

Other aspects have been taken into account in the context of European standards. For example, a number of voluntary standards specific to swimming pools are being drawn up by the European Committee for Standardisation (CEN). These relate, for example, to safety signs, floating boundary markers or ladders and steps.

Certain other aspects, particularly those concerning the operation of swimming pools, such as the supervision and information of bathers and the availability of rescue equipment, are the responsibility of the Member States, and the Commission has at present no plans to regulate them by means of Community legislation.

A Directive on the responsibility of service providers might have contributed to improving protection in this area, but in 1994 the Commission decided to withdraw a proposal along these lines <sup>(2)</sup> after taking into account the opinions of Parliament (in particular the Committee on Legal Affairs and Citizens' Rights) and the Economic and Social Committee, and in the light of the considerations relating to subsidiarity (Article 3b) expressed by the Edinburgh European Council.

(1) OJ L 40, 11.2.1989.

(2) OJ L 339, 30.12.1989.

(3) OJ L 77, 26.3.1973.

(4) OJ L 183, 29.6.1989.

(5) OJ C 12, 18.1.1991.

(1999/C 96/221)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-2949/98**

**by Ludivina García Arias (PSE) to the Commission**

*(8 October 1998)*

*Subject:* Delays in the recognition of higher-education diplomas

Does the Commission not think that, if the Member States are unaccountably delaying the recognition of higher-education diplomas for periods of over a year, they are in effect restricting the professional recognition of qualifications as regulated by Directive 89/48/EEC <sup>(1)</sup> and therefore limiting people's freedom of establishment within the European Union? If this is the case, does the Commission not believe that the recognition or validation of qualifications gained at higher-education establishments in the EU should also be covered by Community law?

(1) OJ L 19, 24.1.1989, p. 16.

**Answer given by Mr Monti on behalf of the Commission**

*(6 November 1998)*

The Commission would refer the Honourable Member to its answer to her Written Question E-529/98 <sup>(1)</sup>.

(1) OJ C 402, 22.12.1998, p. 14.

(1999/C 96/222)

**WRITTEN QUESTION E-2958/98**

**by Nikitas Kaklamanis (UPE) to the Commission**

*(8 October 1998)*

*Subject:* Nuclear reactor at Akkuyu, Turkey

Despite growing international concern, Turkey is pressing ahead with plans to build a nuclear plant on the Aegean coast, even though it is absolutely clear that the region is prone to earthquake. Recently, a letter by the Canadian seismologist Buckthought was published in the Ottawa Citizen, rebutting all the Turkish claims that the region is not an earthquake zone. Among other things, the Canadian professor claims that since 1973 a number of seismic tremors have been recorded in Turkey, the epicentres of which have been between 4 and 60 kilometres from Akkuyu, the planned site of the reactor. In particular, he urges all those who have been involved in this extremely risky programme to adopt a responsible position since a Chernobyl type accident will have fatal consequences for millions of inhabitants of Turkey and the neighbouring countries of Cyprus, Greece and Israel.