

European Communities

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Working Documents

1983 - 1984

13 February 1984

DOCUMENT 1-1347/83

REPORT

drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Transport

on transport infrastructure planning in the
Community

Rapporteur: Mr J. KLINKENBORG


Or. De.

English Edition

PE 83.665/fin.



The Commission of the European Communities forwarded to the European Parliament its report of 29 June 1981 on the implementation of the Council Decision of 20 February 1978 - COM(81) 333 final.

On 14 June 1982 the President of the European Parliament authorized the Committee on Transport to draw up an own-initiative report on the subject. At its meeting of 25 June 1982 the committee appointed Mr KLINKENBORG rapporteur.

The motion for a resolution tabled on 30 September 1982 by Mr GLINNE and others pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on the absence of motorway planning at European level (Doc. 1-647/82) was referred to the Committee on Transport on 11 October 1982. At its meeting of 20 October 1982 the Committee on Transport decided to include this motion for a resolution in Mr KLINKENBORG's report.

At its meeting of 26 November 1982 the Committee on transport held an initial exchange of views on the subject.

At its meeting of 25 January 1983 the committee decided that the report from the Commission of 7 December 1982 on the evaluation of the Community interest of transport infrastructure investments - COM(82) 807 final, should also be considered in Mr KLINKENBORG's report.

At its meeting of 16 February 1983 the Committee on Transport decided that this report should also deal with the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs THEOBALD-PAOLI pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on a special Community programme for Toulon (Doc. 1-1191/82), referred to it on 7 February 1983 for its opinion.

At its meeting of 16 March 1983 the Committee on Transport decided also to consider in this report the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr De Pasquale pursuant to Rule 47 of the Rules of Procedure on planning a fixed link across the straits of Messina (Doc. 1-1338/82) referred to it on 7 March 1983.

At its meeting of 21 September 1983 the committee decided to include in the report the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr ANTONIOZZI on a Community financial and planning contribution to the study and execution of the project to link Sicily to Calabria and the Continent of Europe across the Straits of Messina (Doc. 1-636/83), which had been referred to it on 12 September 1983.

At its meeting of 18 October 1983 the committee also decided that the report should cover the two motions for resolutions referred to it on 10 October 1983, viz. that tabled by Mr CROUX and others on improvements to infrastructures in the Rhine-Meuse Euregio (Doc. 1-745/83) and that tabled by Mr TURNER on Community funding for transport infrastructure in East Anglia (Doc. 1-764/83). At its meeting of 2 November 1983 the committee decided that the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr PAISLEY and others on measures to assist certain islands (Doc. 1-885/83), which had been referred to it for an opinion on 28 October 1983 be dealt with in this report. At its meeting of 23 January 1984 the committee decided in addition to include in the report the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr ALMIRANTE and others on the construction of the Pistoia-Modena motorway route (Doc. 1-1225/83), which had been referred to it on 16 January 1984.

The committee considered the draft report at its meeting of 1 December 1983 and adopted the motion for a resolution unanimously at its meeting of 23 January 1984.

The following took part in the vote: Mr Seefeld (chairman), Mr Kaloyannis (vice-chairman), Mr Klinkenborg (rapporteur), Mr Baudis, Mr Buttafuoco, Mr Chanterie (deputizing for Mrs von Alemann), Mr Gabert, Mr Gatto (deputizing for Mr Ripa di Meana), Mr Gouthier (deputizing for Mr Candia), Mr Key, Mr Loo (deputizing for Mr Albers), Mr Martin, Mr Moreland (deputizing for Mr Marshall), Mr Moorhouse, Mr Konstantinos Nikolaou (deputizing for Mr Lagakos), Mrs Scaroni and Mr Vandewiele.

This report was tabled on 30 January 1984.

The deadline for tabling amendments will be indicated in the draft agenda for the sitting at which the report is to be considered.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
A. Motion for a resolution	6
B. Explanatory statement	13
I. Bases for transport infrastructure planning in the Community	13
II. Route planning as a Community problem	14
III. The work of the Committee on Transport Infrastructures ..	20
IV. Practical experience in evaluating the Community interest of infrastructure projects	22
V. Detailed consideration of the Community interest of a fixed link across the Strait of Messina	24
VI. Conclusions	31
 Annex I: Motion for a resolution by Mr GLINNE and others on the absence of motorway planning at European level (Doc. 1-647/82)	
 Annex II: Motion for a resolution by Mr DE PASQUALE on planning a fixed link across the straits of Messina (Doc. 1-1338/82)	
 Annex III: Motion for a resolution tabled by Mr ANTONIOZZI on a Community financial and planning contribution to the study and execution of the project to link Sicily to Calabria and the Continent of Europe across the Straits of Messina (Doc. 1-636/83)	
 Annex IV: Motion for a resolution by Mr CROUX and others on improvements to infrastructures in the Rhine-Meuse Euregio (Doc. 1-745/83)	
 Annex V: Motion for a resolution by Mr TURNER on Community funding for transport infrastructure in East Anglia (Doc. 1-764/83)	
 Annex VI: Motion for a resolution by Mr AIMIRANTE and others on the construction of the Pistoia-Modena motorway route (Doc. 1-1225/83)	

Annex VII.: Some methodological aspects of the appraisal of major investment projects of Community interest

Annex VIII : Some indicators of the economic situation and the development potential of Sicily, particularly with regard to the construction of a fixed link across the Straits of Messina

Annex IX : Note on financial support for transport infrastructure projects of Community interest under Chapter 78 (transport expenditure) of the Community budget

The Committee on Transport hereby submits to the European Parliament the following motion for a resolution together with explanatory statement:

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

on measures in the field of transport infrastructure in the Community

The European Parliament,

- A. having regard to the report of the Commission of the European Community on the implementation of the Council Decision of 20 February 1978 instituting a consultation procedure and setting up a committee in the field of transport infrastructure (COM(81) 333 final),
- B. having regard to the report from the Commission on the Community Interest of Transport Infrastructure Investments: practical experience with the evaluation methodology (COM(82) 807 final),
- C. having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr GLINNE and others on the absence of motorway planning at European level (Doc. 1-647/82),
- D. having regard to the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs THEOBALD-PAOLI on a special Community programme for Toulon (Doc. 1-1191/82),
- E. having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr DE PASQUALE on planning a fixed link across the straits of Messina (Doc. 1-1338/82),
- F. having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr ANTONIOZZI on a Community financial and planning contribution to the study and execution of the project to link Sicily to Calabria and the Continent of Europe across the Straits of Messina (Doc. 1-636/83),
- G. having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr CROUX and others on improvements to infrastructures in the Rhine-Meuse Euregio (Doc. 1-745/83),
- H. having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr TURNER on Community funding for transport infrastructure in East Anglia (Doc. 1-764/83),
- I. having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr PAISLEY and others on measures to assist certain islands (Doc. 1-885/83),
- J. having regard to the motion for a resolution by Mr ALMIRANTE and others on the construction of the Pistoia-Modena motorway route (Doc. 1-1225/83),

- K. having regard to its resolutions of 10 June 1983 on a transport infrastructure experimental programme¹, of 7 May 1981 on the Community's role in the development of transport infrastructure², of 9 March 1982 on the future of the Community rail network³, of 12 December 1974 on permanent links across certain sea straits⁴ and of 5 June 1973 on the improvement of traffic infrastructures across the Alps⁵, of 8 May 1981 on the construction of a Channel Tunnel⁶, and of 10 June 1983 on the possibilities of providing Community support for a fixed link across the Channel⁷,
- L. having regard to the report by the Committee on Transport (Doc. 1-1347/83),
1. Reaffirms its view that within the present division of responsibilities for transport infrastructure planning a Community dimension must be added to the national dimension, taking on roles of guidance and coordination;
 2. Is convinced that the guiding and coordinating role will be strengthened by the final adoption of the basic regulation proposed by the Commission requiring the Community to provide financial support from its budget for certain projects of special Community interest;
 3. Calls on the Member States to make the furtherance of European integration an express objective of their infrastructure planning;

¹OJ C 184, 11.7.1983, p. 135 et seq.

²OJ C 144, 15.6.1981, p. 41 et seq.

³OJ C 87, 5.4.1982, p. 42 et seq.

⁴OJ C 5, 8.1.1975, p. 43 et seq.

⁵OJ C 49, 28.6.1973, p. 12

⁶OJ C 144, 15.6.1981, p. 98

⁷OJ C 184, 11.7.1983, p. 138

Route planning

4. Believes that the planning of transport links is vitally important to the development of the Community, as the grave problems that have arisen can be resolved only by coordinated planning by all ten Member States; would make the following specific points in this connection:
 - the relationship between the modes of transport must be determined by coordination at European level;
 - the endeavours of the Group of Ten railway undertakings of the Community to achieve a lasting revival of the railways as the most important mode of transport would be helped by coordinated planning of this nature;
 - action to transfer traffic is possible and will have the desired effect only if infrastructures are made compatible;
5. Points out that in its resolution of 9 March 1982 it advocated the expansion of the EEC railway network on the basis of the European infrastructure master plan drawn up by the International Union of Railways and requested the Commission to draw up a route map on that basis taking priority measures into account;
6. Believes that after decades of neglect of rail transport, the development of a modern railway network must be regarded as central to Community transport infrastructure policy;
7. Believes that it is vital to the future of the railways that emphasis be placed on improving the main railway arteries in the Community through provision of adequate capital for rail infrastructure development;
8. Points out that, because of its territorial discontinuity, the Community must also encourage the expansion of the rail network in non-Community countries through which rail traffic between Member States has to pass; in this connection believes that action in Yugoslavia and Austria is required if rail communications with Greece are to meet present day needs;

9. Notes that many international bodies are attempting to coordinate planning of efficient long distance road links in this way, but that actual plans are still decided according to primarily national objectives, and there are few specific arrangements for taking international aspects into account;
-
10. Considers it therefore essential that the Commission actually perform these tasks of guidance and coordination within the Community, and should concern itself with coordinating overall plans and in particular construction schedules;
11. Calls on the Commission in the course of this general planning work to ascertain which major international motorway links and sections important on regional policy grounds are still lacking in the Community; there can be no doubt that it is in the Community's interest to close these gaps in the road network;
12. Points out however that in other respects new motorway construction projects require critical examination in respect of the following problems:
- (a) the scarcity of funds as a result of the general economic crisis;
 - (b) the destruction or disfigurement of the countryside;
 - (c) noxious exhaust emissions and noise from the increasing use of vehicles with combustion engines;
 - (d) policies of transferring heavy goods traffic from roads to rail or internal waterways, especially in relation to efforts to achieve a more efficient use of energy in transport and a solution to the problems of transport across the Alps;
13. Calls upon the Commission to deploy energy and care in its work on the master plan for transport links of Community interest announced by it for the second half of 1984;
14. Emphasizes the importance of airport and port planning in the context of transport infrastructure planning in the Community;

15. Points out that, in committing appropriations from the regional and transport budget, the Commission must assert its role as coordinator and in particular ensure that European transport policy priorities are respected in the distribution of funds among the various forms of transport;

Consultation procedure

16. Believes that the consultation procedure set up by the Council by its Decision of 20 February 1978¹ cannot be effective without a regulation on Community financial support for transport infrastructure projects, but does offer a basically suitable institutional framework within which the trans-frontier infrastructure plans of the Member States of the Community may be coordinated;
17. Regrets the fact that during the first period of activity of the Committee on Infrastructures most Member States adopted a very unenthusiastic attitude towards the consultation procedure;
18. Calls upon the Commission in future to use its right to initiate the consultation procedure and convene the Member States to coordinate their transport infrastructure plans;
19. Calls on all Member States to be scrupulous in giving notification as required by the Council Decision of 20 February 1978, and to provide the Commission with full and detailed information on their transport infrastructure plans;
20. Believes that parliamentary control over the work of the Committee on Infrastructures is essential;

¹OJ L 54, 25.2.1978, p. 16

21. Points out to the Commission that the report on the first period of activity of the Committee on Infrastructures which, under Article 6 of the Decision of 20 February 1978 also has to be forwarded to the European Parliament, does not meet the requirements demanded of it for the exercise of parliamentary control;

22. Believes it is desirable to forward short reports on the results of its work to Parliament following each meeting and that its Chairman should answer questions at a meeting of Parliament's Committee on Transport once a year;

Calls on the Commission in future to do everything in its power to improve parliamentary control over the work of the Committee on Transport Infrastructures;

23. Calls on the Commission also, after exhausting the possibilities of the existing procedure for consultation on transport infrastructures, to consider and propose any improvements the institutional framework of the procedure itself may require;

Evaluation of Community interest

24. Believes that the Commission's first report on practical experience with its methods of evaluating Community interest, using fixed links across the Channel and the Strait of Messina and a new railway tunnel in the Alps as examples, provides no objective and comparable results which could substantially facilitate political decisions fixing priorities;

25. Calls on the Commission to refine and strengthen the instruments of its evaluation method, with a view to achieving the greatest possible degree of objectivity and comparability in the information obtained from this procedure, thereby providing a valuable aid for political decision-making;

26. Points out however that it is methodologically completely unsound for the Commission to base its assessment on data from different sources which cannot therefore be comparable;

27. Calls on the Commission therefore to obtain the initial data for an objective assessment from inquiries conducted by its own services which in the process should cooperate closely with the bodies responsible for planning and executing the projects in question; in the course of such cooperation these evaluation procedures should culminate in detailed cost/benefit calculations quantifying the national and European benefits; in the course of this cooperation the Commission will have to ensure that these calculations are arrived at in the same way for all projects, as they would otherwise not be comparable;
28. Points out that in its opinion of 15 December 1983 on the Commission proposal for a multi-annual transport infrastructure programme, it made a demand to the effect that, to assist with the political decision as to whether a transport infrastructure project should receive support from the Community transport budget, a cost/benefit analysis must first be conducted for each proposed project on the basis of objective criteria common to all projects;
29. Points out that in its resolutions of 5 June 1973¹, 12 December 1974², 8 May 1983³ and 10 June 1983⁴ it stated inter alia that the construction of a new tunnel through the Alps and fixed links across the Channel and the Strait of Messina were prima facie of considerable Community interest; in all three cases this was because the project would forge links between different areas of the European Community separated by natural barriers, whether in peripheral or central positions, and would further the consolidation of a unified economic area;
30. Calls on the Commission therefore to review its evaluation of the Community interest of the three projects mentioned in paragraph 23; for this purpose the Commission should examine all three projects in a pilot study by way of example, and in doing so develop objective criteria for comparing European and national benefit, to be applied to all future projects; in this the Commission should take into account the rapporteur's remarks in the report on which this resolution is based (Doc.1-1347/83) and the annexed comparative table;

¹ OJ C 49, 28.6.1973, p. 12

² OJ C 5, 8.1.1975, p. 43

³ OJ C 144, 15.6.1981, p. 98

⁴ OJ C 184, 11.7.1983, p. 138

31. Calls on the Commission further to take account of the outcome of this review when reassessing and deciding on the second phase of its transport infrastructure experimental programme;
32. Recalls in this connection the demand contained in the Resolution of 10 June 1983 on the transport infrastructure experimental programme¹ that the Commission prevail upon the Member States to submit projects which were of definite interest to the Community;
33. Urges the Commission to apply the method of evaluation developed on the basis of this resolution (Doc. 1-1347/83) to many other projects);
34. Instructs its President to forward this resolution and the committee's report to the Commission and Council of the European Communities.

¹ OJ C 184, 11.7.1983, p. 135 et seq.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTI. Bases for transport infrastructure planning in the Community

1. The European Community's present transport infrastructure policy is based on the Commission Memorandum of 7 November 1979 on the role of the Community in the development of transport infrastructure¹ and on the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 7 May 1981 on the basis of the report by Mr KLINKENBORG (Doc. 1-601/80)². In respect of transport infrastructure planning, this policy may be summed up as, without prejudice to the existing division of responsibilities, advocating that the national dimension be supplemented by a Community dimension, taking over the role of guidance and coordination.
2. In order that projects of Community interest and the Member States' plans and programmes for developing their transport links might be better coordinated, by Decision of 20 February 1978³ the Council introduced a consultation procedure and set up a Committee on Transport Infrastructures. This Decision was based on a Commission proposal⁴ approved by the European Parliament subject to a number of amendments⁵, and replaced the consultation procedure criticized in the European Parliament as inadequate⁶ and contained in the Council Decision of 28 February 1966⁷.
3. The Community's guiding and coordinating role in transport infrastructure planning is closely linked to the granting of financial support from the Community budget for projects of Community interest.

¹Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 8/79

²OJ C 144, 15.6.1981, p. 77 et seq.

³OJ L 54, 25.2.1978, p. 16

⁴Resolution of 4.7.1977, OJ C 184, 1.8.1977, p.15 et seq.

⁵OJ C 207, 2.9.1976, p.7 et seq.

⁶The NYBORG reports, Docs. 377/76 and 185/77

⁷OJ 42, 8.3.1966, p. 583

However, this report will not be touching on this aspect in detail, as Mr MARTIN has already done so in his report on the transport infrastructure experimental programme submitted by the Commission on 14 December 1982. While the question of Community finance for transport infrastructures depends on persuading the Community's inert legislative organ, the Council, finally to act, this report on transport infrastructure planning will be examining how the Commission as the executive of the Community is to make use of an existing and, as we shall see, basically adequate set of instruments for coordinating national infrastructure plans.

II. Route planning as a Community problem

4. Following the KLINKENBORG report on the role of the Community in the development of transport infrastructure, the Committee on Transport recently dealt with two aspects of transport infrastructure planning:

- the future of the Community railway network, in the report by Mr GABERT (Doc. 1-982/81);
- the extension of the network of inland waterways in the Community, in the report by Mr HOFFMANN (Doc. 1-323/82).

The motion for a resolution by Mr GLINNE and others on the absence of motorway planning at European level now provides the opportunity for a closer examination of this sector. It does, however, call for some preliminary remarks on the relationship between the various modes of transport, especially in view of future Community contributions to transport infrastructure investment. It is in fact vital that, when providing budgetary aid for transport infrastructure projects (Article 781, Regional Funds), the Commission respects the priorities of the common transport policy for the development of the various modes of transport.

5. The planning of transport links is fundamental to the future development of the Community because of the unifying effect of such links and because of the dependence of economic development and living standards on adequate communications. Different national approaches to transport policy and route planning in the past have caused serious problems which only joint or at least coordinated planning can remove.
6. If these problems are to be solved, the relative roles of the individual modes of transport must be defined by coordination at European level. Coordinated planning of this kind would effectively support the Group of Ten railway undertakings in the Community in its efforts for a lasting recovery of the railways as the most important mode of transport. However, action to transfer traffic for this purpose can be effective only if infrastructures are compatible.
7. After the decades of neglect of the railways, the development of a modern rail network should be regarded as central to Community transport infrastructure policy. In Mr GABERT's report the Committee on Transport therefore emphatically advocated the expansion of the EEC railway network on the basis of the European infrastructure master plan drawn up by the International Union of Railways and requested the Commission to draw up a route map fixing the Community's priorities. As Mr GABERT dealt with all related matters in his report, there is no need to go into them in detail here.
8. However, the Community's policy for developing the railway network cannot stop at its own borders. As the territory of the Community is not continuous, rail links between several Member States pass through non-Community countries. These transit sections have to be developed at the same rate as the railways within the Community. This is especially true of the sections through Austria and Yugoslavia providing rail links with Greece.
9. Mr GLINNE's motion for a resolution¹ on motorway planning assumes that in some countries in Europe there is a total lack of overall planning

¹Doc. 1-647/82

of road and motorway construction, that the increase in the number of vehicles on the road has been accompanied by the construction of frequently redundant motorways, and that cross-frontier coordination of plans at Community level is essential.

10. International coordination of arterial road planning does in fact already exist under the European Declaration on the construction of main international traffic arteries of 16 September 1950 which came into being at the initiative of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), and was replaced by a new agreement opened for signature on 15 November 1975. The object of this agreement is to establish a network of E roads to be constructed to specific quality standards.
11. The European Conference of Ministers of Transport (ECMT) has devoted great efforts to infrastructure planning, especially the comparative assessment of programmes and projects in the various Member States, and in 1981 published a report by its expert working party on criteria for infrastructure investment. Members of the national administrations¹ believe that the coordination of trans-frontier plans within the ECMT is perfectly satisfactory. On the other hand, the report by the ECMT expert working party concluded, at the very same moment, that transport infrastructure investment decisions were still being reached on primarily national grounds, and that for the most part there were no specific arrangements for taking international aspects into account.
12. On 28 October 1981 the conference of local and regional authorities organized by the Council of Europe adopted a resolution on the European main road network, the annex to which recommended that priority be given to the completion of numerous motorway projects of European interest.

¹ Gleisner, Erwin and Rumpf Karl-Heinz, Transport infrastructure policy-problems at national and international level: Internationales Verkehrswesen, 1981, Vol. 2, p. 91 (96);

² ECMT, Echange d'expériences sur les critères d'investissements retenus pour les projets d'infrastructures des transports terrestres, Paris 1981, p. 7

13. For the area of the European Community, the Commission presented an outline European motorway network in its Memorandum on the role of the Community in the development of transport infrastructure¹. Its Report on bottlenecks² lists the Member States' priorities for motorway construction.
14. Many motions for resolutions tabled in the European Parliament have called for improvements to motorway links, the following since direct elections:
- the Brussels-Strasbourg-Luxembourg motorway, LIMA motion for a resolution, Doc. 1-583/79³;
 - a motorway link between the upper Adriatic and Austria and Yugoslavia, DIDO motion for a resolution, Doc. 1-625/80⁴; CECOVINI motion for a resolution, Doc. 1-582/81⁴; CECOVINI motion for a resolution, Doc. 1-439/82⁵;
 - the Civitavecchia-Leghorn motorway, FILIPPI motion for a resolution, Doc. 1-21/82⁴;
 - the Voltri-Simplon motorway, PININFARINA motion for a resolution, Doc. 1-198/82⁶;
 - the Volos-Igoumenitsa motorway, LAGAKOS motion for a resolution, Doc. 1-309/82⁷;
 - the Innkreis-Pyrhn motorway, SEEFELD motion for a resolution, Doc. 1-335/82⁸.

¹ Bulletin of the European Communities, Supplement 8/79, p. 29

² COM(80) 323 final

³ Included in the KLINKENBORG report on transport infrastructures, Doc. 1-601/80

⁴ Included in the MOORHOUSE report on bottlenecks, Doc. 1-214/82

⁵ Included in the von der VRING report on integrated development operations (Committee on Regional Policy)

⁶ Included in the CAROSSINO report on ports, Doc. 1-844/82 and the COTTRELL report on rail links

⁷ Included in the KLINKENBORG report on Greece

⁸ Included in the BUTTAFUOCO report on freight transport through third countries, Doc. 1-792/82

Pressure groups have also contacted the committee on behalf of the Calais-Bayonne and 'Autostrade Alemagna' (Venice-Munich) motorway projects.

15. As this inventory shows, 'European' planning for a motorway network at present amounts to no more than a shopping list compiling the interests of the various groupings. It ignores:
- Problems arising from the increasing scarcity of funds as a result of the general economic crisis;
 - the ecological and aesthetic damage caused as the countryside is concreted over for motorways;
 - environmental problems caused by increasing numbers of vehicles with combustion engines;
 - any policy of transferring heavy goods traffic from road to rail or internal waterways, as advocated by the European Parliament in the context of energy savings in transport¹ and of transit traffic through the Alps².
16. The master plan of infrastructure links of Community interest described as an objective in the 1979 memorandum and now³ promised for the second half of 1984 has therefore now acquired added importance if the Community's role of guidance and coordination in respect of motorway planning is to be asserted. The deliberations of the Committee on Transport Infrastructures provide the basis for the Commission's work in this field. We shall therefore be examining this institution shortly; but first a number of things need to be said about criteria for a European master plan for the motorway network.
17. Motorway construction has been encountering increasing problems for some time. On the one hand there has been a shortage of public funds which has forced investment to be concentrated on repairs and maintenance. At the same time the public has become

¹ Resolution of 15.10.1981 on the basis of the ALBERS report (Doc. 1-429/81)

² See debate on the oral question by Mr SEEFELD and others on European solutions to the problem of transit traffic in the Alpine region (Doc. 1-298/79), Debates of the European Parliament, Monday, 20 September 1979

³ Commission Communication on progress towards a common transport policy - inland transport - COM(83) 58 final