entes locales y regionales puedan aportar, además de los Estados miembros, supondrá un gran beneficio al conjunto de nuestras inversiones en materia de infraestructura y de respeto del medio ambiente. Creo que es muy apropiada -y tengo que felicitar a la Comisión- la Directiva 85/337, y sería necesario que cada Estado miembro y cada gobierno regional la aplicara a rajatabla, que no se aprobara un proyecto público o privado sin que previamente se haya elaborado un informe en materia de repercusiones ambientales. Ese control, señor Presidente, no lo puede hacer la Comisión. Soy consciente de que no lo puede hacer; lo deben hacer los Estados miembros y los poderes regionales y locales. Las repercusiones ambientales son fundamentales y no podemos escatimar esfuerzos en el control y en el seguimiento.

Por otro lado, señor Presidente, es importante el Acuerdo de Maastricht, el Tratado de la Unión, porque refleja la preocupación por la defensa del medio ambiente y quiero instar, señor Presidente, a que los objetivos del Fondo de cohesión -que son muy claros: mejora de infraestructuras y defensa del medio ambiente- se apliquen sin demora a partir de enero de 1993 y que cada Estado miembro asuma la responsabilidad de hacer una salvaguardia del medio ambiente, como el compromiso de Maastricht lo requiere.

PIMENTA (LDR). - Senhor Presidente, em primeiro lugar quero felicitar o colega Harrison. Compartilhamos totalmente do seu relatório e das conclusões a que chega, pelo que vamos apoiar e votar favoravelmente todo o conjunto do relatório.

Gostaria agora de deixar ao senhor comissário aqui presente três ou quatro mensagens claras, directas, da parte de alguém que já teve a responsabilidade de aplicar este tipo de projectos em Portugal e que sabe bem como hoje em dia os fundos estruturais, em muitos casos, têm contribuído para a degradação do meio ambiente.

Primeira mensagem: é necessário mudar a base jurídica e os regulamentos dos fundos estruturais, como diz o relatório Harrison. Não está claro, hoje em dia, a nível dos regulamentos dos fundos estruturais, qual é a prioridade e a capacidade de actuação em termos de meio ambiente, nomeadamente porque muitos Estados não regulamentaram, no caso do FEOGA-Orientação, as possibilidades que estavam nos regulamentos-base. Portanto, é preciso clarificar a base jurídica e as possibilidades de actuação.

Segunda mensagem: democracia. As comissões de acompanhamento a nível dos planos regionais são fechadas. São conjuntos de funcionários públicos. É

necessário abrir, nas regiões, às organizações não governamentais, ao público, os processos de elaboração das operações integradas de desenvolvimento regional e, depois, o acompanhamento da sua implementação. Não pode ser só um assunto que diz respeito apenas aos governos, às regiões ou aos funcionários públicos de cada Estado-membro. Democracia, abertura ao cidadão: é a única maneira de controlar efectivamente, em termos práticos e concretos, a aplicação dos fundos estruturais.

Terceira mensagem: aplicação do direito comunitário. É inacreditável que, por pressões políticas, a Comissão deixe passar projectos que não foram sujeitos a estudos de impacto ambiental nem tiveram discussões públicas, abertas, como deve ser. Isso tem acontecido em vários Estados-membros e eu sou testemunha de alguns desses casos.

Finalmente, queria deixar uma última palavra sobre o fundo de coesão. É importante que não fiquemos apenas pelos projectos de infra-estruturas. É importante que fique à partida determinado qual é a percentagem certa que a nível europeu vai para os projectos de ambiente.

(Die Sitzung wird um 20.05 Uhr unterbrochen und um 21.00 Uhr wiederaufgenommen.)