

Transport of dangerous goods by railway

1994/0284(SYN) - 12/07/1995

According to Mr KINNOCK, this proposal, which provided the Member States with a certain degree of flexibility, did not interfere with the principles of the internal market and the free movement of services. In this context, the Commission could take over Amendment No 5, which gave Member States the right to adopt rules governing the transport of dangerous goods by rail from or to the states of the former Soviet Union, outside the conditions laid down in the annexes, provided that an equivalent standard of safety was maintained. However, it rejected the following amendments as they were inappropriate: Amendment No 1 because the requirement for advance warning would only result in excessive bureaucracy and would not improve safety; Amendment No 2, which sought to prevent trains transporting dangerous goods from transporting passengers, as it would appear to be out of all proportion given that this ban was already in place for explosives and other highly dangerous substances; Amendment No 3 as it was too permissive as regards derogations; and Amendment No 4, which was not consistent with the proposal's aim of eliminating where possible the obstacles to transport by rail.