

Trans-European transport network: Community guidelines

1994/0098(COD) - 12/12/1995

The rapporteur, Mr PIECYK (PSE, D), considered that the Council's common position did not demonstrate a political will to transpose the Maastricht objectives. He emphasised that the trans-European transport networks contributed to the economic and social cohesion of the Union. Parliament's position at first reading had been to plan the transport network in such a way as to ensure that access to the network respected the environment. In his view, Parliament should retain in full the position it had adopted at first reading as the Council had not changed its position. The Commissioner, Mr KINNOCK, pointed out that the financial regulation adopted contained transitional provisions that allowed appropriations to be allocated until the end of the year. For the following year Parliament would have to adopt the broad lines under the codecision procedure, which would require a rapid agreement between Parliament and the Council in order to avoid any harmful repercussions. He stated that of the 140 amendments tabled he could adopt 47 in full or in part in addition to a further 13, the substance of which had been incorporated in the Commission's amended proposal of 19 June. Compared with Parliament's first reading, the Commission had changed its mind on 7 amendments, which were taken over. Of the amendments that were rejected, Mr Kinnock referred to Amendments Nos 32, 35, 42, 43 and 52, which added routes of local importance or duplicated those that were already included. He rejected Amendments Nos 60, 61, 67, 69, 71 and 72 on high-speed trains and Amendments Nos 114 and 118 on combined transport as these projects were either not economically viable or could be financed by the states or rail companies. The Commissioner did support the amendments tabled by Parliament at first reading on the environment. As regards Annex 3, the Commission agreed with Parliament that the projects the Council had unanimously excluded from the list in question should provide a basis for the objectives in the short and medium term. Finally, the Commissioner pointed out that although the broad lines related to the territory of a Member State, they required, in accordance with the Treaty, the authorisation of the state concerned.