

BOOK NOTES

Competence of the European Communities for Environmental Policy.

Vol. A 59 in the series, *Beiträge zur Umweltgestaltung*. Erich Schmidt Verlag: West Berlin, 1977, Pp. 120. DM 36. This is a trilingual edition in German, French and English, of a proposal for an Amendment to the Treaty of Rome. Volume A 55, "The Legal Basis for Environmental Policy of the European Community", described how two commissions of the Interparliamentary Working Centre considered the question of competence of the European Communities in environmental affairs, on the basis of the Treaties of Rome and made the final recommendation that an amendment (in accordance with EEC Article 236) should be added in order to include environmental protection as a task for the Communities in the Treaty. Following this decision, Christoph Sasse and Eberhard Grabitz, at the request of the Fonds für Umweltstudien, prepared a draft amendment to the EEC Treaty, which is presented for public discussion.

Since the demand for such a draft came from politicians of all parties — some of whom are members of the European Parliament — it is hoped that political realization will be achieved and not "unlikely to be implemented in the near future" as the pessimistic authors seem to think. By amending some provisions of the EEC Treaty and adding a chapter on environmental policy, this research paper is trying to fill in the lack of unanimity about the role of the community in the management of environmental problems in the Member States. Within the framework of this new chapter "Title III", general and special programmes will have to be drawn up and implemented and a Consultative Environmental Committee will have to be established. It is evident nowadays that the Treaty of Rome is not sufficient and has to be amended in order to be able to deal with environmental problems of European dimension and the recommendations in this book should be implemented immediately

Idaho. And I tried to be conscious of what development in my state might mean to our neighbors. The world has become much more independent, and protecting the quality of life will require increasing international cooperation in the future. President Carter's appointment of Ambassador Richardson to the Law of the Sea Conference demonstrates the bipartisan, united front that we are taking in trying to resolve tough international problems regarding resource development and environmental protection. I don't know exactly what proposals will be put forth, but I do know that our dedication to international cooperation in the environmental realm will be strengthened.

EPL: American television viewers already associate you with the celebrated Idaho potato, just as they associate my friend, Edmund Muskie, with the Maine lobster and are aware of your accomplishments as a committed environmentalist. But for the benefit of members of the international community with whom you will be working, such as NATO's CCMS, IUCN, WWF, and other organizations, could you please elaborate upon your accomplishments such as your opposing a major mining project in a scenic area of your state, your working at the preservation as "wilderness" of more than a million acres of timberland, and on other instances of your experience in the environmental field which may not have attracted international attention before your new appointment.

ANDRUS: I was one of the first governors in the nation to be hung with the "environmentalist" tag. In my 1970 campaign for governor one of the main issues was whether or not the White Clouds mountain region of Idaho should be opened to molybdenum mining. My opponent favored mining, but I insisted that this high scenic areas should be preserved and given national park status. I won that election and proudly wore the tag of "environmentalist." The people of Idaho apparently agreed with me because they gave me 71 percent of the vote in the 1974 election. As governor, I worked for the legislation which was signed last year creating a Hell's Canyon National Recreation Area and banning dams in the deep gorge between Idaho and Oregon. I fought efforts to weaken the Clean Air Act to allow degradation of our

Environmental Policy and Law, 3 (1977)

air in the West. I successfully opposed plans to build a major electrical generating plant in a location where it would spur undesirable growth. I held up phosphate development where I thought it would be detrimental, and pushed for minimum streamflow legislation. One of the accomplishments I am most proud of is the successful fight to get the State Legislature to pass a state land use planning law in 1975. I am a strong booster of locally-initiated, state-assisted land use planning. One of my hopes is that we can get the Congress to enact legislation providing federal encouragement for such state programs.

EPL: It was reported that once you have said that "Industrial growth will only be allowed if industry plays according to Idaho's ground rules and immediately complies 100 per cent with environmental regulations." Do you think that this should apply at the federal level also?

ANDRUS: Yes. Conservation is no longer a pious ideal, it is an element of our survival. What I have said, and what I will do, is to work toward the sound development of our natural resources to help preserve our own standard of living in the United States and our commitments to help others less fortunate around the world. But when there is a question as to whether development is sound, as to whether there may be a serious long-term environmental impact through development, I will come down on the side of the environment every time. If we made a mistake in not developing a resource today or tomorrow, the resource will remain there for our use in the future should we have to have it. But if we develop a resource and at the same time cause irreparable environmental damage, we have both used up that resource and left additional permanent liability for future generations. In the past the population was relatively small and the technology limited enough so that while some terrible damage was done — such as the killing off of passenger pigeons and other species and the scars of unreclaimed strip mining. Yet the damage was limited. Today we have the numbers and the technology to strip the world of its natural riches and to leave a devastated planet. The question is, do we want to do that? I don't believe we do. □