



ЕВРОПЕЙСКИ ПАРЛАМЕНТ PARLAMENTO EUROPEO EVROPSKÝ PARLAMENT EUROPA-PARLAMENTET
EUROPÄISCHES PARLAMENT EUROOPA PARLAMENT ΕΥΡΩΠΑΪΚΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΒΟΥΛΙΟ EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN PARLAIMINT NA HEORPA PARLAMENTO EUROPEO EIROPAS PARLAMENTS
EUROPOS PARLAMANTAS EURÓPAI PARLAMENT IL-PARLAMENT EWROPEW EUROPEES PARLEMENT
PARLAMENT EUROPEJSKI PARLAMENTO EUROPEU PARLAMENTUL EUROPEAN
EURÓPSKY PARLAMENT EVROPSKI PARLAMENT EUROOPAN PARLAMENTTI EUROPAPARLAMENTET

2009 - 2014

ПЪЛЕН ПРОТОКОЛ НА РАЗИСКВАНИЯТА	POSĚDŽIO STENOGRAMA
ACTA LITERAL DE LOS DEBATES	AZ ŰLÉSEK SZÓ SZERINTI JEGYZŐKÖNYVE
DOSLOVNÝ ZÁZNAM ZE ZASEDÁNÍ	RAPPORTI VERBATIM TAD-DIBATTITI
FULDSTÆNDIGT FORHANDLINGSREFERAT	VOLLEDIG VERSLAG VAN DE VERGADERINGEN
AUSFÜHRLICHE SITZUNGSBERICHTE	PEŁNE SPRAWOZDANIE Z OBRAD
ISTUNGI STENOGRAMM	RELATO INTEGRAL DOS DEBATES
ΠΛΗΡΗ ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΖΗΤΗΣΕΩΝ	STENOGRAMA DEZBATERILOR
VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS	DOSLOVNÝ ZÁPIS Z ROZPRÁV
COMPTE RENDU IN EXTENSO DES DÉBATS	DOBESEDNI ZAPISI RAZPRAV
TUARASCÁIL FOCAL AR FHOCAL NA N-IMEACHTAÍ	SANATARKAT ISTUNTOSELOSTUKSET
RESOCONTO INTEGRALE DELLE DISCUSSIONI	FULLSTÄNDIGT FÖRHANDLINGSREFERAT
DEBAŠU STENOGRAMMA	

Вторник - Martes - Úterý - Tirsdag - Dienstag - Teisipäev - Τρίτη
Tuesday - Mardi - Dé Máirt - Martedì - Otrdiena - Antradienis - Kedd
It-Tlieta - Dinsdag - Wtorek - Terça-feira - Marți - Utorok - Torek - Tiistai - Tisdag

05.04.2011



*Единство в многообразието - Unida en la diversidad - Jednotná v rozmanitosti - Forenet i mangfoldighed - In Vielfalt geeint - Ühinenud mitmekesisuses
Ενωμένη στην πολυμορφία - United in diversity - Unie dans la diversité - Aontaithe san éagsúlacht - Unita nella diversità - Vienoti daudzveidībā
Susivieniję įvairovėje - Egyesülve a sokféleségben - Magħquda fid-diversità - In verscheidenheid verenigd - Zjednoczona w różnorodności - Unida na diversidade
Unitā ģn diversitate - Zjednotení v rozmanitosti - Zdržena v raznolikosti - Moninaisuudessaan yhtenäinen - Förenade i mångfalden*

Неокончателно издание - Edición provisional - Prozatímní vydání - Foreløbig udgave - Vorläufige Ausgabe
Esialgne versioon - Προσωρινή έκδοση - Provisional edition - Edition provisoire - Eagrán Sealadach - Edizione provvisoria
Pagaidu versija - Negalutinė redakcija - Ideiglenes kiadás - Edizzjoni provizorja - Voorlopige uitgave - Wydanie tymczasowe
Edição provisória - Ediție provizorie - Predbežné vydanie - Začasna različica - Väliaikainen versio - Preliminär utgåva

1 - Откриване на заседанието.....	17
2 - Разисквания относно случаи на нарушаване на правата на човека, на демокрацията и принципа на правовата държава (обявяване на внесените предложения за резолюция): вж. протоколи.....	17
3 - Заключение на Европейския съвет (24-25 март 2011 г.) (разискване).....	17
4 - Време за гласуване	47
4.1 - Мобилизиране на Европейския фонд за приспособяване към глобализацията: Полша - Podkarpackie - Производство на машини (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (гласуване)	47
4.2 - Миграционни потоци, свързани с нестабилността: обхват и роля на външната политика на ЕС (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (гласуване)	47
4.3 - Роля на жените в селското стопанство и селските райони (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (гласуване)	48
4.4 - Ефикасност и ефективност на финансирането от ЕС в областта на извеждането от експлоатация на атомните електроцентрали в новите държави-членки (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (гласуване)	48
4.5 - Мобилизиране на Европейския фонд за приспособяване към глобализацията: Чешка република - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (гласуване).....	48
4.6 - Контрол на износа на стоки и технологии с двойна употреба (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (гласуване)	48
4.7 - Официално подкрепяните експортни кредити (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (гласуване).....	48
4.8 - Нова политическа рамка на ЕС за борба с насилието срещу жени (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (гласуване).....	48
5 - Обяснение на вот	48
6 - Поправки и намерения за гласуване: вж. протоколи.....	77
7 - Одобряване на протокола от предишното заседание: вж. протокола.....	77
8 - Внасяне на документи: вж. протоколи	77
9 - Време за въпроси към председателя на Комисията	77
10 - Рамка на ЕС за координиране на националните стратегии за интегриране на ромите (разискване)	87
11 - Бюджетна прогноза за приходите и разходите за 2012 г. - Раздел I - Парламент (разискване).....	92
12 - Защита на финансовите интереси на Европейските общности — Борба с измамите (разискване)	102
13 - Време за въпроси (въпроси към Комисията). 110	
14 - Статут и финансиране на политическите партии на европейско равнище (разискване).....	125
15 - Споразумение за партньорство в сектора рибарство между Европейската общност и Съюза Коморски острови - Финансови мерки на Общността за прилагането на Общата политика по рибарство и в областта на морското право - Рибарство — Преходни технически мерки - Внос от Гренландия в Европейския съюз на рибни продукти (разискване).....	135

16 - Дневен ред на следващото заседание: вж. протоколи.....	147
17 - Закриване на заседанието	147

ES	ÍNDICE	CS	OBSAH
1 -	Apertura de la sesión	1 -	Zahájení zasedání
2 -	Debates sobre casos de violaciones de los derechos humanos, de la democracia y del Estado de Derecho (anuncio de las propuestas de resolución presentadas): véase el Acta.....	2 -	Rozpravy o případech porušování lidských práv, demokracie a právního státu (oznámení předložených návrhů usnesení): viz zápis
3 -	Conclusiones del Consejo Europeo (24 y 25 de marzo de 2011) (debate).....	3 -	Závěry zasedání Evropské rady (24.–25. března 2011) (rozprava).....
4 -	Turno de votaciones.....	4 -	Hlasování.....
4.1 -	Movilización del Fondo Europeo de Adaptación a la Globalización: Polonia - Podkarpackie - Fabricación de maquinaria (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (votación).....	4.1 -	Uvolnění prostředků z Evropského fondu pro přizpůsobení se globalizaci: Polsko – Podkarpackie – strojírenství (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (hlasování).....
4.2 -	Flujos migratorios provocados por la inestabilidad: ámbito de aplicación y papel de la política exterior de la UE (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (votación)47	4.2 -	Migrační toky plynoucí z nestability: rozsah a úloha zahraniční politiky EU (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (hlasování)
4.3 -	El papel de la mujer en la agricultura y las zonas rurales (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (votación)	4.3 -	Úloha žen v zemědělství a ve venkovských oblastech (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (hlasování).....
4.4 -	Financiación de la UE en el ámbito del desmantelamiento de centrales nucleares en los nuevos Estados miembros (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (votación)	4.4 -	Financování EU v oblasti vyřazování jaderných elektráren z provozu v nových členských státech (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (hlasování)
4.5 -	Movilización del Fondo Europeo de Adaptación a la Globalización: República Checa - Unilever (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (votación)	4.5 -	Uvolnění prostředků z Evropského fondu pro přizpůsobení se globalizaci: Česká republika – UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (hlasování).....
4.6 -	Productos y tecnología de doble uso (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (votación).....	4.6 -	Kontrola vývozu zboží a technologií dvojího užití (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (hlasování)
4.7 -	Créditos a la exportación con apoyo oficial (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (votación)	4.7 -	Státem podporované vývozní úvěry (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (hlasování).....
4.8 -	Marco político de la UE para combatir la violencia contra las mujeres (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (votación)	4.8 -	Nový rámec politiky EU pro boj proti násilí páchanému na ženách (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (hlasování)
5 -	Explicaciones de voto	5 -	Vysvětlení hlasování
6 -	Correcciones e intenciones de voto: véase el Acta 77	6 -	Opravy hlasování a sdělení o úmyslu hlasovat: viz zápis
7 -	Aprobación del Acta de la sesión anterior: véase el Acta	7 -	Schválení zápisu z předchozího zasedání: viz zápis77
8 -	Presentación de documentos: véase el Acta.....	8 -	Předložení dokumentů: viz zápis
9 -	Turno de preguntas al Presidente de la Comisión..	9 -	Doba vyhrazená pro otázky předsedovi Komise ...
10 -	Marco de la UE para la coordinación de las estrategias nacionales de integración de los gitanos (debate).....	10 -	Rámec EU pro koordinaci vnitrostátních strategií integrace Romů (rozprava).....
11 -	Estado de previsiones de ingresos y gastos para el ejercicio 2012 - Sección I - Parlamento (debate)...	11 -	Odhad příjmů a výdajů na rozpočtový rok 2012 – oddíl I – Parlament (rozprava).....
12 -	Protección de los intereses financieros de las Comunidades - Lucha contra el fraude (debate)..	12 -	Ochrana finančních zájmů Společenství – Boj proti podvodům (rozprava)
13 -	Turno de preguntas (preguntas a la Comisión) ..	13 -	Doby vyhrazená pro otázky (otázky Komisi)
14 -	Los partidos políticos a escala europea y las normas sobre su financiación (debate)	14 -	Statut a financování politických stran na evropské úrovni (rozprava).....
15 -	Acuerdo de colaboración en el sector pesquero entre la CE y las Comoras - Medidas financieras comunitarias para la aplicación de la política pesquera común y el Derecho del Mar - Pesca - Medidas técnicas transitorias - Importaciones de productos de la pesca procedentes de Groenlandia (debate).....	15 -	Dohody o partnerství mezi ES a Komorským svazem v odvětví rybolovu – Finanční opatření Společenství pro provádění společné rybářské politiky a pro oblast mořského práva – Rybolov – přechodná technická opatření – Dovoz produktů rybolovu z Grónska (rozprava).....
16 -	Orden del día de la próxima sesión: véase el Acta	16 -	Pořad jednání příštího denního zasedání: viz zápis
17 -	Cierre de la sesión.....	17 -	Ukončení zasedání.....

DA	INDHOLD
1 -	Åbning af mødet 17
2 -	Debat om tilfælde af krænkelse af menneskerettighederne, demokratiet og retsstatsprincippet (meddelelse om indgivne beslutningsforslag): se protokollen..... 17
3 -	Konklusioner fra Det Europæiske Råds møde (24.-25. marts 2011) (forhandling) 17
4 -	Afstemningstid..... 47
4.1 -	Anvendelse af Den Europæiske Fond for Tilpasning til Globaliseringen: Polen – Podkarpackie – Produktion af maskiner (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (afstemning)..... 47
4.2 -	Migrationsstrømme som følge af manglende stabilitet: EU-udenrigspolitikens omfang og rolle (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (afstemning).... 47
4.3 -	Kvindens rolle i landbrug og landdistrikter (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (afstemning) 48
4.4 -	EU-finansieringens effektivitet i forbindelse med nedlukning af kernekraftværker i de nye medlemsstater (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (afstemning) 48
4.5 -	Anvendelse af Den Europæiske Fond for Tilpasning til Globaliseringen: Tjekkiet – Unilever (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (afstemning)..... 48
4.6 -	Kontrol med udførslen af produkter og teknologi med dobbelt anvendelse (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (afstemning) 48
4.7 -	Offentligt støttede eksportkreditter (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (afstemning) 48
4.8 -	Ny EU-rammepolitik til bekæmpelse af vold mod kvinder (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (afstemning) 48
5 -	Stemmesforklaringer..... 48
6 -	Stemmerettelser og -intentioner: se protokollen.... 77
7 -	Godkendelse af protokollen fra foregående møde: se protokollen 77
8 -	Modtagne dokumenter: se protokollen 77
9 -	Spørgetid (spørgsmål til formanden for Kommissionen) 77
10 -	EU-ramme for samordning af nationale strategier for integration af romaer (forhandling) 87
11 -	Overslag over indtægter og udgifter for 2012 - Sektion I - Parlamentet (forhandling)..... 92
12 -	Beskyttelse af EU's finansielle interesser – Bekæmpelse af svig (forhandling)..... 102
13 -	Spørgetid (spørgsmål til Kommissionen) 110
14 -	Statut for og finansiering af politiske partier på europæisk plan (forhandling) 125
15 -	Fiskerimuligheder og den finansielle modydelse, der er omhandlet i fiskeripartnerskabsaftalen mellem EF og Comorerne - EF-finansieringsforanstaltninger til gennemførelse af den fælles fiskeripolitik og havretten - Fiskeri – tekniske overgangsforanstaltninger - Import fra Grønland af fiskevarer, levende toskallede bløddyr, pighuder, sækdyr, havsnegle og biprodukter heraf (forhandling) 135
16 -	Dagsorden for næste møde: se protokollen..... 147
17 -	Hævelse af mødet 147

DE	INHALT
1 -	Eröffnung der Sitzung 17
2 -	Aussprache über Fälle von Verletzungen der Menschenrechte, der Demokratie und der Rechtsstaatlichkeit (Bekanntgabe der eingereichten Entschließungsanträge): siehe Protokoll 17
3 -	Schlussfolgerungen des Europäischen Rates (24.-25. März 2011) (Aussprache)..... 17
4 -	Abstimmungsstunde 47
4.1 -	Inanspruchnahme des Europäischen Fonds zur Anpassung an die Globalisierung: Polen, Podkarpackie – Maschinenbau (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (Abstimmung) 47
4.2 -	Migrationsströme infolge instabiler Verhältnisse: Reichweite und Rolle der Außenpolitik der EU (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (Abstimmung) 47
4.3 -	Rolle der Frauen in der Landwirtschaft und im ländlichen Raum (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (Abstimmung) 48
4.4 -	EU-Finanzmittel für die Stilllegung kerntechnischer Anlagen in den neuen Mitgliedstaaten (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (Abstimmung) 48
4.5 -	Inanspruchnahme des Europäischen Fonds zur Anpassung an die Globalisierung: Tschechische Republik – UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (Abstimmung)..... 48
4.6 -	Güter und Technologien mit doppeltem Verwendungszweck (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (Abstimmung) 48
4.7 -	Öffentlich unterstützte Exportkredite (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (Abstimmung) 48
4.8 -	EU-Politik zur Bekämpfung von Gewalt gegen Frauen (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (Abstimmung) 48
5 -	Stimmerklärungen 48
6 -	Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll.... 77
7 -	Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll 77
8 -	Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll..... 77
9 -	Fragestunde mit Anfragen an den Präsidenten der Kommission 77
10 -	EU-Koordinierungsrahmen für nationale Strategien zur Integration der Roma (Aussprache) 87
11 -	Voranschlag der Einnahmen und Ausgaben für das Haushaltsjahr 2012 –? 92
	Einzelplan I – Parlament (Aussprache)..... 92
12 -	Schutz der finanziellen Interessen der Union – Betrugsbekämpfung (Aussprache) 102
13 -	Fragestunde (Anfragen an die Kommission) 110
14 -	Politische Parteien auf europäischer Ebene und Regelungen für ihre Finanzierung (Aussprache). 125
15 -	Fischereiabkommen EG/Komoren – Finanzielle Maßnahmen der Gemeinschaft zur Durchführung der Gemeinsamen Fischereipolitik und im Bereich des Seerechts – Fischerei - Technische Übergangsmaßnahmen – Einfuhr von Fischereierzeugnissen aus Grönland (Aussprache) 135
16 -	Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll 147

17 - Schluss der Sitzung..... 147

ET SISUKORD

1 - Osaistungjärgu avamine.....	17
2 - Inimõiguste, demokraatia ja õigusriigi põhimõtete rikkumise juhtumite arutamise (esitatud resolutsiooni ettepanekute tutvustamine) (vt protokoll).....	17
3 - Euroopa Ülemkogu kohtumise (24.–25.3.2011) järeldused (arutelu).....	17
4 - Hääletused	47
4.1 - Globaliseerumisega Kohanemise Euroopa Fondi kasutuselevõtmine: Poola – Podkarpackie – Masinatehas (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (hääletus).....	47
4.2 - Ebastabiilsusest tulenevad rändevood: ELi välispoliitika reguleerimisala ja roll (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (hääletus).....	47
4.3 - Naiste roll põllumajanduses ja maapiirkondades (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (hääletus)	48
4.4 - Uutes liikmesriikides asuvate tuumaelektrijaamade dekomisjoneerimiseks eraldatavad ELi vahendid (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (hääletus)	48
4.5 - Globaliseerumisega Kohanemise Euroopa Fondi kasutuselevõtmine: Tšehhi Vabariik – UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (hääletus)	48
4.6 - Kahesuguse kasutusega kaubad ja tehnoloogia (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (hääletus)	48
4.7 - Riiklikult toetatavad ekspordikrediidid (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (hääletus).....	48
4.8 - Naistevastase vägivalda vastu võitlemise ELi poliitiline raamistik (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (hääletus).....	48
5 - Selgitused hääletuse kohta	48
6 - Hääletuse parandused ja hääletuskavatsused (vt protokoll).....	77
7 - Eelmise istungi protokoll kinnitamine (vt protokoll)	77
8 - Esitatud dokumendid (vt protokoll).....	77
9 - Infotund komisjoni presidendi osavõtul.....	77
10 - ELi raamistik romade integreerimise riiklike strateegiade koordineerimiseks (arutelu).....	87
11 - Euroopa Parlamendi 2012. aasta tulude ja kulude eelarvestus, I jagu – Euroopa Parlament (arutelu).....	92
12 - Ühenduse finantshuvide kaitse – pettustevastane võitlus (arutelu)	102
13 - Infotund (küsimused komisjonile)	110
14 - Euroopa tasandi erakondi reguleerivad määrused ja erakondade rahastamise eeskirjad (arutelu).....	125
15 - EÜ ja Komooride vaheline kalandusalane partnerluseping – Ühenduse finantsmeetmed ühise kalanduspoliitika rakendamiseks ja mereõiguse valdkonnas – Kalandus – tehnilised üleminekumeetmed – Kalandustoodete importimine Gröönimaalt (arutelu)	135
16 - Järgmise istungi päevakord (vt protokoll)	147
17 - Istungi lõpp	147

EL ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ

1 - Έναρξη της συνεδρίασης.....	17
2 - Συζήτηση για περιπτώσεις παραβίασης των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων, της δημοκρατίας και του κράτους δικαίου (ανακοίνωση των προτάσεων ψηφίσματος που έχουν κατατεθεί): βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	17
3 - Συμπεράσματα από τη συνεδρίαση του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου (24-25.03.2011) (συζήτηση)	17
4 - Ώρα των ψηφοφοριών	47
4.1 - Κινητοποίηση του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Προσαρμογής στην Παγκοσμιοποίηση : Πολωνία - Podkarpackie - Μηχανήματα (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (ψηφοφορία).....	47
4.2 - Μεταναστευτικά ρεύματα που οφείλονται στην αστάθεια: πεδίο εφαρμογής και ρόλος της εξωτερικής πολιτικής της ΕΕ (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (ψηφοφορία)	47
4.3 - Ο ρόλος των γυναικών στον τομέα της γεωργίας και στις αγροτικές περιοχές (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (ψηφοφορία)	48
4.4 - Χρηματοδότηση της ΕΕ στον τομέα του παροπλισμού πυρηνικών σταθμών στα νέα κράτη μέλη (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (ψηφοφορία).....	48
4.5 - Κινητοποίηση του Ευρωπαϊκού Ταμείου Προσαρμογής στην Παγκοσμιοποίηση : Τσεχική δημοκρατία - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (ψηφοφορία)	48
4.6 - Εξαγωγές ειδών και τεχνολογίας διπλής χρήσης (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (ψηφοφορία) ...	48
4.7 - Εξαγωγικές πιστώσεις που τυγχάνουν δημόσιας στήριξης (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (ψηφοφορία).....	48
4.8 - Πλαίσιο πολιτικής της ΕΕ για την καταπολέμηση της βίας κατά των γυναικών (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (ψηφοφορία)	48
5 - Αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου	48
6 - Διορθώσεις και προθέσεις ψήφου: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	77
7 - Έγκριση των Συνοπτικών Πρακτικών της προηγούμενης συνεδρίασης: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά.....	77
8 - Κατάθεση εγγράφων: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά	77
9 - Ώρα των ερωτήσεων προς τον Πρόεδρο της Επιτροπής.....	77
10 - Ευρωπαϊκό πλαίσιο συντονισμού των εθνικών στρατηγικών ένταξης των Ρομά (συζήτηση).....	87
11 - Κατάσταση προβλέψεων των εσόδων και δαπανών για το έτος 2012 - Τμήμα Ι - Κοινοβούλιο (συζήτηση)	92
12 - Προστασία των οικονομικών συμφερόντων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης - Καταπολέμηση της απάτης (συζήτηση)	102
13 - Ώρα των ερωτήσεων (ερωτήσεις προς την Επιτροπή)	110
14 - Καθεστώς και χρηματοδότηση των πολιτικών κομμάτων σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο (συζήτηση).....	125

15 - Αλιευτική συμφωνία μεταξύ της ΕΚ και των Κοινοτήτων - Κοινοτικά χρηματοδοτικά μέτρα για την εφαρμογή της κοινής αλιευτικής πολιτικής καθώς και στον τομέα του Δικαίου της Θάλασσας - Αλιεία - θέσπιση μεταβατικών τεχνικών μέτρων - Εισαγωγές, από τη Γροιλανδία αλιευτικών προϊόντων (συζήτηση).....	135
16 - Ημερήσια διάταξη της επόμενης συνεδρίασης: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά	147
17 - Λήξη της συνεδρίασης.....	147

EN	CONTENTS
1 - Opening of the sitting	17
2 - Debates on cases of breaches of human rights, democracy and the rule of law (announcement of motions for resolutions tabled): see Minutes.....	17
3 - Conclusions of the European Council meeting (24-25 March 2011) (debate).....	17
4 - Voting time.....	47
4.1 - Mobilisation of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund: Poland - Podkarpackie - Manufacture of machinery (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (vote).....	47
4.2 - Migration flows arising from instability: scope and role of EU foreign policy (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (vote)	47
4.3 - Role of women in agriculture and rural areas (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (vote).....	48
4.4 - EU funding in the area of decommissioning nuclear power plants in the new Member States (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (vote)	48
4.5 - Mobilisation of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund: Czech Republic - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (vote).....	48
4.6 - Dual-use items and technology (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (vote)	48
4.7 - Officially supported export credits (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (vote).....	48
4.8 - EU policy framework to fight violence against women (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (vote)	48
5 - Explanations of vote	48
6 - Corrections to votes and voting intentions: see Minutes.....	77
7 - Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting : see Minutes.....	77
8 - Documents received: see Minutes	77
9 - Question Hour with the President of the Commission	77
10 - EU framework for coordinating national Roma integration strategies (debate)	87
11 - Estimates of revenue and expenditure for 2012 - Section I - Parliament (debate).....	92
12 - Protection of Communities' financial interests – fight against fraud (debate)	102
13 - Question Time (Commission).....	110
14 - Political parties at European level and rules regarding their funding (debate).....	125
15 - EC-Comoros fisheries agreement - Community financial measures for the implementation of the common fisheries policy and in the area of the Law of the Sea - Fisheries - transitional technical measures - Imports from Greenland of fishery products (debate).....	135
16 - Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes	147
17 - Closure of the sitting.....	147

FR	SOMMAIRE
1 - Ouverture de la séance.....	17
2 - Débats sur des cas de violation des droits de l'Homme, de la démocratie et de l'Etat de droit (annonce des propositions de résolution déposées): voir procès-verbal.....	17
3 - Conclusions du Conseil européen (24-25 mars 2011) (débat).....	17
4 - Heure des votes.....	47
4.1 - Mobilisation du Fonds européen d'ajustement à la mondialisation: Pologne - Podkarpackie - Fabrication de machines (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (vote).....	47
4.2 - Flux migratoires liés à l'instabilité: portée et rôle de la politique étrangère de l'UE (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (vote).....	48
4.3 - Rôle des femmes dans l'agriculture et dans les zones rurales (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (vote).....	48
4.4 - Financement européen dans le domaine du démantèlement des centrales nucléaires dans les nouveaux États membres (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (vote).....	48
4.5 - Mobilisation du Fonds européen d'ajustement à la mondialisation: République tchèque - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (vote).....	48
4.6 - Biens et technologies à double usage (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (vote).....	48
4.7 - Crédits à l'exportation bénéficiant d'un soutien public (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (vote).....	48
4.8 - Cadre politique de l'Union en matière de lutte contre les violences faites aux femmes (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (vote).....	48
5 - Explications de vote.....	48
6 - Corrections et intentions de vote: voir procès-verbal.....	77
7 - Approbation du procès-verbal de la séance précédente : voir procès-verbal.....	77
8 - Dépôt de documents: voir procès-verbal.....	77
9 - Heure des questions au Président de la Commission.....	77
10 - Cadre de l'UE pour la coordination des stratégies nationales d'intégration des Roms (débat).....	87
11 - État prévisionnel des recettes et des dépenses pour l'exercice 2012 - Section I - Parlement (débat).....	92
12 - Protection des intérêts financiers de l'Union européenne – Lutte contre la fraude (débat).....	102
13 - Heure des questions (questions à la Commission).....	110
14 - Statut et financement des partis politiques au niveau européen (débat).....	125
15 - Accord de pêche CE-Comores - Mesures financières communautaires relatives à la mise en œuvre de la politique commune de la pêche et au droit de la mer - Pêche - mesures techniques transitoires - Importations de produits de la pêche du Groenland (débat).....	135
16 - Ordre du jour de la prochaine séance: voir procès-verbal.....	147
17 - Levée de la séance.....	147

IT	INDICE
1 - Apertura della seduta.....	17
2 - Discussioni su casi di violazione dei diritti umani, della democrazia e dello Stato di diritto (comunicazione delle proposte di risoluzione presentate): vedasi processo verbale.....	17
3 - Conclusioni del Consiglio europeo (24-25 marzo 2011) (discussione).....	17
4 - Turno di votazioni.....	47
4.1 - Mobilitazione del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione: Polonia - Podkarpackie - Fabbricazione di macchinari (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (votazione).....	47
4.2 - Flussi migratori causati dall'instabilità: portata e ruolo della politica estera dell'UE (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (votazione).....	48
4.3 - Ruolo delle donne nell'agricoltura e nelle zone rurali (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (votazione).....	48
4.4 - Finanziamenti dell'UE nell'ambito della disattivazione di centrali nucleari nei nuovi Stati membri (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (votazione).....	48
4.5 - Mobilitazione del Fondo europeo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione: Repubblica ceca - Unilever (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (votazione).....	48
4.6 - Prodotti e tecnologie a duplice uso (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (votazione).....	48
4.7 - Crediti all'esportazione che beneficiano di sostegno pubblico (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (votazione).....	48
4.8 - Quadro politico dell'UE in materia di lotta alla violenza contro le donne (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (votazione).....	48
5 - Dichiarazioni di voto.....	48
6 - Correzioni e intenzioni di voto: vedasi processo verbale.....	77
7 - Approvazione del processo verbale della seduta precedente: vedasi processo verbale.....	77
8 - Presentazione di documenti: vedasi processo verbale.....	77
9 - Ora delle interrogazioni al Presidente della Commissione.....	77
10 - Quadro europeo di coordinamento delle strategie nazionali per l'integrazione dei Rom (discussione).....	87
11 - Stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese per l'esercizio 2012 - Sezione I - Parlamento (discussione).....	92
12 - Tutela degli interessi finanziari dell'Unione europea - Lotta contro la frode (discussione).....	102
13 - Tempo delle interrogazioni (interrogazioni alla Commissione).....	110
14 - Statuto e finanziamento dei partiti politici a livello europeo (discussione).....	125
15 - Accordi di pesca CE/Comore - Azione finanziaria della Comunità per l'attuazione della politica comune della pesca e in materia di diritto del mare - Pesca - misure tecniche transitorie - Importazione di prodotti della pesca della Groenlandia (discussione).....	135
16 - Ordine del giorno della prossima seduta: vedasi processo verbale.....	147
17 - Chiusura della seduta.....	147

LV	SATURS
1 - Sēdes atklāšana	17
2 - Debates par cilvēktiesību, demokrātijas un tiesiskuma principu pārkāpumiem (paziņošana par iesniegtajiem rezolūcijas priekšlikumiem) (sk. protokolu).....	17
3 - Eiropadomes 2011. gada 24. un 25. marta sanāksmē pieņemtie secinājumi (debates)	17
4 - Balsošanas laiks	47
4.1 - Eiropas Globalizācijas pielāgošanas fonda izmantošana — Polija, Podkarpace — mašīnbūve (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (balsošana)	47
4.2 - Nestabilitātes radītās migrācijas plūsmas — ES ārpolitikas darbības joma un nozīme (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (balsošana)	48
4.3 - Sieviešu nozīme lauksaimniecībā un lauku apvidos (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (balsošana).....	48
4.4 - Atomelektrostaciju ekspluatācijas pārtraukšanai paredzētais ES finansējums jaunajās dalībvalstīs (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (balsošana).....	48
4.5 - Eiropas Globalizācijas pielāgošanas fonda izmantošana — Čehijas Republika, UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (balsošana)	48
4.6 - Divējāda lietojuma preces un tehnoloģijas (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (balsošana).....	48
4.7 - Valsts atbalstīti eksporta kredīti (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (balsošana)	48
4.8 - ES politikas pamatvirzieni pret sievietēm vērstas vardarbības apkarošanai (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (balsošana)	48
5 - Balsojumu skaidrojumi.....	48
6 - Balsojumu labojumi un nodomi balsot (sk. protokolu)	77
7 - Iepriekšējās sēdes protokola apstiprināšana (sk. protokolu).....	77
8 - Dokumentu iesniegšana (sk. protokolu)	77
9 - Jautājumu laiks (jautājumi Komisijas priekšsēdētājam).....	77
10 - ES pamatsistēma romu integrācijas valsts stratēģiju koordinācijai (debates)	87
11 - 2012. finanšu gada budžeta ieņēmumu un izdevumu tāme, I iedaļa — Parlaments (debates).....	92
12 - Eiropas Savienības finanšu interešu aizsardzība — krāpšanas apkarošana (debates).....	102
13 - Jautājumu laiks (jautājumi Komisijai)	110
14 - Eiropas līmeņa politiskās partijas un noteikumi par to finansēšanu (debates)	125
15 - Eiropas Kopienas un Komoru Salu Savienības zivsaimniecības nolīgums - Kopienas finanšu pasākumi kopējās zivsaimniecības politikas īstenošanai un jūras tiesību jomā - Zivsaimniecība - pārejas posma tehniskie pasākumi - Zivsaimniecības produktu imports no Grenlandes (debates).....	135
16 - Nākamās sēdes darba kārtība (sk. protokolu)	147
17 - Sēdes slēgšana	147

LT	TURINYS
1 - Posėdžio pradžia	17
2 - Diskusijos dėl žmogaus teisių, demokratijos ir teisinės valstybės pažeidimo atvejų (paskelbiami pateikti pasiūlymai dėl rezoliucijų) (žr. protokolą)	17
3 - Europos Vadovų Tarybos išvados (2011 m. kovo 24–25 d.) (diskusijos).....	17
4 - Balsuoti skirtas laikas	47
4.1 - Europos prisitaikymo prie globalizacijos padarinių fondo lėšų skyrimas. Lenkija. Pakarpatė (mašinių gamyba) (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (balsavimas)	47
4.2 - Migracijos srutai, kuriuos lemia nestabilumas: ES užsienio reikalų politikos aprėptis ir vaidmuo (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (balsavimas).....	48
4.3 - Moterų vaidmuo žemės ūkyje ir kaimo vietovėse (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (balsavimas)....	48
4.4 - ES lėšų panaudojimas branduolinių elektrinių eksploatavimui nutraukti naujose valstybėse narėse (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (balsavimas)	48
4.5 - Europos prisitaikymo prie globalizacijos padarinių fondo lėšų skyrimas. Čekijos Respublika (UNILEVER) (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (balsavimas)	48
4.6 - Dvejopo naudojimo objektai ir technologijos (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (balsavimas).....	48
4.7 - Oficialiai remiami eksporto kreditai (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (balsavimas)	48
4.8 - Nauja ES kovos su smurtu prieš moteris politikos programa (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (balsavimas)	48
5 - Paaiškinimai dėl balsavimo	48
6 - Balsavimo ketinimai ir pataisymai (žr. protokolą)	77
7 - Ankstesnio posėdžio protokolo tvirtinimas (žr. protokola).....	77
8 - Pateikti dokumentai (žr. protokolą).....	77
9 - Klausimų Komisijos pirmininkui valanda	77
10 - ES nacionalinių romų integravimo strategijų koordinavimo programa (diskusijos).....	87
11 - 2012 m. pajamų ir išlaidų sąmata. I skirsnis. Parlamentas (diskusijos).....	92
12 - Bendrijų finansinių interesų apsauga. Kova su sukčiavimu (diskusijos).....	102
13 - Klausimų valanda (klausimai Komisijai)	110
14 - Europos politinės partijos ir šių partijų finansavimo taisyklės (diskusijos)	125
15 - EB ir Komorų žuvininkystės susitarimas - Bendrijos finansines priemonės, skirtos bendrai žuvininkystės politikai ir jūrų teisei įgyvendinti - Žuvininkystė. Pereinamojo laikotarpio techninės priemonės - Žuvininkystės produktų importas iš Grenlandijos (diskusijos)	135
16 - Kito posėdžio darbotvarkė (žr. protokolą).....	147
17 - Posėdžio pabaiga	147

HU	TARTALOM	MT	WERREJ
1 -	Az ülés megnyitása.....	1 -	Ftuħ tas-seduta.....
2 -	Viták az emberi jogok, a demokrácia és a jogállamiság megsértésének eseteiről (benyújtott állásfoglalásra irányuló indítványok bejelentése): lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	2 -	Dibattiti dwar kazijiet ta' vjolazzjoni tad-drittijiet tal-bniedem, tad-demokrazija u l-istat tad-dritt (thabbir ta' mozzjonijiet għal rizoluzzjonijiet imressqa): ara l-minuti.....
3 -	Az Európai Tanács következtetései (2011. március 24-25.) (vita).....	3 -	Il-konkluzjonijiet tal-Kunsill Ewropew (24-25 ta' Marzu 2011) (dibattitu).....
4 -	Szavazások órája.....	4 -	Hin tal-votazzjonijiet.....
4.1 -	Az Európai Globalizációs Alkalmazkodási Alap igénybevétele: Lengyelország - Podkarpackie - Gépgyártás (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (szavazás).....	4.1 -	Il-mobilizzazzjoni tal-Fond Ewropew ta' Agġustament għall-Globalizzazzjoni: Il-Polonja - Podkarpackie - Manifattura ta' makkinarju (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (votazzjoni).....
4.2 -	Az instabilitásból adódó migrációs hullámok: az EU külpolitikájának hatálya és szerepe (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (szavazás).....	4.2 -	Il-flussi migratorji li joriginaw mill-instabilità: ambitu u rwol tal-politika barranija tal-UE (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (votazzjoni).....
4.3 -	A nők szerepe a mezőgazdaságban és a vidéki területeken (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (szavazás).....	4.3 -	Ir-rwol tan-nisa fl-agrikoltura u fiż-żoni rurali (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (votazzjoni).....
4.4 -	Az új tagállamokban található atomerőművek leállítására elkülönített uniós finanszírozás hatékonysága és eredményessége (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (szavazás).....	4.4 -	L-effiċjenza u l-effikaċja tal-finanzjament tal-UE fil-qasam tad-dekummissjonar tal-impjanti nukleari fl-Istati Membri l-ġodda (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (votazzjoni).....
4.5 -	Az Európai Globalizációs Alkalmazkodási Alap igénybevétele: Cseh Köztársaság - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (szavazás).....	4.5 -	Il-mobilizzazzjoni tal-Fond Ewropew ta' Agġustament għall-Globalizzazzjoni: Ir-Repubblika Ċeka - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (votazzjoni).....
4.6 -	A kettős felhasználású termékek és technológia kivételére vonatkozó közösségi ellenőrzési rendszer (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (szavazás).....	4.6 -	Il-kontroll tal-esportazzjonijiet ta' oġġetti u teknoloġiji b'użu doppju (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (votazzjoni).....
4.7 -	A hivatalosan támogatott exporthitelek (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (szavazás).....	4.7 -	Kreditu ta' esportazzjoni b'sussidju uffijjali (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (votazzjoni).....
4.8 -	A nőkkel szembeni erőszak elleni küzdelemre vonatkozó új uniós politikai keret (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (szavazás).....	4.8 -	Qafas politiku ġdid tal-UE għall-ġlieda kontra l-vjolenza fuq in-nisa (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (votazzjoni).....
5 -	A szavazáshoz fűzött indokolások.....	5 -	Spegazzjonijiet tal-vot.....
6 -	Szavazathelyesbítések és szavazási szándékok: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	6 -	Korrezzjonijiet u intenzjonijiet għall-vot: ara l-Minuti.....
7 -	Az előző ülés jegyzőkönyvének elfogadása: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	7 -	Approvazzjoni tal-Minuti tas-seduta ta' qabel: ara l-Minuti.....
8 -	Dokumentumok benyújtása: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....	8 -	Dokumenti mressqa: ara l-Minuti.....
9 -	A Bizottság elnökéhez intézett kérdések órája.....	9 -	Hin għall-mistoqsijiet lill-President tal-Kummissjoni.....
10 -	Uniós keretrendszer a román integrációját célzó nemzeti stratégiák összehangolására (vita).....	10 -	Il-qafas tal-UE għall-koordinament ta' strategiji nazzjonali għall-integrazzjoni tar-Roma (dibattitu).....
11 -	A 2012-es pénzügyi évre tervezett bevételek és kiadások – I. szakasz – Parlament (vita).....	11 -	Estimi tad-dħul u tan-nefqa għall-2012 - Taqsima I - Il-Parlament (dibattitu).....
12 -	A Közösségek pénzügyi érdekeinek védelme – Csalás elleni küzdelem (vita).....	12 -	Il-protezzjoni tal-interessi finanzjarji tal-Unjoni Ewropea - Ġlieda kontra l-frodi (dibattitu).....
13 -	Kérdések órája (a Bizottsághoz intézett kérdések).....	13 -	Hin tal-mistoqsijiet (mistoqsijiet lill-Kummissjoni).....
14 -	Az európai szintű politikai pártokra irányadó előírások és finanszírozásuk szabályai (vita).....	14 -	Ir-regolamenti li jirregolaw il-partiti politiċi fl-ivell Ewropew u r-regoli dwar il-finanzjament tagħhom (dibattitu).....
15 -	Az EK és a Comore-szigetek közötti halászati megállapodás – A közös halászati politika végrehajtására és a tengerjogra vonatkozó közösségi pénzügyi intézkedések – Halászat – Átmeneti technikai intézkedések – A halászati termékek Grönlandról történő behozatala (vita).....		
16 -	A következő ülésnap napirendje: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.....		
17 -	Az ülés berekesztése.....		

15 - L-opportunitajiet tas-sajd u l-kontribuzzjoni finanzjarja previsti mill-Ftehim ta' Shubija dwar is- Sajd bejn il-KE u l-Komoros - Emenda tar- Regolament tal-Kunsill (KE) Nru 861/2006 tat- 22 ta' Mejju 2006 li jistabbilixxi miżuri finanzjarji Komunitarji għall-implimentazzjoni tal-Politika Komuni tas-Sajd u fil-qasam tal-Liġi tal-Baħar - Sajd - Miżuri tekniċi tranżitorji - L-importazzjonijiet mill- Groenlandja ta' prodotti tas-sajd, molluski bivalvi ħajjin, ekinodermi, tunikati u gasteropodi tal-baħar (dibattitu).....	135
16 - Aġenda tas-seduta li jmiss: ara l-Minuti	147
17 - Ghelug tas-seduta	147

NL	INHOUD
1 - Opening van de vergadering.....	17
2 - Debatten over gevallen van schending van de mensenrechten, de democratie en de rechtsstaat (bekendmaking van de ingediende ontwerpresoluties): zie notulen	17
3 - Conclusies van de Europese Raad (24-25 maart 2011) (debat)	17
4 - Stemmingen	47
4.1 - Beschikbaarstelling van middelen uit het Europees fonds voor aanpassing aan de globalisering: Polen - Podkarpackie - Machines (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (stemming).....	47
4.2 - Migratiestromen als gevolg van instabiele omstandigheden: reikwijdte en rol van het buitenlands beleid van de EU (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (stemming)	48
4.3 - De rol van vrouwen in de landbouw en in plattelandsgebieden (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (stemming).....	48
4.4 - EU-financiering voor het ontmantelen van kerncentrales in de nieuwe lidstaten (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (stemming)	48
4.5 - Beschikbaarstelling van middelen uit het Europees fonds voor aanpassing aan de globalisering: Tsjechische Republiek - UNILEVER (A7- 0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (stemming)	48
4.6 - Producten en technologie voor tweërlei gebruik (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (stemming)	48
4.7 - Door de overheid gesteunde exportkredieten (A7- 0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (stemming)	48
4.8 - Een beleidskader van de EU voor de bestrijding van geweld tegen vrouwen (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (stemming).....	48
5 - Stemverklaringen.....	48
6 - Rectificaties stemgedrag/voorgenomen stemgedrag: zie notulen	77
7 - Goedkeuring van de notulen van de vorige vergadering: zie notulen	77
8 - Ingekomen stukken: zie notulen	77
9 - Vragenuur met de voorzitter van de Commissie....	77
10 - EU-kader voor de coördinatie van nationale strategieën voor de integratie van de Roma (debat)87	
11 - Raming van de inkomsten en uitgaven voor het begrotingsjaar 2012 - Afdeling I - Parlement (debat)	92
12 - Bescherming van de financiële belangen van de Gemeenschappen en fraudebestrijding (debat)....	102
13 - Vragenuur (vragen aan de Commissie)	110
14 - De financiering van politieke partijen op Europees niveau (debat).....	125
15 - Visserijovereenkomst tussen de EG en de Comoren - Communautaire financieringsmaatregelen voor de tenuitvoerlegging van het gemeenschappelijk visserijbeleid en op het gebied van het zeerecht - Visserij - Technische overgangsmaatregelen - Invoer van visserijproducten uit Groenland (debat)	135
16 - Agenda van de volgende vergadering: zie notulen	147
17 - Sluiting van de vergadering	147

PL	SPIS TREŚCI	PT	INDICE
1 -	Otwarcie posiedzenia..... 17	1 -	Abertura do período de sessões 17
2 -	Debata nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (ogłoszenie o złożonych projektach rezolucji): patrz protokół.... 17	2 -	Debates sobre casos de violação dos direitos humanos, da democracia e do Estado de direito (comunicação das propostas de resolução apresentadas): ver Acta 17
3 -	Konkluzje z posiedzenia Rady Europejskiej (24-25 marca 2011 r.) (debata) 17	3 -	Conclusões do Conselho Europeu (24-25.03.2011) (debate)..... 17
4 -	Głosowanie 47	4 -	Período de votação 47
4.1 -	Uruchomienie Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji - Polska, Podkarpackie - produkcja urządzeń (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (głosowanie)..... 47	4.1 -	Mobilização do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização: Polónia - Podkarpackie - Fabrico de máquinas (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (votação) 47
4.2 -	Ruchy migracyjne wynikające z braku stabilności: zakres i rola polityki zagranicznej UE (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (głosowanie)..... 48	4.2 -	Fluxos migratórios decorrentes da instabilidade: âmbito e papel da política externa da UE (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (votação) 48
4.3 -	Rola kobiet w rolnictwie i na obszarach wiejskich (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (głosowanie) ... 48	4.3 -	O papel das mulheres na agricultura e nas zonas rurais (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (votação)48
4.4 -	Efektywność i skuteczność finansowania UE w dziedzinie likwidacji elektrowni jądrowych w nowych państwach członkowskich (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (głosowanie) 48	4.4 -	Financiamento da UE no domínio do desmantelamento das centrais nucleares de potência nos novos Estados-Membros (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (votação)..... 48
4.5 -	Uruchomienie Europejskiego Funduszu Dostosowania do Globalizacji: Republika Czeska - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (głosowanie)..... 48	4.5 -	Mobilização do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização: República Checa - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (votação)..... 48
4.6 -	Produkty i technologie podwójnego zastosowania (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (głosowanie).... 48	4.6 -	Produtos e tecnologias de dupla utilização (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (votação)..... 48
4.7 -	Oficjalnie wspierane kredyty eksportowe (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (głosowanie)..... 48	4.7 -	Créditos à exportação que beneficiam de apoio oficial (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (votação) .48
4.8 -	Ramy polityki UE w dziedzinie walki z przemocą wobec kobiet (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (głosowanie)..... 48	4.8 -	Quadro político da UE em matéria de combate à violência contra as mulheres (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (votação)..... 48
5 -	Wyjaśnienia dotyczące sposobu głosowania 48	5 -	Declarações de voto..... 48
6 -	Korekty do głosowania i zamiar głosowania: patrz protokół 77	6 -	Correcções e intenções de voto: ver Acta..... 77
7 -	Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół 77	7 -	Aprovação da acta da sessão anterior: Ver Acta.... 77
8 -	Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół 77	8 -	Entrega de documentos: ver Acta 77
9 -	Tura pytań do przewodniczącego Komisji Europejskiej..... 77	9 -	Período de perguntas ao Presidente da Comissão.. 77
10 -	Unijne ramy koordynacji krajowych strategii integracji Romów (debata) 87	10 -	Quadro da UE para a coordenação das estratégias nacionais de integração dos ciganos (debate)..... 87
11 -	Preliminarz wpływów i wydatków na rok budżetowy 2012 - sekcja I - Parlament (debata) ... 92	11 -	Previsão de receitas e despesas para o exercício de 2012 - Secção I - Parlamento (debate) 92
12 -	Ochrona interesów finansowych Wspólnot – Zwalczenie nadużyć finansowych (debata)..... 102	12 -	Protecção dos interesses financeiros das Comunidades - Luta contra a fraude (debate) 102
13 -	Tura pytań (pytania do Komisji)..... 110	13 -	Período de perguntas (perguntas à Comissão)... 110
14 -	Partie polityczne na poziomie europejskim oraz zasady dotyczące ich finansowania (debata) 125	14 -	Estatuto e financiamento dos partidos políticos a nível europeu (debate)..... 125
15 -	Umowa w sektorze rybołówstwa między WE a Komorami - Wspólnotowe środki finansowe na rzecz wdrażania wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa oraz w obszarze prawa morza - Rybołówstwo - przejściowe środki techniczne - Przywóz produktów rybołówstwa z Grenlandii (debata)..... 135	15 -	Acordo de pesca CE-Comores - Medidas financeiras comunitárias relativas à execução da política comum das pescas e ao Direito do Mar - Pescas - medidas técnicas transitórias - Importações, a partir da Gronelândia, de produtos da pesca (debate)..... 135
16 -	Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: patrz protokół 147	16 -	Ordem do dia da próxima sessão: ver Acta 147
17 -	Zamknięcie posiedzenia..... 147	17 -	Encerramento da sessão..... 147

RO	CUPRINS	SK	OBSAH
1 -	Deschiderea ședinței 17	1 -	Otvorenie rokovania 17
2 -	Dezbateri asupra cazurilor de încălcare a drepturilor omului, a democrației și a statului de drept (anunțarea propunerilor de rezoluție depuse): a se vedea procesul-verbal..... 17	2 -	Rozpravy o případoch porušovania ľudských práv, demokracie a princípov právneho štátu (oznámenie o podaných návrhoch uznesenia): pozri zápisnicu ... 17
3 -	Concluziile reuniunii Consiliului European din 24-25 martie 2011 (dezbateri)..... 17	3 -	Závery zo zasadnutia Európskej rady (24. – 25. marca 2011) (rozprava) 17
4 -	Votare 47	4 -	Hlasovanie 47
4.1 -	Mobilizarea Fondului european de ajustare la globalizare: Polonia - Podkarpackie - fabricarea de mașini (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (vot)..... 47	4.1 -	Uvoľnenie prostriedkov z Európskeho fondu na prispôsobenie sa globalizácii: Poľsko – Podkarpackie – strojárstvo (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (hlasovanie)..... 47
4.2 -	Fluxuri migratorii cauzate de instabilitate: domeniul și rolul politicii externe a UE (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (vot)..... 48	4.2 -	Migračné toky vznikajúce z dôvodu nestability: rozsah a úloha zahraničnej politiky EÚ (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (hlasovanie)..... 48
4.3 -	Rolul femeilor în agricultură și în zonele rurale (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (vot) 48	4.3 -	Úloha žien v poľnohospodárstve a vo vidieckych oblastiach (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (hlasovanie)..... 48
4.4 -	Finanțarea UE în domeniul dezafectării centralelor nucleare din noile state membre (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (vot) 48	4.4 -	Financovanie EÚ v oblasti vyradovania jadrových elektrární v nových členských štátoch z prevádzky (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (hlasovanie)..... 48
4.5 -	Mobilizarea Fondului european de ajustare la globalizare: Republica Cehă - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (vot)..... 48	4.5 -	Uvoľnenie prostriedkov z Európskeho fondu na prispôsobenie sa globalizácii: Česká republika – UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (hlasovanie)..... 48
4.6 -	Produce și tehnologii cu dublă utilizare (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (vot) 48	4.6 -	Položky a technológie s dvojakým použitím (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (hlasovanie) 48
4.7 -	Creditele la export care beneficiază de sprijin public (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (vot) 48	4.7 -	Štátom podporované vývozné úvery (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (hlasovanie)..... 48
4.8 -	Noul cadru al politicii UE de combatere a violenței împotriva femeilor (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (vot)..... 48	4.8 -	Politický rámec EÚ zameraný na boj proti násiliu páchanému na ženách (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (hlasovanie)..... 48
5 -	Explicații privind votul..... 48	5 -	Vysvetlenia hlasovania..... 48
6 -	Corectările voturilor și intențiile de vot: a se vedea procesul-verbal..... 77	6 -	Opravy hlasovania a zámery pri hlasovaní: pozri zápisnicu..... 77
7 -	Aprobarea procesului-verbal al ședinței anterioare: consultați procesul-verbal..... 77	7 -	Schválenie zápisnice z predchádzajúceho rokovania: pozri zápisnicu 77
8 -	Depunerea documentelor: a se vedea procesul-verbal 77	8 -	Predložené dokumenty: pozri zápisnicu 77
9 -	Timpul afectat întrebărilor adresate Președintelui Comisiei 77	9 -	Hodina otázok pre predsedu Komisie 77
10 -	Cadrul UE de coordonare a strategiilor naționale de integrare a romilor (dezbateri) 87	10 -	Rámec EÚ týkajúci sa koordinácie národných stratégií integrácie Rómov (rozprava) 87
11 -	Estimarea bugetului de venituri și cheltuieli pentru exercițiul financiar 2012 - Secțiunea I - Parlamentul (dezbateri)..... 92	11 -	Odhad príjmov a výdavkov na rok 2012 – oddiel I – Európsky parlament (rozprava)..... 92
12 -	Protecția intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene - Lupta împotriva fraudei (dezbateri) . 102	12 -	Ochrana finančných záujmov Spoločenstiev – Boj proti podvodom (rozprava)..... 102
13 -	Timpul afectat întrebărilor (întrebări adresate Comisiei) 110	13 -	Hodina otázok (otázky pre Komisiu)..... 110
14 -	Statutul și finanțarea partidelor politice la nivel european (dezbateri) 125	14 -	Štatút a financovanie politických strán na európskej úrovni (rozprava)..... 125
15 -	Acordul de parteneriat în sectorul pescuitului între CE și Uniunea Comorelor - Măsurile financiare comunitare privind punerea în aplicare a politicii comune în domeniul pescuitului și în domeniul dreptului mării - Pescuit - măsuri tehnice tranzitorii - Importurile provenite din Groenlanda de produse pescărești (dezbateri) 135	15 -	Dohoda o partnerstve v sektore rybolovu medzi ES a Komorami - Finančné opatrenia Spoločenstva na vykonávanie spoločnej politiky v oblasti rybného hospodárstva a finančné opatrenia v oblasti morského práva - Rybné hospodárstvo – prechodné technické opatrenia - Dovoz produktov rybolovu z Grónska (rozprava)..... 135
16 -	Ordinea de zi a următoarei ședințe: a se vedea procesul-verbal 147	16 -	Program rokovania na nasledujúci deň: pozri zápisnicu..... 147
17 -	Ridicarea ședinței 147	17 -	Skončenie rokovania..... 147

SL	VSEBINA	FI	SISÄLTÖ	
1 -	Otvoritev seje.....	17	1 - Istunnon avaaminen.....	17
2 -	Razprave o primerih kršitev človekovih pravic, demokracije in načela pravne države (razglasitev vloženih predlogov resolucij): glej zapisnik.....	17	2 - Keskustelu ihmisoikeuksien sekä demokratian ja oikeusvaltion periaatteiden loukkauksia koskevista tapauksista (käsiteltäväksi jätetyt pätöslauselmaesitykset): ks. pöytäkirja	17
3 -	Sklepi Evropskega sveta (24.-25. 3. 2011) (razprava)	17	3 - Eurooppa-neuvoston (24.–25. maaliskuuta 2011) pöytäkirjat (keskustelu).....	17
4 -	Čas glasovanja.....	47	4 - Äänestykset.....	47
4.1 -	Uporaba sredstev Evropskega sklada za prilagoditev globalizaciji: Poljska - Podkarpackie - Proizvodnja strojev (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (glasovanje).....	47	4.1 - Euroopan globalisaatiorahaston varojen käyttöönnotto: Puola - Podkarpackie - koneiden ja laitteiden valmistus (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (äänestys)	47
4.2 -	Migracijski tokovi, ki nastajajo zaradi nestabilnosti: obseg in vloga zunanje politike EU (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (glasovanje).....	48	4.2 - Epävakauden aiheuttamat muuttovirrat: EU:n ulkopolitiikan soveltamisala ja tehtävä (A7- 0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (äänestys)	48
4.3 -	Vloga žensk v kmetijstvu in na podeželju (A7- 0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (glasovanje).....	48	4.3 - Naisten asema maataloudessa ja maaseudulla (A7- 0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (äänestys)	48
4.4 -	Financiranje EU na področju razgradnje jedrskih elektrarn v novih državah članicah (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (glasovanje).....	48	4.4 - EU:n rahoitus ydinvoimalaitosten käytöstä poistamisen alalla uusissa jäsenvaltioissa (A7- 0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (äänestys)....	48
4.5 -	Uporaba sredstev Evropskega sklada za prilagoditev globalizaciji: Češka republika - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (glasovanje).....	48	4.5 - Euroopan globalisaatiorahaston varojen käyttöönnotto: Tšekki – UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (äänestys)	48
4.6 -	Blago in tehnologija z dvojno rabo (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (glasovanje).....	48	4.6 - Kaksikäyttötuotteiden ja -teknologian vientiä koskeva valvontajärjestelmä (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (äänestys).....	48
4.7 -	Uradno podprti izvozni krediti (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (glasovanje).....	48	4.7 - Julkisesti tuetut vientiluotot (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (äänestys)	48
4.8 -	Politični okvir EU za boj proti nasilju nad ženskami (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (glasovanje).....	48	4.8 - Naisiin kohdistuvan väkivallan torjumista koskeva EU:n politiikka (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (äänestys)	48
5 -	Obrazložitev glasovanja.....	48	5 - Äänestysesitykset	48
6 -	Popravki in namere glasovanja: glej zapisnik.....	77	6 - Äänestymiskäyttäytymistä ja äänestysaikeita koskevat ilmoitukset: ks. pöytäkirja.....	77
7 -	Sprejetje zapisnika predhodne seje: gl. zapisnik....	77	7 - Edellisen istunnon pöytäkirjan hyväksyminen: ks. pöytäkirja	77
8 -	Predložitev dokumentov: glej zapisnik.....	77	8 - Vastaanotetut asiakirjat: ks. pöytäkirja.....	77
9 -	Čas za vprašanja predsedniku Komisije	77	9 - Kyselytunti (komission puheenjohtaja).....	77
10 -	Okvir EU za usklajevanje nacionalnih strategij vključevanja Romov (razprava)	87	10 - Romanien osallistamista koskevien kansallisten strategioiden koordinoitua koskevat EU:n puitteet (keskustelu)	87
11 -	Načrt prihodkov in odhodkov za leto 2012 - Oddelek I - Parlament (razprava)	92	11 - Ennakoarvio tuloista ja menoista varainhoitovuodeksi 2012 - Pääluokka I - Euroopan parlamentti (keskustelu).....	92
12 -	Zaščita finančnih interesov Evropske unije – boj proti goljufijam (razprava)	102	12 - Yhteisöjen taloudellisten etujen suojaaminen - petostentorjunta (keskustelu).....	102
13 -	Čas za vprašanja (vprašanja Komisiji).....	110	13 - Kyselytunti (kysymykset komissiolle)	110
14 -	Politične stranke na evropski ravni in pravila glede njihovega financiranja (razprava).....	125	14 - Euroopan tason poliittisia puolueita ja niiden rahoitusta koskevat säännöt (keskustelu)	125
15 -	Sporazum med Evropsko skupnostjo in Zvezo Komori o ribolovu - Finančni ukrepi Skupnosti za izvajanje skupne ribiške politike in na področju pomorskega prava - Ribišstvo - prehodni tehnični ukrepi - Uvoz ribiških proizvodov iz Grenlandije (razprava)	135	15 - EY:n ja Komorien välinen kalastuskumppanuussopimus - Yhteisen kalastuspolitiikan täytäntöönpanoa ja kansainvälisen merioikeuden alaa koskevat yhteisön rahoitustoimenpiteet - Kalastus - tekniset siirtymätoimenpiteet - Kalastustuotteiden tuonti Grönlannista (keskustelu).....	135
16 -	Dnevni red naslednje seje: glej zapisnik.....	147	16 - Seuraavan istunnon esityslista: ks. pöytäkirja ...	147
17 -	Zaključek seje.....	147	17 - Istunnon päättäminen.....	147

SV INNEHÅLL

1 - Öppnande av sammanträdet.....	17
2 - Debatter om fall av kränkningar av de mänskliga rättigheterna samt av demokratiska och rättsstatliga principer (tillkännagivande av ingivna resolutionsförslag): se protokollet	17
3 - Europeiska rådets slutsatser (24-25 mars 2011) (debatt)	17
4 - Omröstning	47
4.1 - Utnyttjande av Europeiska fonden för justering för globaliseringseffekter: Polen – Podkarpackie – maskintillverkning (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (omröstning).....	47
4.2 - Migrationsströmmar till följd av instabilitet: Omfattning och roll för EU:s utrikespolitik (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (omröstning).....	48
4.3 - Kvinnors roll inom jordbruket och i landsbygdsområden (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (omröstning)	48
4.4 - EU-finansieringen vid avvecklingen av kärnkraftverk i de nya medlemsstaterna (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (omröstning).....	48
4.5 - Utnyttjande av Europeiska fonden för justering för globaliseringseffekter: Tjeckien – Unilever (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (omröstning).....	48
4.6 - Produkter och teknik med dubbla användningsområden (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (omröstning)	48
4.7 - Statsstödda exportkrediter (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (omröstning)	48
4.8 - Ram för EU-politiken för att bekämpa våld mot kvinnor (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (omröstning).....	48
5 - Röstförklaringar.....	48
6 - Rättelser/avsiktsförklaringar till avgivna röster: se protokollet	77
7 - Justering av protokollet från föregående sammanträde: se protokollet.....	77
8 - Inkomna dokument: se protokollet	77
9 - Frågetimme med kommissionens ordförande.....	77
10 - EU:s ram för samordning av nationella strategier för integrering av romer (debatt).....	87
11 - Beräkning av inkomster och utgifter för budgetåret 2012 – avsnitt I – parlamentet (debatt).....	92
12 - Skydd av EU:s ekonomiska intressen – Kampen mot bedrägerier (debatt)	102
13 - Frågestund (frågor till kommissionen)	110
14 - Regler för och finansiering av politiska partier på europeisk nivå (debatt)	125
15 - Fiskeavtalet mellan EG och Komorerna - Gemenskapens finansieringsåtgärder för genomförande av den gemensamma fiskeripolitiken och havsrättsligt arbete - Fiske – tekniska övergångsbestämmelser - Import av fiskeriprodukter från Grönland (debatt).....	135
16 - Föredragningslista för nästa sammanträde: se protokollet	147
17 - Avslutande av sammanträdet.....	147

ВТОРНИК 5 АПРИЛ 2011 Г.
 MARTES 5 DE ABRIL DE 2011
 ÚTERÝ 5. DUBNA 2011
 TIRSDAG DEN 5. APRIL 2011
 DIENSTAG, 5. APRIL 2011
 TEISIPÄEV, 5. APRILL 2011
 ΤΡΙΤΗ 5 ΑΠΡΙΑΙΟΥ 2011
 TUESDAY, 5 APRIL 2011
 MARDI 5 AVRIL 2011
 MARTEDI' 5 APRILE 2011
 OTRDIENA, 2011. GADA 5. APRĪLIS

2011 M. BALANDŽIO 5 D., ANTRADIENIS
 2011. ÁPRILIS 5., KEDD
 IT-TLIETA, 5 TA' APRIL 2011
 DINSDAG 5 APRIL 2011
 WTOREK, 5 KWIETNIA 2011
 TERÇA-FEIRA, 5 DE ABRIL DE 2011
 MARȚI 5 APRILIE 2011
 UTOROK 5. APRÍLA 2011
 TOREK, 5. APRIL 2011
 TIISTAI 5. HUHTIKUUTA 2011
 TISDAGEN DEN 5 APRIL 2011

PRZEWODNICZY: JERZY BUZEK
Przewodniczący

1 - Otwarcie posiedzenia

(Posiedzenie zostało otwarte o godz. 9.05)

2 - Debata nad przypadkami łamania praw człowieka, zasad demokracji i państwa prawa (ogłoszenie o złożonych projektach rezolucji): patrz protokół

3 - Konkluzje z posiedzenia Rady Europejskiej (24-25 marca 2011 r.) (debata)

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku
 dziennego jest oświadczenie przewodniczącego Rady
 Europejskiej „Konkluzje z posiedzenia Rady
 Europejskiej (24 - 25 marca 2011 r.)”. Głos zabierze
 przewodniczący Rady Europejskiej Herman Van
 Rompuy.

**Herman Van Rompuy, President of the European
 Council.** – Mr President, President of the European
 Commission, honourable Members, within the space of
 49 days, I have chaired 3 meetings of the European
 Council and a Summit of Heads of State and
 Government of the eurozone. These facts illustrate the
 great and urgent challenges our Union is facing, both on
 the economic and on the diplomatic front. It also neatly
 illustrates that meetings of the European Council are not
 just an event: they are part of a process. Indeed, in the
 meeting on which I am reporting today – that of 24 and
 25 March – we duly approved a significant set of
 economic measures that have been prepared and

discussed over the last year, we stepped up our action
 with regard to ongoing events in Libya and we initiated
 our response to the catastrophic events in Japan. Allow
 me to take each of those issues in turn.

On economic issues, we took forward a comprehensive
 package of measures. Under the impulse of earlier
 meetings, including the informal eurozone summit of
 11 March, we were able to bring together almost all the
 strengths of this endeavour. Of course, approving
 measures and procedures to deal with the crisis does not
 in itself take you immediately out of the crisis. This will
 require perseverance and sustained effort. I will not
 repeat all the decisions we took in detail. You will find
 them in the conclusions. However, let me summarise six
 key points.

Number one: we agreed on the Treaty amendment
 needed to give full legal certainty to the permanent
 Stability Mechanism. In its resolution of 15 December,
 Parliament called for a light Treaty change that provides
 a legal basis for such a mechanism, rather than resorting
 to a profound amendment of the Treaty. We followed
 that advice, and I was delighted when Parliament
 endorsed the proposed Treaty amendment by such an
 overwhelming majority on 23 March. I am especially
 glad that we were able to reassure Parliament about
 some of the concerns that had been raised in this context.
 I would like to thank the rapporteurs, Mr Brok and
 Mr Gualtieri, for working so closely with me to achieve
 this result.

Number two: we reached a detailed agreement on the
 size, scope and mode of operation for the future Stability
 Mechanism and on improving the temporary facility.

Number three: we endorsed the position of the Council
 on the six legislative proposals on budgetary and
 macroeconomic surveillance ahead of negotiations with
 Parliament. I know you are working hard on this; indeed,
 I met your rapporteurs and will be meeting your

coordinators this afternoon. All those concerned understand the need to conclude by June.

Number four: we started the European Semester. It is an exercise in which we follow up the implementation of the EU 2020 strategy, the Stability and Growth Pact and macroeconomic surveillance. The European Council in June will draw the necessary conclusions. I will personally see to it that this does not sink into the sands of a bureaucratic process.

Number five: we agreed that credible stress tests for the banks will take place soon. The task is double: the banks must do the test and governments must be ready to deal with the outcome of the tests.

Number six: we provided for a new quality of economic coordination. We call it the Euro Plus Pact for two reasons: firstly because it is about what eurozone countries want to do more – they share one currency and wish to undertake supplementary efforts on top of existing EU commitments and arrangements; and secondly because it is also open to the others. That is why I am glad that six non-euro countries have already announced that they will join the Pact. They are Denmark, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria and Romania. It remains open for any of the four remaining Member States to join later on.

Let me say once again that the political commitment of the Euro Plus Pact comes on top of all the other measures in the package to improve Member States' economic performance: the stronger Stability and Growth Pact on fiscal surveillance, the new macroeconomic surveillance and implementation of the crucial EU 2020 strategy on structural reforms to achieve economic growth. The commitments in terms of competitiveness, public finances and pensions, employment and so on must be translated into the national reform and stability programmes. They will also be evaluated annually at the highest level.

I have a final remark on the economy. Some people fear this work is about dismantling the welfare states and social protection. Not at all. As I said to the social partners at the Tripartite Social Summit, it is to save these fundamental aspects of the European model. We want to make sure that our economies are competitive enough to create jobs and to sustain the welfare of all our citizens and that is what our work is about. These, then, were the main elements of our global economic package to help us come out of the crisis. As I said, they are the result of a long process, not a single meeting.

It was on 25 March 2010 that the European Council decided to improve European economic governance, launching the Task Force that I had the honour to chair. One year later, we are getting new rules, new instruments and more ambitious policies. It was, and remains, an effort of all institutions, including this Parliament and all the Member States. It was not always easy, not always without drama, but the political will has

been unflinching, our sense of direction is clear and significant results are there.

Not all our problems are over. They are the result of past mistakes and a lack of appropriate instruments both at the European and at the national level. But we now have every chance of dealing with them and not repeating them.

I should now like to turn to the situation in Libya, which was, of course, something we discussed on 24 and 25 March. We showed common determination. I know that some among you had doubts, but we worked hard to secure concrete results. Two weeks previously, at an extraordinary meeting of the European Council on 11 March, we had adopted a clear line on Libya. Without that clear European position, the subsequent actions would not have been possible. We decided that, to safeguard the safety of the civilian population, Member States could examine all necessary options, provided that there is a demonstrable need, a clear legal basis and support from the region.

Those three conditions were quickly met. The clear need was obvious when the regime stepped up the violence against its own people. The legal base was provided when the UN Security Council agreed the landmark resolution on Libya a few days after the European Council meeting. Regional support was immediately forthcoming from the Arab League.

The actions undertaken by a coalition of European, Arab and North American countries implementing the UN resolution have helped protect the civilian population of Libya. A massive bloodbath has been avoided. Thousands of lives have been saved. This is the most important result and deserves the highest attention, more so than the decision-making process. The wood is more important than the trees.

We all know that the decision to take military action was not easy. There are, quite naturally, questions and hesitations. That is perfectly normal in issues of war and peace. But any difficulties that we have experienced over that aspect of the Libyan crisis should not mask for one moment the full track record of the European Union. From the beginning of the crisis, the European Union was at the forefront. It was the first to impose sanctions, the first to impose a travel ban on leading figures in the regime, the first to freeze Libyan assets and the first to recognise the Interim Transitional National Council as a valid interlocutor, at the request of this Parliament. The Union also coordinated rescue efforts for EU citizens and has provided, and continues to provide, substantial humanitarian aid.

The political objectives we set on 11 March remain unchanged. Gaddafi must go. We want a political transition led by the Libyans themselves and based on broad-based political dialogue. We stand ready to help a new Libya, both economically and in building its new institutions.

We are also following the events in the rest of the region closely. Knowing that the situation is different in each country, we express our utmost concern at the situation in Syria, Yemen and Bahrain. We strongly condemn the escalation of violence and we support political and social reforms in our southern neighbourhood. We also have to change our policy, and I will be discussing this later today with several MEPs responsible for this region within Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs. On the positive side, we noted the smooth conduct of the constitutional referendum in Egypt two weeks ago.

Allow me to say a few words on Côte d'Ivoire as well. It was not on the agenda of the most recent European Council, but we adopted conclusions in December and have been closely following developments there ever since. First of all, we condemn the violence, particularly violence against civilians, in the strongest possible terms. This must stop on all sides. Secondly, the current situation is a clear result of the lack of respect for democracy. Democracy is not only about elections, but also respect for the outcome of the elections. The international community was clear about the results of the presidential elections in Côte d'Ivoire last year. We must be consistent in our position.

Finally, on Japan, turning to the accumulation of tragedies that had hit Japan, we as the European Council expressed our sympathy and solidarity for the Japanese people and our condolences for the thousands of victims. We must not forget them, even while other aspects of the drama in Japan are retaining our attention. We are ready as a Union to assist in any way we can. In these tragic days, as true friends of Japan, we reiterate the strategic importance of the EU-Japan relationship. As we know, the effects of the events go beyond Japan, and that is why the European Union is drawing all the lessons fully. We are paying close attention to the consequences for the global economy and to the nuclear aspects. That is a top priority.

We therefore decided that the safety of all of our nuclear plants should be urgently reviewed in the 'stress tests' on safety. The Commission will report to the European Council on the stress tests before the end of the year. It will review existing EU rules on the safety of nuclear installations and propose improvements wherever necessary. In Europe, we want the highest standard for nuclear safety, because ensuring the safety of nuclear plants cannot stop at our borders. We encourage and support neighbouring countries to do similar stress tests. A worldwide review of nuclear plants would be best.

Mr President, honourable Members, that concludes my summary of what we agreed at this, the third meeting of the European Council this year. Much of it paves the way for further work in this Parliament, be it through legislative procedures or through Parliament's general right of scrutiny over the common foreign and security policy. I look forward to hearing your views.

2-009

José Manuel Barroso, *Président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, le Président du Conseil européen nous a fait une présentation sur l'ensemble des décisions prises lors de la réunion de la semaine passée. Permettez-moi de partager avec vous la lecture que j'en fais et, surtout, de vous dire quelques mots sur les étapes à venir.

Je crois que l'on peut dire que des décisions structurelles très significatives ont été prises pour une plus grande stabilité financière de la zone euro et une plus grande coordination économique. C'est un véritable tournant pour la gouvernance économique européenne, surtout si l'on pense au chemin parcouru.

Nous avons enfin sérieusement consolidé les fondations de la composante économique de notre union économique et monétaire. Je crois que, maintenant, elle aura des bases plus stables.

Nous disposons dorénavant d'un cadre pour mieux répondre ensemble à des crises qui pourraient se produire. Et, dernier élément, et non des moindres, pour apprécier les résultats de ce Conseil, on peut dire que le cadre respecte les dispositions du traité et suit une approche communautaire.

Nous savons tous que cela n'était pas gagné d'avance. La Commission a été aux avant-postes de la réponse globale à la crise et de la vision d'une Europe à l'horizon 2020. Elle a bénéficié du soutien crucial de ce Parlement, ce dont je tiens une fois de plus à vous remercier. Les positions prises ensemble par ce Parlement et par la Commission en défense de l'approche communautaire ont été entendues et ont joué un rôle important dans les résultats obtenus.

Notre nouvelle architecture économique est donc maintenant largement en place. Mais elle n'est pas une garantie en soi: il faudra que les responsables politiques prennent les décisions de substance adéquates.

Nous devons, dans ce nouveau cadre, mettre en œuvre avec détermination et sans plus tarder les priorités d'assainissement budgétaire et de réformes structurelles nécessaires à la croissance qui ont été entérinées par ce Conseil européen, sur la base de l'examen annuel de croissance préparé par la Commission.

Je suis confiant que notre détermination dans les semaines et mois à venir sera aussi forte, si ce n'est plus, que celle dont nous avons fait preuve jusqu'à présent dans la mise en place cohérente et coordonnée des différents éléments de notre réponse globale à la crise: semestre européen, pacte euro plus, nouveau cadre de gouvernance économique renforcée ainsi que des mesures solidaires et responsables pour maintenir la stabilité financière de la zone euro.

Je ne vous cache pas que la Commission aurait voulu aller plus loin dans plusieurs domaines de la

gouvernance économique, et notamment en ce qui concerne le nouveau mécanisme de stabilisation financière de la zone euro. Nous aurions voulu davantage de flexibilité, par exemple. Toutefois, je crois que l'on peut dire que nous avons réussi à obtenir un mécanisme ancré dans le traité, avec une forte intervention de la Commission et un suivi par ce Parlement. Le résultat obtenu est important et l'avis positif sur la modification du traité, si largement approuvé par cette chambre, y a contribué.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, il faut désormais mettre les nouvelles structures de gouvernance au service d'une réponse à la conjoncture. La vérité est que la conjoncture reste difficile. Et la balle est maintenant surtout dans le camp des États membres qui doivent finaliser leurs programmes nationaux de réforme et leurs programmes de stabilité ou de convergence.

La Commission attend de recevoir de chacun d'entre eux des propositions concrètes et ambitieuses pour progresser ensemble sur la voie des grands objectifs de la stratégie Europe 2020, c'est-à-dire pour plus d'emplois et plus d'investissements dans l'éducation, la formation, la recherche et l'innovation, et aussi pour lutter de façon plus courageuse contre la pauvreté et l'exclusion sociale.

Nous attendons également la présentation de leurs mesures pour corriger les déséquilibres macroéconomiques persistants et améliorer la compétitivité et la croissance pour l'emploi.

Dès que nous recevrons ces documents, nous pourrons alors préparer nos propositions d'avis et de recommandations par pays pour qu'elles puissent être adoptées avant le Conseil européen de juin, qui marquera la fin du cycle du tout premier semestre européen.

Je tiens à souligner que nous partageons tous ici une responsabilité commune et qu'il est important que chacun s'approprie pleinement la stratégie Europe 2020. C'est la stratégie Europe 2020 qui reste le cadre essentiel pour les réformes européennes pour la croissance et pour l'emploi. Et je voudrais citer à cet égard le point 6 des conclusions du Conseil européen qui précise très clairement que – et je cite – "dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre de ces politiques et pour obtenir une large adhésion à ce processus, une coopération étroite sera assurée avec le Parlement européen et les autres institutions et organes consultatifs de l'Union européenne (Comité économique et social européen, Comité des régions); les parlements nationaux, les partenaires sociaux, les régions et d'autres parties prenantes y seront pleinement associés." J'insiste sur ce point, parce que, vous le savez, l'une des critiques les plus fréquentes à la stratégie de Lisbonne était précisément le manque d'*ownership* du programme de réformes pour l'économie européenne. J'espère que, cette fois-ci, nous aurons pu bénéficier des leçons que nous pouvons tirer de ce processus, et cette fois-ci engager vraiment, sur le plan européen et national, un effort sérieux de croissance pour l'emploi.

Sur le front de la réforme de la gouvernance économique, il revient maintenant au Parlement d'avancer vers l'approbation finale du paquet des six propositions législatives et j'espère que nous aboutirons rapidement à un résultat ambitieux. C'est essentiel pour avoir tout le système de gouvernance en place.

Je pense donc que nous avons beaucoup de raisons d'être satisfaits des résultats du dernier Conseil européen, mais aussi beaucoup de raisons pour ne pas relâcher nos efforts, bien au contraire, car la conjoncture reste difficile et incertaine, notamment sur les aspects sociaux qui nous préoccupent tous beaucoup.

Dans les semaines à venir, la Commission présentera également ses propositions sur l'acte pour le marché unique et je me réjouis que le Conseil européen ait dédié tellement de temps à la discussion sur l'avenir du marché unique, et aussi qu'il ait souligné le rôle crucial du marché unique pour stimuler la croissance et l'emploi et favoriser la compétitivité, en relevant notamment l'importance de réduire les contraintes réglementaires qui pèsent en particulier sur les PME.

Nous voulons libérer le potentiel de croissance du marché unique. Et je voudrais rappeler ici que la consolidation budgétaire ne constitue pas un objectif en soi, mais un moyen pour activer une croissance équitable et durable et créer des emplois.

Et puisque nous parlons de croissance équitable, il est important de souligner que le Conseil européen s'est également prononcé sur la possibilité d'une taxe d'imposition sur les transactions financières internationales. Et j'ai confirmé l'intention de la Commission de faire des propositions dans le domaine de la taxation du secteur financier. En fait, nous pensons que tous doivent donner une contribution dans la réponse à la crise.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, comme vous le savez, le Conseil européen a également discuté de la situation en Méditerranée du Sud, notamment en Libye. Le président du Conseil européen a présenté un rapport très détaillé. Je voudrais simplement vous mentionner l'entretien que j'ai eu hier avec le Premier ministre de la Tunisie. J'ai réitéré notre appui à la révolution démocratique et notre disponibilité à aider le peuple tunisien dans sa quête de liberté, de justice et de progrès social. J'ai aussi évoqué, dans ce contexte, la question de la migration, que la Tunisie et l'Europe doivent aborder ensemble, dans un esprit constructif, un esprit de véritable partenariat, car c'est précisément un partenariat pour la démocratie et pour la prospérité partagée que nous avons proposé et que le Conseil européen a très bien reçu.

Un autre sujet a occupé le Conseil européen, précisément la crise au Japon et notamment les aspects nucléaires.

J'ai également eu hier une conversation téléphonique assez substantielle avec le Premier ministre japonais, qui a remercié l'Union européenne pour son action et à qui

j'ai exprimé de nouveau notre solidarité, en lui réaffirmant que nous continuerons à nous tenir à leurs côtés. Nous avons aussi discuté de la question nucléaire. Le Premier ministre Kan m'a informé sur la situation au Japon, sur les derniers développements en matière de sécurité, et a marqué sa disponibilité pour coopérer avec nous dans les efforts qui seront faits, en Europe et dans le monde, en matière de sûreté nucléaire.

Il est évident qu'il y a une inquiétude publique grandissante autour du nucléaire. Il faut répondre à cette inquiétude et assurer une sûreté nucléaire maximale. Et il faut agir en toute transparence. Il va donc être procédé à des "tests de résistance" des centrales nucléaires européennes et les résultats seront rendus publics. Le Conseil européen a chargé la Commission européenne et le groupe des régulateurs européens dans le domaine de la sûreté nucléaire de définir l'étendue et les modalités de ces tests, qui seront menés par des autorités nationales indépendantes. La Commission examinera également le cadre législatif réglementaire en matière de sûreté des installations nucléaires et proposera, d'ici à la fin de l'année, toutes les améliorations qui pourraient se révéler nécessaires.

Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, nous ne devons pas décevoir l'espoir mis dans notre capacité d'agir ensemble pour le bien commun européen. C'est ce à quoi la Commission s'emploie quotidiennement, en sachant pouvoir compter sur le soutien de ce Parlement, et nous continuerons à le faire en assumant pleinement nos nouvelles responsabilités.

2-010

Joseph Daul, au nom du groupe PPE. – Messieurs les Présidents, chers collègues, le dernier Conseil européen a fait progresser nos pays dans la bonne direction. En augmentant la capacité du Fonds de solidarité et en décidant de le pérenniser, les 27 ont prouvé une nouvelle fois leur attachement à l'euro et l'importance qu'ils attachent à la solidarité entre les pays les plus solides financièrement et ceux qui éprouvent des difficultés momentanées.

Dans le même temps, la décision de sceller un pacte de l'euro entre les pays membres de la zone euro, et même au-delà, est significative de la volonté politique des dirigeants européens de tirer les leçons de la crise financière.

En effet, la monnaie que nous partageons nous oblige à plus de cohérence dans nos choix économiques et sociaux. Le temps est passé où chaque pays pouvait, sans consultation préalable de ses partenaires, prévoir un taux de fiscalité atypique ou des règles sociales particulières. La raison en est simple: tout pays doit pouvoir bénéficier de la solidarité de ses partenaires de la zone euro.

Mais cette solidarité ne peut être acceptée par nos peuples que s'ils savent que chacun fait des efforts comparables dans la gestion de ses deniers publics. Le pacte de l'euro, dans ce sens, est une avancée importante

vers la convergence de nos économies. Mon groupe le soutient fermement, tout en demandant – et je ne cesserai de le faire – que sa mise en œuvre s'opère dans le contexte de la méthode communautaire, sous l'autorité de la Commission, mon cher Président. Vous avancez, vous avez fait un travail qui est bien, mais il faut encore avancer dans cette méthode communautaire sous l'autorité de la Commission. C'est comme ça que nous allons construire l'Europe. Chers collègues, vous savez que je suis têtu et je continuerai à le répéter autant de fois qu'il le faudra, encore ici, pour qu'on ne l'oublie pas.

L'Europe se distingue dans le monde par son modèle d'économie sociale de marché, un modèle auquel nos concitoyens sont justement attachés et qui est fondé sur le principe de la solidarité, mais qu'il est difficile de préserver dans le contexte de la mondialisation. La question est de savoir comment lui assurer un avenir viable en trouvant un juste milieu entre l'assistanat prôné par les socialistes, dont on a vu qu'il nous menait à la faillite, et celui du libéralisme à outrance, dont on a vu les dangers avec la crise financière.

Pour y parvenir, il faut s'assurer de trois choses. Premièrement, que tous nos pays réduisent leur déficit, deuxièmement, qu'ils adoptent des règles budgétaires, fiscales et sociales comparables et, troisièmement, qu'ils investissent ensemble dans l'innovation pour doper notre croissance, à ce jour clairement insuffisante. Nous ne pouvons, en effet, préserver et renforcer notre modèle que si nous investissons dans les secteurs d'avenir: énergie verte, nanotechnologies, biotechnologies, etc.. Étant donné notre marge de manœuvre financière réduite, la meilleure façon de remporter le défi de la croissance et de faire des économies d'échelle est de mutualiser nos compétences et nos capitaux. Sans l'investissement massif dans l'innovation, sans véritable plan européen, nous nous priverons de la capacité de rivaliser avec nos concurrents.

Chers collègues, pendant que nos chefs d'État et de gouvernement se réunissaient, il y a dix jours, la centrale de Fukushima continuait de préoccuper le monde entier et les insurgés de Libye attendaient un geste fort des Européens. Sur ces deux sujets, nos pays et l'Union européenne ont agi avec esprit de responsabilité.

Sur le nucléaire, en effet, nous avons offert au Japon notre savoir-faire, dans une situation extrêmement difficile et préoccupante pour ce pays, mais aussi pour l'ensemble de la communauté internationale. Il y aura, c'est certain, un avant et un après-Fukushima. Mon groupe souhaite que l'après-Fukushima, même si nous n'y sommes malheureusement pas encore, constitue une période de réflexion et d'action pour assurer, d'une part, un renforcement significatif des règles de sûreté nucléaire et, d'autre part, un accroissement de nos efforts dans le domaine de l'énergie verte. Je suis d'accord avec votre approche, Président, concernant la Côte d'Ivoire.

Sur la Méditerranée enfin, je salue l'appel réitéré par le Conseil européen au retrait du colonel Kadhafi, permettant de tourner une nouvelle page dans l'histoire

de ce pays. Je souhaite que tous nos pays se réunissent autour d'une politique de voisinage aussi ambitieuse et couronnée de succès au Sud qu'ils ont su le faire dans les années 90 à l'Est.

(Applaudissements)

2-011

Martin Schulz, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Wenn man den Reden von Herrn Van Rompuy und Herrn Barroso aufmerksam zuhört, fällt einem spontan das schöne deutsche Lied ein: „Alles im Griff auf dem sinkenden Schiff“. Wir haben keine Probleme, es ist alles *easy*. Wir haben alles zur besten Zufriedenheit von jedem gelöst.

Ihre Berichte über den Europäischen Rat kann ich jedenfalls so nicht nachvollziehen. Ich habe Verständnis dafür, dass Sie nicht hierherkommen, um uns Negatives zu berichten. Ich würde, wenn ich Präsident des Europäischen Rates wäre, diesen permanenten Wiener Kongress wahrscheinlich auch in den schillerndsten Farben hier schildern.

Sie haben über Libyen gesprochen. Was Sie dabei nicht erwähnt haben, ist die tiefgreifende Differenz der beiden größten europäischen Regierungen in dieser Frage. Zwischen Frankreich und Deutschland gibt es überhaupt keinen Konsens in der Libyen-Frage. Die Zerstrittenheit der Europäischen Union in einer der zentralsten internationalen Fragen ist ein Indiz dafür, dass man eben nicht alles im Griff hat. Das Ergebnis dieses Rates, Herr Van Rompuy, hätten wir bereits im Jahr 2010 haben können, besser gesagt, wir hätten es im Jahre 2010 bereits haben müssen. Wenn wir hätten verhindern wollen, dass es während eines Jahres eine Abwärtsspirale – vor allen Dingen in der Eurozone – gibt, hätte man das bereits im Frühjahr 2010 so machen müssen, wie es jetzt gemacht worden ist.

Wir müssen uns die Frage stellen, warum es im Frühjahr 2010 nicht so gemacht worden ist? Weil im Europäischen Rat, in der Institution, der Sie vorsitzen, eben nicht die Gemeinschaftsmethode, der Gemeinschaftsgeist und das gemeinschaftliche Ziel bestimmt, was diskutiert und entschieden wird, sondern noch der letzte nationale taktische Vorbehalt eine größere Rolle spielt als das gemeinsame europäische Ziel. Und darunter leidet Europa in besonderer Weise.

Ich hätte mir von Ihnen, Herr Barroso, zum Beispiel ein Wort dazu gewünscht, wie es möglich ist, dass die Partei, der Sie angehören, deren Parteichef Sie waren, die Sie zum Premierminister in Portugal gemacht hat, nun eine Regierung zu Fall bringt, die die Maßnahmen in Portugal durchsetzt, die Sie und der neben Ihnen sitzende Kommissar von dieser Regierung verlangen.

(Beifall)

Das kann man Ihnen nicht zum Vorwurf machen. Sie sind nicht mehr der Chef der Partei. Aber ich hätte mir vom Chef der Kommission ein klares Wort zu diesem

ausschließlich taktischen Vorgehen nationaler Art zu Lasten der Europäischen Union gewünscht, denn der Sturz dieser Regierung kommt exakt zu dem Zeitpunkt, wo diese Regierung sich anschickt, das zu tun, was der Stabilitätsrahmen von ihr verlangt. So kann man Europa nicht nach vorne bringen!

Was mir große Sorgen gemacht hat – dazu habe ich von Ihnen beiden kein Wort gehört – ist, dass immer exakt vor einem Europäischen Rat der gleiche Film abläuft. Kaum haben sich die Staats- und Regierungschefs in den Entwürfen der Schlussfolgerungen auf eine den Euro stabilisierende Maßnahme oder auf eine Maßnahme, die ein einzelnes Euro-Land stabilisieren soll, geeinigt, kommt irgendeine Rating-Agentur – in der City of London oder in New York – und stuft genau dieses Land herab, was immer zum gleichen Ergebnis führt, nämlich zum Anheizen der Spekulationswelle gegen den Euro. Wann haben wir endlich den Mut zu sagen: „Europa lässt sich nicht von diesen Spekulanten weiter regieren“?

(Beifall)

Was sagen wir eigentlich zu den Banken? Ich bin Ihnen dankbar, Herr Barroso, dass Sie jetzt gesagt haben: „Ich komme mit einem Vorschlag zur Finanztransaktionssteuer.“ Die Europäische Zentralbank leiht zurzeit Geld für 1 % an die gleichen Banken, die dieses Geld dann zu 10 % an Mitgliedstaaten der Euro-Zone verleihen. Es bleibt dabei: Die Verursacher der Krise sind immer noch die größten Profiteure der Krise. Deshalb muss die Finanztransaktionssteuer kommen, damit diese an den Folgelasten dieser finanziellen Krise beteiligt werden.

Herr Barroso, Sie haben über Europa 2020 gesprochen: mehr Beschäftigung, mehr Investitionen, mehr Forschung und Bildung, mehr Umweltschutz – toll: durch immer weniger öffentliche Investitionen. Ein Ergebnis ist: EU 2020 ist genau wie der Lissabon-Prozess toll, aber es wird scheitern, wenn wir in der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung Europas immer nur einseitig Haushalte kürzen. Was wir brauchen, ist der Mut zu öffentlichen Investitionen. Schauen Sie sich die Investitionen in den *emerging states* an! Schauen Sie sich die öffentlichen Investitionen in Indien an! Schauen Sie sich das in Brasilien an! Schauen Sie sich in anderen Kontinenten an, was dort öffentlich investiert wird!

Europa kürzt sich zu Tode, und deshalb wäre eine Methode zur Erreichung unserer Ziele, der EU-2020-Ziele, im „Sixpack“ zur Economic Governance als rechtsverbindliche Grundlage zu erklären. Dann verpflichten sich die Regierungen, endlich das zu tun, was sie großartig ankündigen, aber hinterher durch ihre Haushaltskürzungen – übrigens auch durch die Kürzung des EU-Haushalts selbst – verhindern. Deshalb, Herr Barroso, erwarte ich von Ihnen und noch mehr von Ihrem Haushaltskommissar Lewandowski einen engagierten und ambitionierten Entwurf eines EU-Haushalts, der das, was er selbst fordert, möglich macht.

2-012

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank Mr Van Rompuy for this report on the Council, but let us be honest, I do not think that the crisis is over, and I do not believe that, with the measures we are taking now, it can be over. There is a heavy thunderstorm on our doorstep.

What we have done in the European Union so far is to use stop-gaps: measures which may be necessary but are not in fact solving the crisis. We have given EUR 110 billion to Greece and EUR 67 billion to Ireland, and I am not including the EUR 24 billion for the Irish banks that we have just decided to provide. For the moment we have EUR 76 billion in government bonds which the ECB has purchased. I can tell you that it will continue to do that, because the emergency fund is not allowed to go on the secondary markets. This means that it will continue to do so. On top of that, the ECB has accepted EUR 100 billion of collateral to give liquidity to the banks in Europe. In total, that is EUR 400 billion that we have invested in this crisis in recent months. That is three times the budget of the European Union! And the worst is still to come. On Thursday there will probably be an increase in interest rates in Europe – from 1% to 1.25% – which may worsen the situation. It is necessary to combat inflation, but on the other hand this is making the situation worse.

So that is the situation: EUR 400 billion that we have invested. And have we solved the crisis? No, we have not solved the crisis. What is necessary is a really bold and in-depth approach and we do not have that for the moment. In this regard I would like to quote Nout Wellink, the President of the Dutch national bank, who published his annual report a few days ago. He says three things about the outcome of our decisions and those of the Council in recent weeks. He says that the budget rules are not tight enough, the economic governance package is too little and the pact for the euro is in fact too weak because there is no mechanism to enforce it. I am not the one saying this, I am quoting Nout Wellink, President of the Dutch national bank, who is repeating exactly what Mr Trichet said last week. The third thing he mentioned is that financial supervision is being conducted on too national a basis.

I think Nout Wellink is right. We can even add a number of other elements. The first is the EFSF and the ESM. The permanent and temporary rescue funds cannot work because they have a unanimity rule. If we keep this rule, it means that the entire eurozone will from now on be hijacked by eurosceptic governments and by eurosceptic political parties.

Finally – and this is my message for today – we still have to clean up the European banks. The problem has not been solved and the economic recovery in Europe will not start if we do not first of all deal with that problem. Not only do they have the old products from the financial crisis still in their portfolios, but they now also have a number of bonds in their portfolios from

problematic countries whose ratings are going down every day and at least every week.

What I am asking is that Mr Barroso and Mr Trichet come forward as quickly as possible with a global response on that issue, namely a bolder Stability Pact – and Parliament is working on that – and economic governance. Is there real economic governance? What we have now is an intergovernmental approach without a sanction mechanism and that will not work. It has not worked in the past and it will not work in the future. We must come forward with a proposal to abolish the unanimity rule in the rescue funds, because it cannot work. We are in fact giving all the power to the countries and the parties who are against the system.

Finally, we have to come forward with a plan for the European banking sector. We will not have economic recovery before you have put on the table a European mechanism to clean up the banks. We all know that will take money. Recapitalise the European banks, finance investment in Europe – as has been requested by Mr Schulz – and at the same time cover the bad public finances of a number of our Member States. How will we do that? Where is the money? The only way to find the money is to create a real European bond market, and we know it. Creating a European bond market is the only way out of the crisis.

I would like to say to Mr Barroso that now is the time for him to deliver. Time is running out and it is not only with a pact for the euro that we will solve the problems.

2-013

Daniel Cohn-Bendit, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Messieurs les Présidents, chers collègues, j'avoue, Monsieur Van Rompuy, que Martin Schulz vous a cité une petite chanson allemande. En français, cela s'appelle "Tout va très bien, Madame la Marquise, il n'y a pas de problème".

J'avoue que je suis étonné de la manière dont on présente les choses ici. Ne soyons pas dupes! Même si on aime vous écouter, on lit de temps en temps les journaux, donc on sait comment s'est passé ce Conseil. Ne nous racontez pas de petites histoires! On sait quels sont les problèmes. On n'est pas ici pour perdre notre temps.

Je voudrais vous dire une chose, à vous et à M. Barroso. Vous parlez toujours de "stabilité, croissance, emploi, compétitivité". C'est vrai! Mais vous savez comment cela arrive chez les citoyens? Cela s'appelle – et ils le comprennent comme cela – "inégalités, sentiment d'injustice, précarité". C'est cela la traduction. Et si l'Union européenne ne change pas, n'essaie pas de répondre à ce sentiment d'injustice, à ce sentiment d'inégalité ou à cette réalité d'inégalité, à la réalité de la précarité, eh bien les gens comprennent "compétitivité" comme "ça va nous tomber sur le dos".

Et c'est là où nous avons un véritable problème, parce que les mécanismes de sauvetage des banques, qui sont, je le dis, nécessaires, veulent dire, pour les citoyens,

"tout va bien pour les banques". Regardez les bénéficiaires des banques! Regardez les plus gros salaires! Les gens disent: "Mais on est complètement fous! On dépense de l'argent et après, ce seront les citoyens et ce seront les budgets nationaux qui devront être là pour que l'on augmente les inégalités". Toutes les statistiques nous montrent, ces dernières années, que les inégalités augmentent. Si on ne répond pas à ce problème, les citoyens se détournent et l'on voit un peu la vague d'extrême-droite anti-européenne qui monte dans toute l'Europe. Cette vague-là a une raison: c'est que nous sommes incapables de répondre à ce sentiment d'inégalité, d'injustice et de précarité. Donc, tant qu'on ne répondra pas à cela, on n'y arrivera pas.

Et – Guy Verhofstadt en a parlé – en ce qui concerne les eurobonds, ce qu'il faut dire aux citoyens et ce qu'il faut mobiliser, c'est un fonds de défense, oui, mais si nous n'avons pas un fonds d'investissement, si nous ne démontrons pas que, justement, nous voulons relancer la machine – et là, il faut des eurobonds non seulement de défense, mais aussi d'investissement – eh bien, si nous n'allons pas dans cette direction, les citoyens ne comprennent rien et ne comprennent pas cette politique.

Et puis, il faut dire les choses: concernant les inégalités, pourquoi n'est-il pas possible aujourd'hui de prendre, en Europe, certaines mesures sociales qui parlent aux citoyens? Par exemple, de décider d'un salaire minimum pour toute l'Europe, non pas à la même hauteur, mais de lancer l'idée d'un salaire minimum. C'est quand même incroyable que, dans un pays comme l'Allemagne, où l'on parle de rééquilibrage économique, eh bien, ce problème-là, on n'en parle, on n'en discute pas. Il est incroyable que l'Allemagne, un des rares pays faisant le plus de bénéfice aujourd'hui dans l'Europe, soit incapable d'instaurer un salaire minimum pour ses citoyens. C'est quand même quelque chose qu'il faut poser dans la gouvernance économique et sociale de l'Europe.

Alors, à propos de la Libye, Martin Schulz l'a dit avec raison, c'est quand même dramatique! Vous avez un pays comme l'Allemagne qui se cache, et puis d'autres pays qui ont essayé de répondre, et là, je suis d'accord, mais seulement, ce que j'aimerais, quand on discute maintenant d'une politique de voisinage, c'est que nous fassions le bilan des bêtises qu'on a faites avant dans la politique de voisinage. Où en étaient nos relations avec M. Kadhafi avant qu'on le bombarde? Quelles étaient les relations des pays européens avec M. Kadhafi, avec M. Ben Ali, avec M. Moubarak? Faisons enfin une évaluation de ce que, dans les accords d'association, ces articles sur les droits de l'homme comptaient pour nous. Nada! Rien! Si on ne fait pas cette évaluation, arrêtons après de nous mentir. Est-ce qu'au Conseil européen, il y a eu cinq minutes de réflexion sur ce qu'on n'a pas fait, avant, dans la politique de la Méditerranée? Est-ce que vous avez réfléchi à cela? J'ai rien lu dans les journaux, j'ai rien entendu de ce que vous avez dit là-dessus. Si le Conseil européen était capable d'un minimum d'autocritique de ce qui n'a pas été fait avant!

Et puis alors maintenant, sur le Japon. Le problème, c'est que la plus grande sécurité nucléaire, c'est la sortie du nucléaire. Il n'y a pas de risque zéro dans le nucléaire. Cela ne se fera pas du jour au lendemain, mais si on ne sort pas du nucléaire, il n'y aura pas de sécurité. Et le problème, ce n'est pas – *stress test* – un accident. Le problème, et c'est le président de la sûreté nucléaire française, M. Lacoste, qui l'a dit – et c'est quand même incroyable que, jusqu'à présent, nous n'ayons jamais étudié cela –, c'est le cumul des possibilités d'accidents. Et c'est cela le Japon. Ce n'est pas un accident, c'est le cumul de quatre, cinq accidents, plus les erreurs humaines, qui a créé cette situation.

Il est impossible, mathématiquement, d'assurer cette sécurité. Tant que les Européens ne disent pas ... on ne sortira pas du jour au lendemain, mais si on ne sort pas du nucléaire, arrêtons de parler de la sécurité nucléaire. La sécurité zéro, dans le nucléaire, ça n'existe pas.

2-014

Jan Zahradil, za skupinu ECR. – Pane předsedající, nejdůležitějším tématem uplynulé Evropské rady byla ekonomika, stabilita eurozóny. Vy dobře víte, že ve skupině ECR je většina poslanců ze zemí, které nejsou součástí eurozóny a dokonce většina poslanců ze zemí, které se ani nepřipojily k paktu pro euro. To ale neznamená, že bychom si přáli neúspěch eurozóny, naopak, my si přejeme stabilní a prosperující Evropskou unii včetně eurozóny. Přejeme si odpovědné národní vlády, které zastaví zadlužování, které změní strukturu veřejných výdajů, které se pustí do fiskálních reforem a tudíž kroky, které vedou ke znovunastolení finanční disciplíny považujeme za správné.

Co nepovažujeme za správné a co nám vadí je skrytá agenda, kterou tady některé členské státy, částečně i Komise a některé poslanecké skupiny v tomto Parlamentu prosazují. Je to snaha využít tuto krizi k dalšímu posunu pravomocí. Je to snaha dále pokročit ve fiskální a daňové harmonizaci. Je to snaha udělat další krok k vytvoření fiskální unie a tudíž další krok k vytvoření plně politické unie. Takové unii my říkáme ne, takovou unii my nepodporujeme.

Já tady sedím od roku 2004 a vždycky když dojde k nějakým těžkostem, tak slyším jednu jedinou frázi: „Potřebujeme více Evropy, potřebujeme více komunitární metody“ a já říkám ne, nepotřebujeme. Právě snaha řešit všechno na úrovni Evropské unie nás zavedla do problémů, které řešíme jak? Zase na úrovni Evropské unie. Takže prosím, pochopte konečně, že současný model evropské integrace se vyčerpá. Přestaňte žít v paděsát let staré představě poválečné evropské integrace minulého století, evropské paradigma se změnilo a čím dříve se s tím někteří z vás vyrovnají, tím lépe pro ně.

2-015

Lothar Bisky, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Ratspräsident, Herr Kommissionspräsident! Meine Fraktion kritisiert die Ergebnisse der Ratstagung als unzureichend.

Erstens: zur Wirtschaftspolitik. Was wir von den beschlossenen Vorgaben im Bereich der Wirtschaftspolitik halten, haben wir in der vergangenen Woche in einer Anhörung artikuliert. Was gebraucht wird, ist die Überwindung neoliberaler Profit- und Wettbewerbsfixierung, wie sie an den Begrifflichkeiten wie *Flexicurity*, Anpassung des Rentenalters usw. deutlich wird.

Notwendig ist aus unserer Sicht eine demokratisch legitimierte und kontrollierte wirtschaftspolitische Steuerung, die Steuer-, Lohn- und Umweltdumping durch entsprechende gemeinsame Mindeststandards verhindert, die eine wirksame Regulierung der Finanzmärkte sicherstellt, und die es verbietet, Gewinne zu privatisieren, aber Risiken gleichzeitig der Allgemeinheit aufzubürden.

Zum zweiten Punkt: südliche Nachbarschaft Libyen. In Nordafrika, besonders in Libyen, haben sich die EU-Mitgliedstaaten in eine makabre Situation gebracht. Es ist schon einiges hier kritisiert worden. Ich will nur auf einen Punkt mit Deutlichkeit hinweisen: Diktator Gaddafi bekämpft Demonstranten und Aufständische mit Waffen, die er von uns gekauft hat. Er wird dafür von NATO-Truppen beschossen, angeblich um die Kämpfer für Freiheit und Demokratie zu schützen, die ebenfalls europäische und US-amerikanische Waffen einsetzen.

Ich frage mich: Was ist der vorhandene Ehrenkodex gegen Waffenhandel wert, wenn eine solche Situation möglich ist? Wo ist die Unterstützung für Freiheit, Menschenrechte und den Kampf gegen soziale Ungerechtigkeit, wenn es konkret wird wie in Lampedusa, wo täglich Hunderte Flüchtlinge aus Nordafrika eintreffen? Ich fürchte, auch mit dem schnell zusammengeschriebenen neuen Nachbarschaftskonzept bleibt es mehrheitlich bei europäischer Interessenpolitik statt angemessener Orientierung auf die Bedürfnisse der Partnerländer.

Zum dritten Punkt: Japan. Wir haben heute Nachmittag und morgen noch Zeit für Diskussionen über Japan. Auch hier ist kein kohärenter europäischer Ansatz erkennbar, wenigstens was Sicherheitskontrollen, also die sogenannten Stresstests angeht. Mich wundert es nicht, wenn Bürgerinnen und Bürger da skeptisch fragen: Wofür stehen wir denn eigentlich in der Europäischen Union?

2-016

Godfrey Bloom, *on behalf of the EFD Group*. – Mr President, I would like to go back to the matter of Libya if I may.

When did the political class and the great and the good suddenly catch up with the fact that Colonel Gaddafi is an evil man? When, since that wonderful photograph with you embracing him, Mr President, did you suddenly come to realise that he was a “wrong’un”?

I can tell you that the victims of Lockerbie in Scotland and the victims of IRA atrocities in my country knew very well what sort of scoundrel this man was. But he has got oil and he has got money so you all turned a blind eye, didn't you?

Well, the chickens have come home to roost. The most absurd figure in all this is the British Prime Minister, who stands there rattling his empty scabbard – having disestablished the Royal Navy, having disestablished the Royal Air Force – making threats from the sidelines, with no aircraft carriers, nothing, and calls himself a Conservative but is just a superannuated schoolboy whistling in the dark.

We talk a great deal about violence against the people, we talk a lot about democracy. And yet we have had a homicidal baboon in Zimbabwe for years now, and we do not do anything about it, do we? We do not care because there is no money and there is no oil. That is so typical of this place: full of hypocrisy and humbug.

2-017

Barry Madlener (NI). – Mijnheer Barroso, u krijgt uw zin. Er komt een permanent steunfonds voor de euro, een fonds dat landen gaat financieren die hun staatskas hebben geplunderd, een fonds dat de risico's afwentelt op de landen die hun zaakjes wel op orde hebben.

De meeste economen zijn het met ons eens: dit fonds gaat de euro niet redden, net zomin als de afspraken van het groei- en stabiliteitspact dat konden. Het is een boterzacht akkoord dat de zwakke en frauderende landen belooft met zachte leningen. Waar gaat dat geld vandaan komen? Hoe wordt het fonds gevuld? Op papier gaan alle landen meedoen met dat fonds, inclusief Ierland, Griekenland en Portugal. Maar die landen hebben helemaal geen geld!

Waar het op neerkomt is dat de landen die hun zaakjes wel op orde hebben, zoals Nederland, gaan betalen. Nederlandse burgers gaan de rekening betalen van zwakke lidstaten als Griekenland en Portugal - uw land, mijnheer Barroso - en dat is, Voorzitter, onaanvaardbaar. Dat is geen solidariteit, maar het belonen van het slecht gedrag van een aantal zwakke lidstaten op kosten van hardwerkende Nederlanders, Duitsers en Belgen.

De euro kan zo niet gered worden. In plaats hiervan zullen wij die landen eruit moeten zetten. Griekenland moet de drachme terugkrijgen en Portugal de escudo opnieuw invoeren. Sommige landen zullen moeten accepteren dat zij de eurozone moeten gaan verlaten en dat hebben zij helemaal aan zichzelf te danken.

2-018

Werner Langen (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Die Ergebnisse des Gipfels waren ein wichtiger Zwischenschritt, aber die Bewährungsprobe kommt noch. Wenn es nämlich so geht, wie mit allen anderen Dingen, einschließlich des Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakts, und die Mitgliedstaaten sich nicht daran halten, dann sind sie das Papier nicht wert, auf dem sie stehen. Deshalb teile ich nicht den Optimismus der beiden Präsidenten, dass

die Krise jetzt vorbei ist, sondern sie kommt erst in ihre eigentliche Bewährungsprobe.

Seit der Lehmann-Pleite sind immerhin über zweieinhalb Jahre vergangen, und wo stehen wir nun? Zweieinhalb Jahre haben wir gebraucht. Die Vorschläge zur Finanzmarkttransaktionssteuer hat der zuständige Kommissar beim letzten Mal noch abgelehnt. Ich würde gerne mal Ergebnisse sehen. Wenn ich mich an die letzte Legislaturperiode erinnere, dann hat dieses Parlament in der letzten Legislaturperiode in 12 Beschlüssen Maßnahmen zum Finanzmarkt gefordert, und der zuständige Binnenmarktkommissar – schön, dass er nicht mehr im Amt ist – hat sich geweigert. Das ist die Realität! Die Kommission war nicht der Vorreiter zur Lösung der Probleme.

Wir haben allerdings auch im Rat festgestellt, dass nationale Egoismen überwunden werden müssen, und erst das Parlament musste erwirken, dass die Kommission in ihrer Rolle bei der Verfassungsänderung gestärkt wird. Es gibt also überhaupt keinen Grund für schöne Welt. Ich muss Herrn Verhofstadt Recht geben. Die Haushaltskonsolidierung ist zu lasch, die Governance zu unverbindlich, der Euro-Pakt zu schwach und die nationale Aufsicht nach wie vor zu stark. Wenn wir nicht den Mut haben, von den nationalen Regierungen mehr Engagement für Europa zu fordern, dann wird es keine vernünftige Dauerlösung geben.

Herr Barroso, ich habe Kritik geübt, als die griechischen Kollegen aus meiner Fraktion gegen das griechische Programm gestimmt haben. Ich bin grundsätzlich nicht der Meinung von Herrn Schulz. Wenn ein Sozialist als Regierungschef abgewählt wird, dann ist das an und für sich schon etwas Gutes. Aber im Fall von Portugal hat auch Ihre Partei gegen das Programm gestimmt. So etwas darf in Europa nicht passieren. Ich bitte alle, daran mitzuwirken, dass diese nationale Sicht der Problemlösung keine Zukunft hat!

2-019

VORSITZ: DAGMAR ROTH-BEHRENDT
Vizepräsidentin

2-020

Edite Estrela (S&D). – Senhora Presidente, Senhores Presidentes, caros Colegas, há uma pergunta que os cidadãos europeus fazem: será que as decisões do Conselho Europeu são as necessárias e adequadas à saída da crise? Muitos deles podem pensar que as decisões vão no bom sentido, mas são lentas e pouco ambiciosas. Aqueles que viram o documentário "Inside Job" ficaram indignados com tanta ganância e falta de escrupulos e perguntam: se as agências de rating funcionam deste modo, o que está a fazer a Europa para termos agências de rating independentes e fiáveis?

O Presidente Barroso disse, há pouco tempo, que se um Estado-Membro puder evitar o recurso à ajuda externa o deve fazer, porque a ajuda externa tem custos elevados. É também essa a opinião do governo português. Portugal não precisa de ajuda externa, só precisa de financiamento à sua economia e às suas famílias a juros

razoáveis. Mas como as agências de rating servem os interesses dos especuladores, o resultado dos sacrifícios enormes que os portugueses estão a fazer vai directamente para os bolsos desses especuladores. É esta a justiça europeia? Os decisores políticos não percebem que estamos perante uma crise da zona euro, insisto, da zona euro? Que os ataques às dívidas soberanas de alguns países visam sobretudo fragilizar o euro e pôr em causa a moeda única e o próprio projecto europeu? Trata-se de um problema europeu que necessita de uma resposta europeia.

Para sairmos da crise precisamos de mais Europa e não de menos Europa, precisamos de estar à altura do nosso passado e dos desafios do presente e do futuro, precisamos de dar confiança e esperança aos cidadãos porque sem o apoio dos cidadãos não há projecto europeu.

2-021

Sylvie Goulard (ALDE). – Messieurs les Présidents, vous nous avez fait un tableau positif de ces discussions. Il y a des éléments positifs, je ne vais pas revenir là-dessus. Moi, j'ai une préoccupation qui va au-delà du détail technique et de ce que vous nous avez dit. C'est la fracture Nord-Sud qui est en train de s'installer dans l'Union européenne. Nous entendons – comme cela a encore été le cas il y a un instant – des personnes qui prétendent que les uns ont raison et que les autres ont tort, que les uns sont les bons, que les autres sont les méchants, et qui semblent oublier l'interdépendance. C'est grave.

Et d'ailleurs dans le refus de traiter la question des banques, que Guy Verhofstadt a évoqué, je crois qu'il y a, pour beaucoup, le refus d'un certain nombre de pays du Nord, qui donnent beaucoup de leçons aux pays du Sud, de voir leurs propres responsabilités. Je crois donc que s'il est une tâche qui vous incombe, Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, et à vous aussi, Monsieur Barroso, c'est d'éviter à tout prix que cette fracture se prolonge et s'installe. Il faut des solutions qui soient acceptables pour tout le monde. Il faut placer tout le monde devant ses responsabilités.

Et dernier point: je trouve que le Conseil européen est extrêmement nombriliste. Toute cette discussion se fait comme si l'euro n'avait pas une vocation mondiale. Il n'y a rien sur la représentation externe de la zone euro au FMI. La France préside en ce moment le G20, souhaite faire avancer l'idée d'une réforme monétaire mondiale et il n'y a pas de proposition qui, comme celle des eurobonds que nous essayons de pousser, tendrait à faire de l'euro une monnaie véritablement mondiale.

2-022

Philippe Lamberts (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président Van Rompuy, je respecte beaucoup à la fois votre personne et votre travail, mais sachez que vous ne m'avez vraiment pas convaincu.

Vous dites que les travailleurs ne doivent pas se tracasser, qu'on travaille pour eux. Moi, ce que je lis quand je regarde le "pacte pour l'euro plus", comme

vous l'appellez, c'est que, quand on parle de compétitivité, on parle de quoi? On parle de réduire les salaires, on parle de plus de flexibilité et de moins de sécurité. On ne dit rien sur la productivité et sur nos ressources. On ne dit rien sur la productivité de l'énergie.

Moi, ce que je vous dis, c'est qu'on ne gagnera jamais la course aux bas salaires contre la Chine. Par contre, la Chine est bien partie pour nous battre sur l'efficacité énergétique et sur l'efficacité des ressources. Qu'est-ce qu'il restera alors à l'Europe en termes de compétitivité si ce n'est pas sur ces terrains-là que nous allons?

Vous nous dites qu'il ne faut pas que les allocataires sociaux s'inquiètent. Mais sur l'équilibre des finances publiques, objectif raisonnable, vous dites qu'il faut couper les dépenses. 40% des dépenses publiques sont des dépenses de nature sociale et il ne faudrait pas s'inquiéter! Et vous nous dites qu'on s'occupe des recettes. Les recettes, parlons-en! La CCCTB, la base imposable consolidée pour les entreprises, c'est vraiment une blague! Vous en parlez au conditionnel; vous dites que, de toute façon, ça doit être neutre du point de vue des revenus, donc on n'aura pas un euro de plus avec ça et, en plus, de toute façon, les entreprises pourront choisir. Je n'ai jamais vu personne choisir dans ses options fiscales celle qui lui coûte le plus.

Par contre, s'il y en a qui ne doivent pas se tracasser, c'est bien les actionnaires et les créanciers des banques. Vous nous parlez de *stress tests*. Ceux de l'an dernier étaient une blague. Je ne sais pas si, cette année-ci, ce sera la même blague de mauvais aloi. Ce qui est sûr, c'est que, de toute façon, même si ces *stress tests* sont sérieux, à la fin, qui va capitaliser les banques? Leurs actionnaires ou bien nous, les contribuables? Soyons sérieux! De toute façon, pour eux, visiblement, il ne faut pas s'inquiéter.

Et, enfin, on ne parle pas de l'éléphant qui est dans le salon, à savoir l'insoutenabilité totale de la dette grecque, de la dette irlandaise. Vous le savez, il n'est pas possible, de quelque manière qu'on tourne le problème, qu'ils parviennent à rembourser. Et plus tard on restructurera, plus douloureux sera l'exercice. Ça ne sera jamais un exercice plaisant, mais vous attendez et ça nous coûtera cher.

(Applaudissements)

2-023

Martin Callanan (ECR). – Madam President, every time the EU is confronted with a specific problem, it falls into the trap of devising a complex, bureaucratic, heavy-handed solution which is often completely disproportionate to the severity of the issue. This is the mistake that we are now making with regard to the current financial crisis: it is serious, it does require action, but many of the proposed solutions will have far-reaching and, in my view, highly damaging effects for the long-term future of Europe.

The opportunity is being seized on by many to launch plans for permanent economic governance, with intervention and control as its guiding principles. The solution, we are told, is firstly to abuse the existing rules such as Article 122 of the Treaty, which was never intended for the bailouts that it has been used to pay for – my hope is that some country will have the courage to challenge this in the European Courts – and to impose more limitations on our Member States, which in reality means constraining the democratic choice of many of the electorates.

If you look at the case of Ireland, that country has tried its very best to stabilise its banking system – stabilisation, incidentally, which is desperately needed by banks and institutions in other Member States, which would otherwise be terribly exposed – and Ireland's reward for that is to face demands from other Member States to increase its own rates of corporation tax in order to compete with the bloated situations in other countries. It is unjust and it is undemocratic.

2-024

Bairbre de Brún (GUE/NGL). – A Uachtaráin, cad é an cineál smaointeoireachta a thugann agus a threoraíonn an Chomhairle agus an Coimisiún chun a chreidiúint nach méadóidh na beartais a forchuireadh ar Éirinn an fiachas nó nach é seo an toradh a bheidh ar chur i bhfeidhm na mbeartas úd nó bheartais den chineál sin trasna an AE?

Cuirfidh na bearta a aontaíodh ag an gcruinniú mullaigh iachall ar gach Ballstát a bheith teoranta ar loighic eacnamaíoch atá le haimhleas na ndaoine – loighic ina bhfuil ciorruithe riachtanach agus a bhaineann an cumas de na Ballstáit chun fás a chur chun cinn.

Ciallaíonn na beartais atá á bhforchur ar Éirinn ag an AE agus ag an gCiste Airgeadaíochta Idirnáisiúnta (CAI) ciorruithe fíochmhara, cailliúint post, agus laghdú suntasach ar sheirbhísí poiblí. Níl ualach fhiachas na hÉireann inbhuanaithe. Mura gcaithfidh bannóirí cuid d'ualach an easnaimh a roinnt, mainneoidh Éire amach anseo.

2-025

Niki Tzavela (EFD). – Madam President, the Euro Plus Pact aims at strengthening and enhancing European competitiveness, but how can we achieve a European added value economy when our labour market is being violated by illegal immigration and our European products are being replaced by contraband products imported from labour-intensive countries in the East?

The sooner we identify and protect our geographical and economic products from the European Union the better. So my proposal is that we incorporate the identification and protection of the economic and geographical borders of Europe within the Euro Pact, otherwise we will not be able to achieve a competitive Europe within a very strongly aggressive competitive global economy.

2-026

Frank Vanhecke (NI). – Als de crisis in Libië iets goed illustreert is dat naar mijn mening in de eerste plaats een totaal gebrek aan een ernstige Europese geopolitieke strategie om de Europese belangen veilig te stellen. Het is immers een trieste waarheid dat ons optreden daar in de eerste plaats het gevolg is van een interne binnenlandse politieke agenda van Sarkozy, die zichzelf een soort Falkland-moment gunde.

Het blijft in elk geval merkwaardig dat al degenen - ook in deze zaal - die zo fel en terecht tekeergaan tegen het absolute kwaad Kadhafi, zich tot zeer recentelijk maar al te graag breed lachend lieten fotograferen aan de zijde van de Libische dictator, die zij met militaire eer gingen ontvangen. Wat ik maar wil zeggen is dat het gemakkelijker is om vandaag op Kadhafi te schieten dan een antwoord te bieden op de enorme vragen die zich nu gaan stellen.

Om er één te noemen. Gaan wij die rebellen - verzamelnaam voor een zeer heterogene club waarvan sommigen naar Europese normen mentaal nog niet de middeleeuwen ontgroeid zijn - verder bewapenen en zo ja, welke garantie hebben wij dan dat die wapens niet gaan dienen om dat land nog verder in de chaos te storten, zoals dat in Iran gebeurde na het verdrijven van de sjah?

Wat mij betreft, ik zou willen dat die Europese inzet en slagkracht wat beter zichtbaar zijn in het militair bewaken van onze eigen buitengrenzen. Daar wordt op dit ogenblik ook een stille oorlog uitgevochten, een angstaanjagende voorbode van een immigratie-invasie waar niemand over spreekt. Daar hebben wij Europese slagkracht ook nodig.

2-027

Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE). – Voorzitter, tijdens de laatste Europese Raad zijn besluiten genomen die een jaar geleden nog ondenkbaar waren en daarvoor wil ik graag voorzitter Van Rompuy en ook voorzitter Barroso van harte danken.

Het is een belangrijke stap, maar wel op een hele moeilijke weg die wij hebben te gaan om het vertrouwen in de euro en in onze economie te herstellen, om uit de crisis te komen door de economische groei en werkgelegenheid te bevorderen. Dit Parlement - u heeft het aangegeven - heeft een medewetgevende rol ten aanzien van het wetgevingspakket ter versterking van het economisch bestuur. Daarin willen wij nog meer ambitie zien en daarover zult u in de komende tijd met het Parlement in discussie kunnen gaan. Het gaat dan wat ons betreft om een sterkere en ambitieuzere monetaire poot, voortbouwend op de voorstellen van de Europese Commissie. U heeft verschillende collega's al horen zeggen dat wij een steviger stabiliteits- en groeipact willen met een omgekeerde stemprocedure.

Ten tweede is er een veel sterkere sociaal-economische coördinatie nodig. Dat gaat over meer dan de *commitments* van het europact - want in de EU 2020-strategie zijn de beginselen van onze sociale marktco-

nomie verankerd - meer *commitment* om die beginselen uit te werken ten einde de groei en werkgelegenheid voor onze burgers te bevorderen. Die doelen - en ik hoor voorzitter Barroso daar ook over spreken - willen wij veiligstellen in de nationale hervormingsprogramma's en ook daarover zullen wij voorstellen doen.

U zegt en benadrukt dat met het oog op het bereiken van een akkoord in juni deze punten al kunnen worden afgesloten. Wat ons betreft kunt u in ieder geval op deze punten uw werk al starten om de Raad in beweging te krijgen, want dan is het ook mogelijk om in juni een akkoord te bereiken.

2-028

Proinsias De Rossa (S&D). – Madam President, I have to ask some frank questions of the European Quartet – the Troika plus the Council. Are you serious about saving the eurozone and the European project?

The bank stress tests have just concluded, based on the most pessimistic scenarios in Ireland. The new Irish Government has drawn a line under the Irish banking debacle. It has, to everyone's surprise in Ireland, decided that there will be no haircuts for senior bond holders in the Allied Irish Bank and the Bank of Ireland.

But what is the European quid pro quo? Why is the European Central Bank silent on essential medium-term funding for Irish banks? Why are President Sarkozy and Chancellor Merkel insisting on the destruction of the Irish industrial base in return for a cut in the bail-out interest rate? Why are some Member States blocking progress on the European financial transaction tax and the eurobonds? Why is the European budget being cut?

The short answer is short-term electoral calculations and doctrinaire economics. The Irish economic crisis is an integral part of the European crisis. The failure of the Irish economy would not only be a failure for Europe, but would be a failure of Europe.

Debt sustainability for Ireland is critical for Ireland and Europe and the Quartet must get real on this issue. What we need from the Quartet now is imagination and vision in its ongoing negotiations with Ireland.

I want you to mark my words. Ireland is a democracy, just like France, just like Germany, just like Finland: we govern at the will of the people. Ireland's electorate has accepted severe austerity through gritted teeth and seething anger. They need to see fair play in Europe, otherwise quite soon the window of tolerance currently opened to the Irish Government will shut with a bang.

2-029

Carl Haglund (ALDE). – Fru talman! Låt mig börja med någonting positivt. Man skulle kunna fokusera på de problem som de beslut ni har fattat i rådet innebär, och visst finns det sådana, men det positiva är ändå att ni har kommit framåt när det gäller den ekonomiska styrningen och den makroekonomiska biten. Min kollega från Irland uttryckte nyss hur bekymrad man är i Irland. Deras problem har att göra med att vi hittills inte har haft

någon som helst insikt i den makroekonomiska biten. Det är någonting vi i framtiden kan få tack vare det här ekonomiska styrningspaketet. Här tycker jag rådet har gått i rätt riktning.

Det som däremot känns en aning bekymmersamt är att det i rådet tycks saknas en vilja att ändra på sin egen beslutskultur. Man vill fortsätta ha möjlighet att använda sig av olika typer av politiska arrangemang, något man kanske kan kalla för kohandel. Men om ni inte ändrar på beslutskulturen är jag rädd att ni i framtiden inte kommer att klara av att ta de beslut som krävs när ni står inför svåra överväganden utifrån de rekommendationer som jag däremot tror att kommissionen klarar av att ta fram. Detta är en utmaning som rådet måste ta på allvar och ta tag i. Det här illustreras ganska väl också av den tendens som vi såg under rådsmötet där också mitt eget medlemsland, Finland, var en aning besvärligt när det gällde en annan fråga, i det fallet stabilitetsmekanismerna. Som finländare beklagar jag detta. Alla finländare tänker inte så, men det är en bra illustration av att beslutskulturen i rådet måste ändras.

2-030

Konrad Szymański (ECR). – Nowa architektura finansów publicznych w Unii Europejskiej oparła się o próbę wzmocnienia zdrowych reguł finansów i wydatków publicznych oraz o całkiem niezdrową skłonność do ograniczania suwerenności podatkowej państw członkowskich. Bardzo wątpię, by państwa grupy Euro Plus były w stanie narzucić sobie rygoryzm w zakresie wydatków publicznych wspólnie, skoro nie mogły tego uczynić w pojedynkę.

Nie mam natomiast wątpliwości, że ujednolicenie bazy podatkowej jest efektywnym krokiem w kierunku unii podatkowej, która ma tylko jeden cel – likwidację konkurencji podatkowej w Unii Europejskiej. Prawdziwe intencje zdradzili politycy francuscy, N. Sarkozy, C. Lagarde, nalegając od tygodni na podniesienie stawek podatkowych w Irlandii pod pretekstem walki z kryzysem. Podnoszenie stawek podatkowych w Unii Europejskiej bez względu na państwo członkowskie jest jednak receptą na utrzymanie kryzysu, nie na jego załagodzenie.

2-031

Die Präsidentin. – Vielen Dank! Den Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die sich jetzt zu *Catch the Eye* melden, möchte ich sagen, dass wir bereits jetzt ca. 20 Wortmeldungen haben und ich nicht glaube, dass wir vor der Abstimmung genügend Zeit dafür haben werden. Aber Sie können sich nichtsdestoweniger melden.

2-032

Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL). – Mr President, on 19 January, in answer to Joe Higgins, Mr Barroso declared here in this Chamber that Europe is trying to support Ireland. With the abject capitulation of the new Fine Gael/Labour Government to the interests of the bondholders, it is clear that it is not the Council or the Commission that are doing the supporting, but it is the working class in Ireland and in Europe, which is being

forced to support European banks and speculators through paying for their losses.

The proposals for economic governance represent an attempt to entrench cutbacks and wage cuts. The scoreboard on austerity, and the proposals for fines of hundreds of millions of euro, are designed to ensure that, regardless of mass opposition, working people pay for the crisis. This European shock doctrine will be facilitated by a change to the Treaties, on which the establishment in Europe and Ireland are determined to avoid a referendum. The Socialist Party and the Left in Ireland will demand a referendum on this proposal for permanent austerity.

2-033

Oreste Rossi (EFD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questo Consiglio ha toccato tre temi di grande importanza: la catastrofe ambientale e nucleare che ha colpito il Giappone, la crisi finanziaria che sta attraversando l'Europa e la situazione del Maghreb.

Sul primo punto, pur essendo vicini alla popolazione così duramente colpita, non possiamo accettare una revisione degli accordi commerciali a scapito delle nostre imprese. Siamo invece favorevoli a un intervento umanitario con mezzi, uomini e soldi.

Pensare invece che la crisi finanziaria sia passata è pura utopia. È indispensabile predisporre un pacchetto di interventi per aiutare i paesi membri ad uscire dall'attuale situazione, assicurando stabilità all'intera area dell'euro. Siamo anche favorevoli alla riduzione degli oneri normativi e della burocrazia e a promuovere scambi con i paesi terzi, a condizione di vantaggi reciproci.

Sul Maghreb riteniamo che l'Unione europea abbia fatto una pessima figura, in quanto ogni paese membro si è mosso autonomamente e l'Alto rappresentante, la baronessa Ashton, non ha saputo gestire la crisi. In particolare, l'Unione europea ha abbandonato l'Italia a un'invasione incontrollata di clandestini.

2-034

Hans-Peter Martin (NI). – Frau Präsidentin! Die besorgten Europäer haben immer mehr Angst. Es gibt zwei Themen, die besonders bewegend sind. Das eine ist, dass weiterhin nicht konsequent genug mit der Wirtschafts- und der Eurokrise umgegangen wird. Weiterhin ist es so, dass der Rat und auch die Kommission den Ereignissen hinterhinken.

Schauen Sie der Wirklichkeit ins Auge: Wir brauchen einen Schuldenschnitt, zumindest in Griechenland, vermutlich auch in Portugal. Da wird kein Weg daran vorbeiführen. Je später Sie diese Frage angehen, umso kostspieliger wird es, nicht nur in finanzieller Hinsicht, sondern auch im gemeinsamen Glauben an das europäische Projekt. Was da in Griechenland weiterhin passiert, führt zu einem Aufschaukeln von Emotionen. Wir waren mit einer Sonderdelegation vor Ort: Die Grundstimmung ist, dass die EU schuld ist an den Problemen in Griechenland – weil nicht ordentlich

kommuniziert wird und weil auch die notwendigen Schritte, die heute schon deutlich absehbar sind, nicht eingeleitet werden.

Das zweite Thema ist die Atomkraft. Was da vorbereitet wird an sogenannten Stresstests, wird nur dann sinnvoll sein und die Glaubwürdigkeit in das gemeinsame Europa wiederherstellen, wenn diese Stresstests tatsächlich nach strengen Kriterien – nicht nach den weichen Kriterien der IAO – ablaufen, wenn tatsächlich unabhängige Experten hinzugezogen werden, und wenn die Ergebnisse und der ganze Prozess auch wirklich entsprechend öffentlich dargestellt werden und nachvollziehbar sind.

2-035

Mario Mauro (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Presidente del Consiglio, signor Presidente della Commissione, nella mia visione della politica è doveroso cercare di mettere insieme gli ideali con gli interessi. In una visione forse un po' schematica e fanciullesca delle Istituzioni europee, io credo che le Istituzioni europee rappresentino i nostri ideali e che i nostri governi, per tante ragioni, rappresentino i nostri interessi.

C'è una partita da giocare, quindi. Ciò che mi colpisce è che mi sembra che in alcune circostanze i giocatori della partita degli ideali rinuncino a giocare la partita. Alcune settimane fa la signora Ashton, qui, quando il Parlamento ha fatto la proposta di riconoscere, o meglio che la Commissione proponesse al Consiglio di riconoscere, il Consiglio provvisorio della Libia, ha detto che quello non era il suo mandato.

Ieri, dopo una bellissima esposizione, il Commissario Malmström, quando è arrivata al dunque di fare la proposta al Consiglio di una strategia che renda europea la crisi legata ai flussi migratori, ha detto che rinunciava, perché pensa che in Consiglio non ci sia la maggioranza.

Come fa la squadra degli ideali a vincere la partita se i nostri giocatori rinunciano a tirare in porta magari perché pensano che il portiere sia troppo bravo? Credo che sia questo un punto essenziale per comprendere storicamente il compito cui siamo chiamati.

Mi permetto di fare questa osservazione: chi sono i giocatori dell'attacco? Sono le Istituzioni europee: il Parlamento, la Commissione e anche lei, signor Presidente Van Rompuy, perché credo che lei non rappresenti il Consiglio nel senso che ne difende gli interessi, ma che sia l'uomo che può far capire al Consiglio gli ideali sui cui puntare.

Vi chiedo allora semplicemente: se siete i giocatori del nostro attacco, passatevi la palla, giocate all'attacco, fate goal e come si dice in questo tipo di partite, fateci sognare.

2-036

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non c'è dubbio che l'istituzione di un meccanismo di stabilità permanente rappresenti un

risultato importante, che dà fondamento a quell'impegno politico di difendere a ogni costo la moneta comune. Per questo, nonostante non poche riserve sul metodo e sulla natura intergovernativa del fondo, il Parlamento ha sostenuto questo sbocco e si è concentrato sull'obiettivo di garantire un solido legame tra l'ESM e le istituzioni dell'Unione.

In questo senso, il riferimento nelle conclusioni del Consiglio europeo a un regolamento per stabilire le procedure che definiranno le condizionalità è importante e ora ci aspettiamo che la Commissione elabori una proposta adeguata.

È tuttavia difficile considerare questo risultato, pur positivo, adeguato. Il problema è l'indirizzo di fondo della *governance* economica europea. Ci si ostina a curare i sintomi della malattia e non le cause. I deficit sono l'effetto e non la causa della crisi e pensare di risolvere la malattia limitandosi a tagliare i deficit con una mano e rifinanziare le banche con l'altra è illusorio e rischia di aggravare la crisi e di rendere insostenibile lo stesso compito del meccanismo di stabilità permanente.

Se si vuole curare la malattia e non solo i sintomi, occorre aggredire alcuni nodi di fondo. Si parla di rafforzare la competitività dell'Europa. È giusto, ma quale modello di competitività perseguiamo? Non si può inseguire il modello di una ripresa trainata unicamente dalle esportazioni all'esterno dell'Europa, perché quel modello accentuerà gli squilibri. Per essere più competitivi verso l'esterno bisogna anche attivare una domanda interna di qualità.

Dobbiamo quindi affrontare il nodo delle banche e del sistema del credito all'economia per indirizzare il risparmio europeo verso investimenti a lungo termine. Occorre dotarsi di strumenti, quali gli Eurobond, la tassa sulle transazioni finanziarie e un bilancio degno di questo nome per grandi investimenti pubblici a livello europeo che fungano da volano a quelli privati e, infine, occorre considerare il modello sociale europeo non come un peso, ma come una risorsa.

2-037

Sharon Bowles (ALDE). – Mr President, the Euro Plus Pact might be useful, but it must not be used as an excuse for weakness in the legislative package. A strong commitment to the single market is key to competitiveness in the EU and therefore the euro area. That is welcome, but single market initiatives remain in the framework of the Treaty and the 27.

The ESM facility, I fear, lacks flexibility and is unsustainable for recovery with a two-and-a-half to three per cent risk premium. I understand the need for discipline and risk provision, but these rescue mechanisms are not for money-making, especially when there is self interest beyond eurozone stability, such as several Member State banks being supported by Irish taxpayers, as has been mentioned.

We have not solved the banking crisis, nor will we by being faint-hearted. Germany, even, has not recapitalised its own banks nor recognised impaired assets and also relies on the indulgence of everyone else in the EU and worldwide to allow silent participations as core capital, otherwise stress tests will be failed.

So, President of the Commission, President of the Council, let us have some vision, some humility, some honest self appraisal; the very least you can do is to treat risk premiums as collateral and give them back when the risk is gone. Small-mindedness will not save the euro and the markets know that.

2-038

Gerald Häfner (Verts/ALE). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist eigentlich nicht Aufgabe der Politik, mit Steuerzahlergeld Banken zu retten oder Staaten künstliche Liquidität zu verschaffen. Es ist eigentlich Aufgabe der Politik, die rechtlichen Rahmenbedingungen so zu setzen, dass eine solche Situation nie eintritt. Jetzt müssen Sie das Falsche tun, weil Sie das Richtige über Jahrzehnte versäumt haben. Sie wollen jetzt – und das begrüßen wir – an die Ursachen heran. Aber nach allem, was sich absehen lässt, tun Sie es wieder nur auf der falschen Ebene mit den falschen Mitteln und im falschen Rahmen, denn Sie wollen es außerhalb der Verträge tun.

Wir haben es zum Glück ein Stück weit in die Gemeinschaftsmethode hineinziehen können, aber nicht ausreichend in eine klassische Top-down-Politik. Dabei muss gerade auf diesem Feld jede Politik demokratisch diskutiert, legitimiert und kontrolliert werden. Sie machen es mit den falschen Instrumenten, denn Sie nehmen das Geld von den Steuerzahlern, um die Banken und diejenigen zu stützen, die an Banken und mit anderen Finanzprodukten spekulieren. Sie haben aber immer noch nicht ausreichend Wege beschritten, um diejenigen heranzuziehen, die aus dieser Situation über lange Zeit hinweg Gewinne erzielt haben. Damit schaffen Sie weiterhin eine Schieflage in den europäischen Gesellschaften, die die Zustimmung zu dieser Politik nicht stärkt, sondern schwächt. Sie belasten einseitig die öffentlichen Kassen und Haushalte und schonen die privaten Vermögen. Damit tragen Sie nicht zur wirklichen Lösung der Probleme bei, sondern zur Lösung von Symptomen.

2-039

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – Jarenlang hebben veel lidstaten een begrotingsbeleid gevoerd waarbij de bomen tot in de hemel leken te groeien. Schulden maken was geen probleem, want de economische groei zou die als sneeuw voor de zon doen verdwijnen.

Hetzelfde dachten veel particulieren. Zij kochten dure huizen, ver boven hun stand. De toenemende meerwaarde daarvan zou hen wel redden. Dit kaartenhuis is ingeklapt. De schuldencrisis wordt met nieuwe schulden bestreden. De Europese Centrale Bank heeft voor miljarden staatsobligaties opgekocht uit Portugal, Ierland en Griekenland. De economie van die landen moet nu onder de zweep door en vele jaren

constant keihard groeien om er weer bovenop te komen. Dat gaat niet lukken, Voorzitter. Die economieën krimpen schrikbarend. Men koerst strak af op een faillissement.

Tijd dus voor crisisaanpak 2.0. Laat de failliete landen met hun voormalige munten verdergaan in combinatie met flink devalueren en deels kwijtschelden van de schulden. En dan kijken wij over een jaar of tien weer verder.

2-040

Ida Figueiredo (GUE/NGL). – Senhor Presidente, é espantoso, mas revelador dos caminhos que esta União Europeia está a seguir, que os principais porta-vozes do Conselho e da Comissão tenham aqui ignorado a crise social grave que se vive em diversos países da União Europeia, designadamente na zona euro. Onde estão as respostas para os cerca de 100 milhões de pessoas em situação de pobreza nesta União Europeia, dos quais, seguramente, mais de 20 milhões são trabalhadores de baixos salários e trabalho precário, o que contribui para os lucros dos grupos económicos e financeiros escandalosamente altos? Onde estão as respostas para os cerca de 25 milhões de desempregados, dos quais a maioria é mulheres e jovens, a quem é negado um presente digno e a possibilidade de construir um futuro que permita assegurar a própria evolução dos nossos países?

Mais uma vez, a única preocupação das decisões do Conselho foi a defesa dos interesses dos grupos económicos e financeiros com maior centralização do poder político para facilitar maior concentração e acumulação do poder económico e tudo isto para, em nome da crise, pôr em causa direitos sociais e laborais, aumentar a exploração de quem trabalha e agravar a dependência de países com economias mais frágeis, como Portugal.

2-041

John Bufton (EFD). – Madam President, the Council deems centralised regulation of national budgetary agendas essential to aid economic recovery – in particular, the proposal of multiannual consolidation plans addressing deficit, revenue and expenditure targets to be reached within stipulated time-frames with associated penalties if obligations are not met.

The UK deficit is largely structural and must be addressed internally. I greatly oppose any involvement from Brussels in my country's affairs, considering the mess made in Greece and Ireland, which are likely to need further bail-outs. Portugal would rather turn to Brazil, suggesting Lisbon's reluctance to become an economic protectorate with austerity measures that stifle growth.

The Council states consolidation should be frontloaded in Member States with large deficits. What would stop migration of citizens to stronger economies in the Union under laws of the EU's own creation?

The Council suggests reducing the regulatory burden. Does this encompass legislation for which Europe has been the architect for decades, such as the Working Time Directive and extended maternity pay?

Decentralised and less-stifled markets are vital for economic welfare, not punitive regulatory measures.

2-042

Andreas Mölzer (NI). – Frau Präsidentin! Auf der Tagung des Europäischen Rats wurden bekanntlich drei brisante Themen beraten, bei denen die EU-Entscheidungen meines Erachtens von Unbelehrbarkeit und Realitätsverlust gekennzeichnet waren.

Zum einen werden die 700 Milliarden aus dem Rettungsschirm bald ausgeschöpft sein und dann möglicherweise die EU-Nettozahler mit ins Verderben gerissen werden. Anstatt im Sinne effizienten Krisenmanagements das Scheitern des Stabilitätsmechanismus einzugestehen, hat die EU nur das Risiko für alle vervielfacht.

Zum anderen darf bezweifelt werden, ob eine Opposition ehemaliger Gaddafi-Minister wirklich an Demokratie interessiert ist. Höchst beunruhigend ist für mich die Identifizierung des militärischen Oberbefehlshabers der libyschen Rebellen als langjähriger CIA-Agent.

Schließlich zeugen AKW-Stresstests, die freiwillig und ohne Konsequenzen durchgeführt werden sollen, vom Brüsseler Realitätsverlust. Den Vogel abgeschossen hat die Kommission jedoch mit der Reaktivierung einer zwanzig Jahre alten Verordnung, ohne die Grenzwerte für radioaktiv belastete Lebensmittel anzupassen.

2-043

Alain Lamassoure (PPE). – Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, Madame la Présidente, sur l'Union économique et monétaire, le résultat du Conseil européen est impressionnant. Bravo! Mais comprenons que cela va poser un problème nouveau et redoutable, à savoir l'acceptation politique des décisions ainsi prises, à deux niveaux.

Premier niveau: entre les États membres eux-mêmes. Depuis le début, cette procédure du pacte euro plus repose sur un accord purement intergouvernemental, à l'initiative d'un État membre, le plus important. Une fois, ça va. Mais si, pendant plusieurs années consécutives, le cheminement politique est le même, nous risquons d'aller vers de très fortes tensions nationales. Déjà, la chancière allemande a été huée dans les rues d'Athènes et de Dublin. Il faut donc transformer peu à peu cette procédure intergouvernementale en une procédure authentiquement européenne, pas encore communautaire, mais européenne. C'est le sens des amendements adoptés par le Parlement, et le président Juncker, et vous, Monsieur le Président Van Rompuy, doivent être félicités et remerciés de les avoir adoptés.

Second niveau: l'acceptation par les opinions publiques dans chacun des États membres. Comment les partis, qui sont aujourd'hui dans l'opposition dans nos pays, se sentiraient-ils liés par des orientations politiques sur lesquelles ils n'ont jamais été consultés? Regardons ce qui s'est passé hier aux élections irlandaises, observons le débat électoral aujourd'hui, au Portugal. La seule manière de donner à ces recommandations une forme de légitimité politique est de veiller à ce que les parlements nationaux soient associés, dès le premier jour, tout au long de la procédure du semestre européen, alors que les conclusions du Conseil ne mentionnent les parlements qu'en passant, dans la même catégorie que les régions, les partenaires sociaux ou les ONG. L'enjeu est incomparablement plus important. C'est une nouvelle dimension de la démocratie européenne que les décisions prises nous invitent à explorer.

(Applaudissements)

2-044

Udo Bullmann (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Rat und Kommission schlagen uns vor, dass die öffentlichen Haushalte in Europa konsolidiert werden müssen, und da haben sie Recht. Doch wenn wir uns anschauen, wie das funktioniert und wie es weiter funktionieren wird, müssen wir feststellen: Es trifft die Falschen. Schulen werden geschlossen, Erzieherinnen und Erzieher werden entlassen, Forscherinnen und Forscher werden vor die Tür gesetzt, die Investitionen im öffentlichen Bereich werden gekürzt, liegen brach.

Ich frage Herrn Van Rompuy und Herrn Barroso: Ist es das, was Sie meinen? Jetzt sagen Sie sicherlich, dass Sie das nicht meinen, sondern dass an anderer Stelle gekürzt werden soll. Dann frage ich zurück: Wo soll denn gekürzt werden? Und meine Kernfrage lautet folgendermaßen: Wenn Sie denken, dass woanders gekürzt werden soll, warum wird dann in den Texten, die Sie uns zur Beschlussfassung im „Sixpack“ zur Economic Governance vorschlagen, nicht unterschieden, ob ein Land Panzer kauft, ob ein Land Kriegswaffen kauft und in eine marode Staatswirtschaft investiert, oder ob es Wege in die Zukunft beschreitet? Oder ob es in ein modernes Energieversorgungssystem und in die Bildung und in die Ausbildung seiner Kinder investiert? Diese Texte sind dumm, hat Romano Prodi einmal dazu gesagt, und er hat immer noch Recht, denn sie können diese Unterscheidung nicht anbieten. Also müssen wir diese Texte verbessern, weil man Europa nicht vernünftig regieren kann, wenn man diese Unterscheidung nicht treffen kann.

Die letzte Kernfrage lautet: Wo kommen eigentlich die Einnahmen her, damit wir gemeinsam aus der Krise herauswachsen können? Denn wir können uns nicht aus der Krise heraussparen. Da, Herr Barroso, warten wir auf Ihren Vorschlag zur Finanztransaktionssteuer in Europa, so wie dieses Haus dies mit großer Mehrheit beschlossen hat. Geben Sie Europa eine Chance und lassen Sie uns nicht weiter Zeit mit guten Worten verlieren!

2-045

Wolf Klinz (ALDE). – Frau Präsidentin! Meine Herren Präsidenten, wenn man Ihnen aufmerksam zuhört, hat man den Eindruck, alles ist im Lot: Der Euro ist gesichert, wir haben einen neuen Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakt, wir haben einen ESM, und wir haben einen Plus-Pakt für den Euro.

Ich sage hier auf gut Deutsch: „Die Botschaft hör ich wohl, allein, mir fehlt der Glaube“. Wir dürfen den Ausgangspunkt für die ganzen Überlegungen und Maßnahmen nicht vergessen, nämlich die galoppierende Verschuldung mancher Euro-Mitgliedstaaten, die sinkende Wettbewerbsfähigkeit, realwirtschaftliche Verwerfungen und als Folge davon ein steigendes Leistungsfinanzdefizit, das finanziert werden muss.

Es ist jetzt schon absehbar, dass die Bedingungen des neuen Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspaktes von manchen Mitgliedstaaten beim besten Willen nicht erfüllt werden können. Der ESM wird nicht zur Überwindung der realwirtschaftlichen Verwerfungen führen, weil keiner eine Insolvenz eines Euro-Mitgliedstaates überhaupt ernsthaft in Erwägung zieht und weil die Aussicht auf ESM-Finanzhilfen dann zu einem weiterhin laschen Verhalten führen wird.

Die sogenannten strengen Auflagen werden sich de facto in der Praxis als ziemlich leichtfüßig herausstellen. Der Zwang zu einstimmigen Beschlüssen führt zu dem schon aus der Vergangenheit bekannten Kuhhandel. Nicht zuletzt ist der Pakt für den Euro viel zu unverbindlich, um notleidende Staaten überhaupt zu tiefgreifenden realwirtschaftlichen Reformen veranlassen zu können.

Insgesamt befürchte ich also, dass wir die eigentlichen Ursachen nicht beseitigen werden. Wir werden mit dem ESM eine dauerhafte Verschuldungsfazität haben, deren Kreditrahmen in regelmäßigen Abständen erhöht werden muss. Er wird sich als Fass ohne Boden herausstellen, und die Bürger der Staaten, die im Wesentlichen zahlen müssen, sehen sich einmal mehr getäuscht. Die Zustimmung zu Europa wird weiter sinken.

2-046

Derk Jan Eppink (ECR). – Ik heb een persoonlijke vraag aan de heer Van Rompuy. De oorlog in Libië gaat door. Wij hebben gezien dat er warme betrekkingen waren tussen de Libische leiders en Europese leiders als vriendjes in de zandbak.

Ik heb vorige keer foto's laten zien, ook van u, mijnheer Van Rompuy. Ik waardeer u als een man van integriteit, oprecht, zelfs in de politiek. Consistent. En daarom heb ik mij gestoord aan die foto's. Honderden mensen werden gedood in Lockerbie, velen van hen Europeanen. En dan zien wij Europese leiders samen met de moordenaar. Dus toen ik u zag was ik teleurgesteld. Misschien is het omdat u pas in deze job bent, tussen premiers en presidenten en ander uitverkoren volk. Maar ik zou u willen adviseren met twee benen op de grond te blijven staan.

Europa moet aan de kant van de vrijheid staan. Het wezen van dit project is vrijheid en u en de heer Barroso, die ook heel vriendelijk was tegen de heer Kadhafi, hebben dit verloochend en daarom ben ik teleurgesteld in u.

2-047

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Madam President, so far we have dealt with the crisis but now we need to deal with the fundamental problems that caused the crisis – namely the large deficits and the weak public finances.

That is why the reform of the Stability and Growth Pact is of utmost importance, not only to reach the aims and targets but also to have credibility in the economies of Europe. We also need to tackle the problems of the lack of competitiveness and economic growth. That is the main task we need to deal with in order to fight poverty and create jobs, but also to secure prosperity.

Of course, Member States have a fundamental responsibility here to restructure budgets, giving priority to social security and investments in growth at the same time as deficits are reduced. They must reform markets, including labour markets and other opportunities for small and medium-sized enterprises.

That is what Member States must do – and much more – but let us also underline what the European Union as such must do. We must have the same level of preparedness to restructure the budget of the European Union as we are demanding from Member States, ensuring that we give priority to growth and investment, research and science and open markets.

We also need to ensure that we are reforming the European market. Seventy percent of the European economy is in the service sector, but the Services Directive is rather limited in that perspective. The future of the European economy lies in the service sector and the knowledge economy. There is strong demand for the Commission to put forward proposals making the internal market applicable to the whole knowledge economy. That is the key issue in making Europe the leading knowledge economy in the world.

2-048

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Messieurs les Présidents, après cette crise, dans la compétition mondiale, quelle est la meilleure arme de l'Union européenne? Vous l'avez définie vous-mêmes: la stratégie pour l'Union européenne 2020.

Or, lorsque je regarde ce que vous faites en matière de gouvernance économique, j'ai l'impression qu'il y a là une contradiction absolue. Car si l'on regarde le pacte de stabilité, la gouvernance économique, vous êtes en train de passer d'une stratégie de coordination à une stratégie de surveillance, qui se traduit par la transformation d'un consensus de Washington en un consensus de Bruxelles. Lorsque vous parlez de réformes structurelles, vous parlez de baisse des salaires, d'augmentation de l'âge de la retraite.

Moi, je vais vous parler des vraies réformes structurelles dont nous avons besoin. C'est d'investissements publics, d'abord dans l'éducation. Savez-vous que, pendant toute la période de la stratégie de Lisbonne, la moitié des États membres ont diminué le budget qu'ils ont consacré à l'éducation? Est-ce que vous les avez sanctionnés pour cela? Est-ce que vous savez que l'Union européenne ne mettra jamais en œuvre cette stratégie 2020 si nous ne mutualisons pas les investissements pour l'avenir, si, lorsque vous évaluez les dépenses publiques des États membres, les seules dépenses que vous regardez avec un œil différent, où vous intégrez du qualitatif, ce sont les États membres qui mettraient en place des réformes des retraites par capitalisation et que vous ignorez ceux qui seraient conduits à faire des efforts en matière d'éducation?

Lorsque je regarde la situation en Irlande aujourd'hui, une chose me frappe. Jour après jour, vous décidez de sauver des banques et, pendant ce temps-là, les Irlandais s'en vont. Ce n'est pas l'Union européenne que nous voulons. Moi, je préfère que nous sauvions les citoyens irlandais plutôt que leurs banques. Et puis, pour sauver les banques, vous avez inventé des *stress tests*. Alors maintenant, j'ai l'impression qu'à chaque fois qu'il y a une difficulté, on met en place des *stress tests*. Ce sont les nouveaux comités Théodule. *Stress test* pour le nucléaire, *stress test* pour les banques, *stress test* pour la Commission, peut-être, demain. Peut-être que nous le proposerons. Mais moi, je préférerais avoir une Commission qui prenne l'initiative et qui soit là où elle doit être.

Lorsque je regarde les avis de la Banque centrale européenne aujourd'hui, j'ai l'impression qu'elle se préoccupe plus de ce qui n'est pas dans son mandat, à savoir du niveau des salaires, plutôt que de la viabilité de notre système bancaire et de son efficacité au service de l'investissement public dont nous avons besoin. Ce Parlement européen a mis sur la table des propositions dont vous refusez de tenir compte sur la taxation des transactions financières ou sur les eurobonds.

Messieurs les Présidents, il est temps que vous écoutiez les propositions qui viennent de ce Parlement européen pour réussir la stratégie que vous avez vous-mêmes adoptée.

2-049

Lena Ek (ALDE). – Fru talman! Ministerrådet har också vid sitt senaste sammanträde behandlat frågan om säkerhet för kärnkraftsverk och europeiska reaktorer. Det är ett ämne som nu är föremål för förhandlingar i parlamentet. Vi kommer att ha en resolution som ska upp till omröstning på torsdag

Jag tror att de flesta europeiska medborgare nog trodde att stresstester var ett självklart inslag i säkerhetsåtgärderna kring kärnkraft sedan decennier. Så är inte fallet. Det förslag som har antagits av rådet i slutsatserna är alldeles för vekt. Vi måste testa inte bara tekniken och geografin utan också säkerhetskulturen och multipla risker. Vi måste se till att det finns öppenhet

och insyn. Det är fullständigt oacceptabelt att regeringar och nationella myndigheter ska revidera sig själva på det här området. Det ska naturligtvis vara oberoende kontroller, fakta ska offentliggöras, full transparens måste råda under insyn av kommissionen. Det är det enda som är trovärdigt för den här tekniken i fortsättningen. Det måste också ske en omförhandling av den institutionella strukturen som ju är lika gammal som Europeiska unionen. Den måste uppdateras. Vi måste ha europeiska säkerhetsstandarder inom systemet och slutligen måste vi se till att också ministerrådet kommer fram med förslag när det gäller energieffektivisering, alternativa energikällor och en tidsplan för detta.

2-050

Vicky Ford (ECR). – Madam President, the most important conclusion from the Council meeting was not headline-sexy. It said that the single market has a key role to play to deliver growth.

But is this all talk? On economic governance, I already see colleagues wanting to water down the Stability Pact, and when it comes to supporting businesses, we are not much better.

MEPs flock to sign up to campaigns for cyclists and horse welfare, but when it came to campaigning to cut red tape for small businesses, only a third of us joined in and there was only one UK Labour signature. The Commission promises to unlock venture capital, which is laudable, but almost laughable given that it spent all of last year trying to legislate it out of the market altogether.

It is time to walk the walk. Nine heads of state have signed a letter on specific actions for business, trade, innovation and investment. They call on us to choose growth. I certainly do.

2-051

Jaime Mayor Oreja (PPE). – Señora Presidenta, el Consejo Europeo ha adoptado un conjunto de medidas relacionadas con la gobernanza, con el saneamiento presupuestario, con la competitividad, etc. y quiero decir que todas van en la buena dirección.

Esos dieciséis puntos del Consejo Europeo se deben en buena medida a la tarea que han desarrollado tanto el Presidente Van Rompuy como el Presidente Barroso, y de ahí mi felicitación, en primer lugar, porque sí valoro, algunos valoramos lo que ustedes han hecho al frente de las Instituciones.

Pero, señor Presidente, el problema es que no sólo vivimos una crisis económica, es que vivimos una crisis de confianza y de carácter político en Europa y en las naciones europeas. No se trata sólo de valorar los contenidos concretos económicos y técnicos del Consejo Europeo. Al mismo tiempo que hay Consejos Europeos hay elecciones europeas, nacionales y de ámbito regional, y en todas ellas se confirma nuestro nerviosismo. Hay posiciones que se extreman. Hay posiciones que, en estos momentos, se encierran en los nacionalismos. De ahí que ustedes tengan que entender

muy bien que no sólo han de afrontar la crisis, sino también las consecuencias políticas y sociales que está produciendo la crisis.

No son simplemente tiempos en que hay una crisis Norte-Sur, como algún compañero ha dicho acertadamente, en la Unión Europea; son tiempos nuevos, y los tiempos nuevos se caracterizan porque se acumulan y se multiplican las crisis y no se resuelven. Aparecen de modo inesperado, dentro y fuera. Y esos tiempos nuevos exigen esencialmente actitudes nuevas, actitudes personales nuevas, actitudes institucionales nuevas, y ése es el gran reto político que tenemos por delante.

Un cambio de actitud personal empieza por uno mismo. Uno, si es del Parlamento Europeo, tiene que decir en qué debe cambiar el Parlamento para afrontar tiempos nuevos, y lo mismo debe hacerse desde la Comisión y desde el Consejo; todos y cada uno de nosotros tenemos que saber afrontar este tema.

Pero, en cualquier caso, lo importante es que no pierdan el norte, porque ustedes van en la buena dirección.

2-052

Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, señor Presidente del Consejo en ejercicio, señor Presidente de la Comisión, queridos colegas, ésta es la primera crisis de la zona del euro, y cuando sobrevino la crisis hemos podido detectar que la Unión Europea no se encontraba equipada para afrontarla.

Ha habido fallos de diseño, como la ausencia de previsión sobre la asistencia financiera para los países de la eurozona, falta de eficacia en el cumplimiento de los compromisos en materia de finanzas públicas y en materia de competitividad y un incremento de los desequilibrios macroeconómicos y de la divergencia en el ámbito de la eurozona.

Hemos visto cómo los pasos que se habían dado para contar con una voz europea en el ámbito de la política exterior y de seguridad no se vieron acompañados en el ámbito económico, pese a los requerimientos de la globalización, no pudiendo convertirse nuestro potencial económico en liderazgo económico a nivel global, y la cojera entre el pilar monetario común y el económico intergubernamental se ha hecho mucho más evidente.

Para dar una respuesta apropiada, es necesario avanzar en la integración. No hay una salida nacional, salvo que algunos se equivoquen de siglo. Por eso, el Consejo Europeo de los pasados 24 y 25 de marzo ha dado pasos importantes en la buena dirección, incluso espectaculares. La puesta en práctica del semestre europeo, la adopción del mecanismo de estabilidad permanente, con los compromisos adquiridos ante el Parlamento, e incluso el paquete legislativo, que será necesario equilibrar por parte del Parlamento, van en la buena dirección. El Pacto Euro Plus supone, sin duda alguna, un avance, pero quedan muchas cosas por hacer. La crisis sigue ahí, hay veintitrés millones de parados y

todavía hay nubes importantes en nuestro horizonte y grandes desafíos.

Por eso es necesario un pacto con los ciudadanos europeos en una triple dimensión, porque la política de austeridad tiene sus límites y es necesario apostar por una política de crecimiento y empleo a través de inversiones que permitan reorientar nuestro modelo económico y cumplir la Estrategia 2020.

La política de sostenibilidad fiscal y financiera exige un marco europeo tanto en el ámbito de las deudas soberanas como en la recapitalización de las entidades financieras y es necesario un auténtico pacto social europeo que introduzca mejoras de la productividad, con estándares sociales, avances fiscales y la actualización del Estado de bienestar.

2-053

Ivo Strejček (ECR). – Paní předsedající, to, co se stalo na jednání Evropské rady 24. a 25. března 2011 a obsah textu, který byl přijat jsou přiběhem o prosazení fiskální unie zadními dveřmi. Vytvoření jednotné měny Euro a období existence této měny je historií ignorance ekonomických zákonitostí, porušování pravidel, lhaní o výši deficitů veřejných financí a podvádění v národních statistikách. Pakt růstu a stability byl přijat jako *last chance break* proti notorickým černým pasažérům a byl po celá léta porušován všemi. Proč si myslíme, že při rozdílnosti charakteristik národních ekonomik, rozdílné míry inflace, rozdílné míry nezaměstnanosti tomu bude u paktu Europlus jinak? Zvlášť nevhodný považují návrh na harmonizaci základů korporátních daní.

2-054

Paulo Rangel (PPE). – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Presidente do Conselho, Senhor Presidente da Comissão, em primeiro lugar queria naturalmente cumprimentá-los pelos resultados do Conselho de 24 e 25 de Março, nomeadamente pela consolidação do semestre europeu mas, muito mais do que isso, pela institucionalização do mecanismo europeu de estabilidade e pelo fecho do Pacto Euro Plus que já vinha da Cimeira da Zona Euro de 11 de Março.

Creio que estes são resultados muito positivos para a Europa e só é pena que não tenha este processo ficado totalmente concluído nos dias 24 e 25 de Março. Creio que, se nós tivéssemos dado esse sinal, se os Estados tivessem dado esse sinal no Conselho, fechando completamente este pacote de reforma do fundo, nós estaríamos hoje numa posição mais forte para enfrentarmos os 3-4 meses e, em parte, teríamos atenuado os efeitos da crise que neste momento vive o meu país, Portugal, e sobre a qual também não quero deixar de dar uma palavra. Para dizer que, no caso do PSD, totalmente integrado no PPE, existe uma absoluta e total disponibilidade para o cumprimento daquelas que são as exigências e obrigações da integração no espaço europeu. É isso que temos feito, mesmo neste momento, em que há dificuldades quanto ao financiamento de curto prazo. Ao contrário do que tem feito o Governo socialista, o Partido Social Democrata tem mostrado a total disponibilidade para dar as garantias à Europa que

forem necessária no contexto desta crise. E, com isto, quero dar o sinal, sem trazer a política interna para o Parlamento Europeu, do cometimento, do compromisso, da total garantia do Partido Social Democrata face à rigorosa agenda que o país vai ter de ter depois das suas eleições de 5 de Junho.

2-055

Edít Herczog (S&D). – Elnök Asszony! Elnök Urak! Az európai csúcson született megállapodás a magyar soros elnökség első komoly politikai sikere. Elsősorban konzervatív siker. Végrehajtása az egységen múlik. Ezért sajnálatos és magyarázatra szorul, hogy négy konzervatív kormánnyal rendelkező ország nem vállalta az Euró Plusz Paktumot. Sajnálatos és köröngyeforgató magatartás, hogy amit soros elnökként javasunk másoknak, azt a magunk számára nem tartjuk elfogadhatónak. Aki kimarad, az lemarad! Az ország, ahol nem a tudáson és versenyképességen alapuló kitörés a cél, hanem az olcsó bérmunka, az adóverseny megnyerése, az már középtávon is az Európai Unió szegényháza lesz. Ha már az adóversenyt említettem: Elnök Urak! Mivel magyarázzák, hogy a Tanács nem tárgyalta az adóparadicsomok kérdését? Úgy gondolják, hogy ez nem az európai polgárok problémája? Tévednek! Sokkal több előrehaladást várunk a Tanácstól és a Bizottságtól.

Engedjék meg, hogy a Japán természeti katasztrófával és az azt követő ipari katasztrófával is foglalkozzak. 12 000 halott, 17 000 eltűnt, százezrek hajlék és milliók munka nélkül. Az Európai Unió, amely a szolidaritást értéknek tekinti, muszáj, hogy segítsen! A katasztrófa megrázta a világ energia- és nyersanyagpiacait. Hosszú távra meghatározza a politikai és gazdasági környezetet. Muszáj, hogy javítsunk a világ nukleáris biztonságán! Muszáj, hogy kidolgozzuk azokat a szabványokat, amelyek ezt lehetővé teszik! Muszáj, hogy növeljük a K+F befektetéseket, és muszáj, hogy az európai energiapolitikában a diverzifikációt erősítsük! Ezek a célok, Elnök Urak, a 2020-as célokban már megfogalmazódtak. A Tanács és a Bizottság dolga, hogy az idevezető utat és az ehhez szükséges forrásokat előteremtse. Jó munkát kívánunk ehhez!

2-056

Άννα Ποδημάτα (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, χωρίς να θέλω να υποβαθμίσω τη σημασία των πρόσφατων αποφάσεων του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου, η λογική που χαρακτηρίζει τις ευρωπαϊκές αποφάσεις εδώ και ένα χρόνο, είναι πολύ αργά, πολύ λίγο. Και αυτό όχι γιατί δεν έχουν γίνει σημαντικά βήματα προς τα εμπρός, αλλά γιατί το μέτρο σύγκρισης σήμερα δεν μπορεί να είναι το παρελθόν, το τι κάναμε παλαιότερα για τη σταθερότητα και την ενίσχυση της ευρωζώνης, αλλά το πόσο αποτελεσματικοί είμαστε στην αντιμετώπιση της κρίσης. Δυστυχώς, όμως, δεν είμαστε αποτελεσματικοί ούτε απέναντι στις αγορές - αρκεί να δείτε πού έφθασε τις τελευταίες μέρες το κόστος δανεισμού για τις χώρες της περιφέρειας και ειδικά της Πορτογαλίας - αλλά, δεν είμαστε αποτελεσματικοί και πειστικοί, δυστυχώς, ούτε απέναντι στους ευρωπαίους πολίτες που θεωρούν, ολόένα και περισσότερο ολόένα και περισσότεροι, ότι η

Ευρώπη δεν είναι μέρος της λύσης, αλλά μέρος του προβλήματος.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο με δύο πρόσφατα ψηφίσματά του, αλλά και εξέχουσες προσωπικότητες από όλο το πολιτικό φάσμα, έχουν επισημάνει ότι για να υπάρξει μία αποτελεσματική και συνολική απάντηση στην κρίση χρέους, θα πρέπει να εξετάσουμε σοβαρά τη λύση ενός συστήματος έκδοσης ευρωομολόγων. Ταυτόχρονα, η πλειοψηφία του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου απαντά ότι αυτό δεν γίνεται, γιατί σε συνθήκες κρίσης θα δημιουργούσε ηθικό κίνδυνο για τις υγιείς δημοσιονομικά χώρες. Και ενώ όμως επικαλούνται τον ηθικό κίνδυνο για να αντιστρατευθούν το ευρωομολόγο, δημιουργούν ηθικό κίνδυνο σε βάρος των χωρών με οικονομικές δυσκολίες, βάζοντας επισήμως στο τραπέζι χωρίς κανέναν δισταγμό την προοπτική της ελεγχόμενης χρεοκοπίας και της εμπλοκής των ιδιωτών στον επιμερισμό του κόστους, και έτσι διαιωίζουμε την κρίση κρατώντας σε δυσθεώρητα ύψη το κόστος δανεισμού.

Εάν θέλουμε ελικρινά συμμετοχή των ιδιωτών και έναν δικαιότερο επιμερισμό του κόστους, τότε να εξετάσουμε στα σοβαρά και κατά προτεραιότητα την επιβολή φόρου χρηματοπιστωτικών συναλλαγών, ώστε μέρος των εισόδων να χρησιμοποιηθεί για την χρηματοδότηση του μόνιμου μηχανισμού.

2-057

Андрей Ковачев (PPE). – Г-жо председател, уважаеми г-н Барозу, уважаеми г-н Ромпой, кризата в която се намираме в момента, потвърждава нуждата от визионери в Европа не само сред хората, които взимат решения, но и сред гражданите.

Тъжно е, но е истина. Загубихме много време и пропуснахме много възможности през годините на растеж. Създаването на единната валута е безспорен успех. Той, обаче, изглежда като една красива къща със счупен покрив. Нанесохме се през сухия период, а сега е дъждовно, вали в Еврозоната, вали висок дефицит и задлъжнялост, ниско кредитно доверие.

Пактът Европлюс и решенията на Съвета са стъпка в правилната посока. Икономическият семестър е мярка, която ще направи икономиките и бюджетите ни по-координирани и по-устойчиви във финансови кризи.

Радвам се и е правилно решението на 60 страни извън Еврозоната, включително и моята страна България, да се присъединят към пакта, за да могат активно да участват в процеса на взимане на решения по икономическите политики и да не позволи Европа да се разделя от различни стандарти и принципи.

Сигурен съм, че рано или късно европейските икономически политики трябва да се основават на общностния метод, а не на междуправителствения, както е сега, и не е може би далече денят, когато ще има нова междуправителствена конференция или

защо не конвент по въпросите на икономическото и политическото управление на Европа.

Приветствам заключението на Съвета по въпросите, свързани с Либия. Европейският съюз трябва да се ангажира активно при изграждането на демокрацията след края на конфликта и да помогне на либийския народ да изгради правова държава и гражданско общество. Това ще бъде разбира се сигнал и за останалите държави в региона, че Европа стои зад легитимните искания на гражданите.

Европа също трябва да извлече своите поуки от кризата в Либия и в целия арабски свят. Какво можем ние още да направим за нашите съседи, за нашите близки съседи на юг? Дали можем да използваме нашия опит от Източното партньорство в Средиземноморието?

И накрая, г-н Ромпой и г-н Барозу, Европа има нужда от оперативни сили за бързо реагиране, които да могат да изпълняват мисии под флага на Европейския съюз. За целта е необходимо повече способности и повече интеграция в областта на сигурността и отбраната, разбира се без да дублираме или да заменяме НАТО.

2-058

Frédéric Daerden (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président Van Rompuy, il est clair qu'il y a, dans vos conclusions, des choses évidentes contre lesquelles on ne peut être: une gouvernance rigoureuse. Personne ne peut être contre. Mais rigueur ne doit pas signifier déficit zéro ou austérité, mais plutôt dépenses intelligentes.

La nécessaire compétitivité de l'Union est à améliorer, c'est une évidence, mais la seule variable d'adaptation ne peut être la baisse des salaires ou la coupe dans les dépenses sociales. La compétitivité s'acquiert par l'investissement dans la qualification, la recherche, l'excellence et les grandes infrastructures.

Tout le monde s'accorde ici sur le fait que l'Union, que l'euro, sont à un tournant. Il s'agit pour nous de choisir entre un modèle du repli sur soi, dans lequel chacun regarde à sa compétitivité par rapport à l'État membre voisin, sa notation sur les marchés financiers, sa plus faible contribution possible au budget européen, ou choisir un modèle solidaire – le seul acceptable – dans lequel les normes sociales sont tirées vers le haut, notamment en respectant la place du dialogue social et des syndicats, avec des minima sociaux partout en Europe et des mécanismes d'indexation des salaires sauvegardés, dans lequel la solidarité entre les générations est assurée par un système de pension qui garantit un niveau adéquat pour vivre dignement, comme l'a indiqué récemment le Parlement.

Il faudrait que les États membres soient affranchis des pressions des marchés financiers grâce à une Banque centrale européenne au rôle renforcé et qu'on dispose d'agences de notation mieux réglementées, un modèle

solidaire qui assure une véritable cohésion sociale et territoriale en Europe, notamment via un budget européen renforcé, avec une réforme profonde de ses ressources propres, avec, enfin, la mise en place de la taxe sur les transactions financières.

Vos conclusions reposent sur une idéologie marquée dans laquelle dette et déficit sont les responsables de la crise, alors que la cause réelle est l'irresponsabilité des acteurs financiers. Sans un changement de prisme idéologique au sein du Conseil, nous ne sortirons pas de la crise, nous ne rendrons pas confiance aux citoyens. Il y a aujourd'hui un déficit démocratique clair et, si le Conseil et la Commission continuent à faire des propositions qui ne tiennent pas compte de l'avis du Parlement, le rejet de notre projet par nos concitoyens s'intensifiera encore un peu plus.

2-059

Marianne Thyssen (PPE). – Het voorbije jaar is keihard gewerkt en zijn er meerdere hervormingen op het spoor gezet, opdat de Unie ook in de toekomst een samenleving kan zijn waar het goed en rechtvaardig leven en werken is. Ik sluit mij daarom graag aan bij de collega's die lof betuigd hebben aan het voorzitterschap van de Europese Raad.

Na alles wat hier al door de collega's gezegd is, wil ik nog drie punten aansnijden. Mijn eerste gaat over de loonkosten als een van de factoren in het mededingingsbeleid. Tijdens de crisis heb ik zowel de voorzitter van de Commissie als de voorzitter van de Europese Raad meermaals lovend horen spreken over de automatische stabilisatoren. In plaats van scherpe pieken en dalen zorgen zij dat wij een stabielere economie hebben met minder banenverlies, hetgeen perfect past in de sociale markteconomie die wij willen zijn. Maar sommigen vrezen nu dat een al te nadrukkelijke focus op de factor loonkosten in het Euro Plus-pact de speelruimte voor die automatische stabilisatoren al te zeer zou beperken. Mijn vraag is, Voorzitter, hoe kijkt u daar tegenaan?

Nog een tweede bedenking bij de factor loonkosten. Van vakbondszijde hoor ik voortdurend zeggen dat op het stuk van de loonvorming afbreuk zou worden gedaan aan de autonomie van de lidstaten en hun sociale partners en dat wij mogelijk afstevenen op een flagrante inbreuk op de bevoegdheidsregels van het Verdrag. Mijn vraag is: zitten wij daar nu echt in een risicozone of is die vrees ongegrond? Ook graag hierover uw analyse, mijnheer de Raadsvoorzitter, want als die dubbele vrees onterecht is, dan moeten wij die echt wel de wereld uit helpen.

Tenslotte een vraagje over de gemeenschappelijke geconsolideerde heffingsgrondslag voor de vennootschapsbelasting. In de conclusies van de lentetop lees ik één zinnetje, amper één, en dan nog zonder de minste toezegging van de Europese Raad ter zake. Moet ik hieruit afleiden dat er nog lang geen consensus bestaat om die gemeenschappelijke heffingsgrondslag in te voeren en dat wij hooguit kunnen gaan dromen van

versterkte samenwerking in dezen? Dank bij voorbaat voor uw antwoorden.

2-060

Κρίτων Αρσένης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η κ. Ποδηματά με κάλυψε στο θέμα των οικονομικών. Θα αναφερθώ σε ένα άλλο πάρα πολύ σημαντικό ζήτημα, στο ζήτημα της πυρηνικής ενέργειας. Τι μας δίδαξε η Ιαπωνία. Δύο πράγματα: πρώτον, ότι κανένας δεν μπορεί να είναι ποτέ επαρκώς προετοιμασμένος για φυσικές καταστροφές και συνδυασμούς τους. Δεύτερο, ότι η πυρηνική ενέργεια δεν είναι ποτέ απολύτως ασφαλής.

Τι κάνουμε εμείς; Κατηγορούμε την Ιαπωνία για αμέλεια. Λέμε ότι δεν ήταν η πυρηνική ενέργεια, αλλά η Ιαπωνία που δεν ήταν ασφαλής. Λέμε ότι θα κάνουμε τους δικούς μας ελέγχους στους σταθμούς της πυρηνικής ενέργειας, ώστε να δούμε ποιοί δεν είναι ασφαλείς και ποιοί είναι, και κατόπιν να προχωρήσουμε στην περαιτέρω ανάπτυξή τους. Δεν πήραμε όμως, έτσι, τα μαθήματα από την Ιαπωνία. Δεν έχουμε καν την ετοιμότητα της Ιαπωνίας απέναντι στις καταστροφές, δεν έχουμε καν την πολιτική για την προστασία των πολιτών μας απέναντι σε διασυννοριακά προβλήματα, όπως ένα πυρηνικό ατύχημα.

Πρέπει να σταματήσουμε να ζητάμε σήμερα την κατασκευή νέων πυρηνικών σταθμών. Να επενδύσουμε, όχι στην ανάπτυξη της πυρηνικής ενέργειας, αλλά στην ανάπτυξη της απόδοσης των φωτοβολταϊκών και των άλλων ανανεώσιμων πηγών ενέργειας. Οι επιπτώσεις της πυρηνικής ενέργειας είναι διασυννοριακές και για αυτό είναι ευθύνη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, γι' αυτό τον λόγο, κ. Barroso και κ. van Rompuy, θα είναι και δική σας μεγάλη ευθύνη αν δεν πάρουμε τα απαραίτητα μέτρα απέναντι σε ένα νέο ατύχημα.

2-061

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (PPE). – Madam President, I would like to touch upon three issues. First, I think that the Council summit meeting brought very important and positive results, given the difficulty of the situation and the context. I welcome the formula of having an inclusive Euro Plus Pact open to those who are not yet eurozone members, as President Van Rompuy said.

At the same time, we are creating a European stability mechanism safety net. Could we not consider that in both mechanisms in Euro Plus, which is an obligational commitment to observe certain rules of behaviour in macroeconomic and macro-financial policy, and also in ESM. The safety net should be open so that both convergence and solidarity, which is ESM, may be inclusive and not exclusive.

My second remark concerns neighbourhood policy. We seem to be redesigning our neighbourhood policy. The stimulus is coming from the South, but it is important for our overall neighbourhood policy. I hope that it will be – if we read the documents by Baroness Ashton and Mr Füle – far more society-oriented, more generous towards those societies and demanding of authorities and governments. We should move away from short-sighted

economic interests and base this policy on a human rights and democracy approach, moving from status quo policy to transition policy. But when we create this new paradigm it should also be applicable to the East. We should be more human rights and democracy-based and more society-oriented and less authority-oriented than we are now.

My third point concerns EU-NATO. In Libya we have a new experience of EU and NATO cooperation, which is a relationship which we do not yet fully understand. We also have an old experience in Afghanistan, which is not always good. At the same time, this relationship is important. Let us aim to be successful this time.

2-062

Arturs Krišjānis Kariņš (PPE). – Cienījamā priekšsēdētāja, kolēģi! Es domāju, ka mums ir skaidri jānovelk robežšķirtne starp pagātni un nākotni. Attiecībā uz pagātni es teiktu, ka ir jāatrod atsevišķs risinājums konkrēti Grieķijai un Īrijai. Es domāju, ka mums ir jāļauj norakstīt tos zaudējumus strukturētā plāna veidā, lai šīs sabiedrības atkal varētu tikt uz kājām. Nav pareizi turpināt šo valstu nodokļu maksātājus sodīt par kļūdām, ko faktiski privātais sektors, konkrēti, bankas bija izdarījušas. Un attiecībā uz nākotni mums jāskatās uz to, kas tad ir mūsu mērķis Eiropā. Un tas ir — nodrošināt stabilu izaugsmi. Bet, lai nodrošinātu stabilu izaugsmi, tas līdzeklis, kas ir nepieciešams, — un tas ir arī tas, kas Padomē tika runāts, — ir nodrošināt zemus valdības parādus.

Ko nodrošinās zemi vai mazi valdības parādi? Tie nodrošinās finanšu tirgu uzticību šim valstīm, kas savukārt nodrošinās zemas procentu likmes, lai to valsts uzņēmumi varētu atkal atsperties un attīstīties. Tad, kad uzņēmumi attīstīsies, būs investīcijas. Kad būs investīcijas, būs darbavietas, kas mums Eiropā ir nepieciešamas. Un šis process, proti, samazināt valdības izdevumus, lai parādu līmenis būtu zems, neizslēdz investīcijas.

Vairāki kolēģi pieminēja to, ka investīcijas ir nepieciešamas, ka mēs nevaram, kā saka, taupīt, „iztaupīt” sevi no šīs krīzes, ka ir jāinvestē. Un es varu konkrēti minēt savu valsti — Latviju, kura ne tikai vienlaikus pēdējos divus gadus ir veikusi nopietnus taupības pasākumus, bet šogad 2011. gadā vienu trešo daļu no valdības budžeta atvēlēja publiskām investīcijām. Tātad tas ir iespējams, mums ir šis ceļš jāiet nākotnē, lai mēs nenonākam tur, kur šodien esam nonākuši. Paldies par uzmanību!

2-063

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE). – Consiliul European a făcut un pas semnificativ înspre crearea mecanismului european de stabilitate prin adoptarea Deciziei de modificare a Tratatului privind funcționarea Uniunii.

Viitorul mecanism va asigura un răspuns stabil și coerent în eventualitatea unor situații de destabilizare a zonei euro. Este foarte bine să existe un astfel de mecanism. Este preferabil însă să nu se ajungă în astfel de situații, ceea ce înseamnă să se aplice cu consecvență

și disciplină prevederile guvernății economice. Toate statele membre trebuie să contribuie la stabilitate, fie că fac parte, sau încă nu fac parte din zona euro. De aceea, crearea Pactului euro plus, la care au aderat și state din afara zonei euro, printre care și România, este un lucru extrem de pozitiv.

Implementarea Semestrului european va asigura coordonarea politicii economice europene prin ameliorarea competitivității, reducerea birocrăției, promovarea educației și stimularea forței de muncă. Acest priorități însă trebuie transpuse foarte rapid în măsuri concrete la nivel național.

Succesul noilor reforme structurale europene este strâns legat de întărirea pieței unice. Uniunea are nevoie de o strategie care să contribuie la crearea de locuri de muncă și care să acopere deficiențele de pe piața forței de muncă din Uniune.

Este salutară intenția Comisiei de a prezenta Actul privind piața unică, care ar trebui adoptat până la sfârșitul anului 2012. Regret însă că, printre măsurile prioritare, care să dea un nou impuls pieței unice și competitivității, nu este menționată nevoia de liberă circulație a tuturor lucrătorilor europeni, punându-se accent doar pe libera circulație a serviciilor.

2-064

Simon Busuttli (PPE). – In-nies li qed jaħarbu mill-gwerra fil-Libja, issa bdew jaslu fl-Ewropa, speċjalment f'Lampedusa u f'Malta. U f'pajjizi, in-nies għandhom żewġ biżgħat:

L-ewwel nett, il-biza' illi ma jafux kemm se jaslu nies. Dan huwa biza' li m'għandniex twegħiba għalih għaliex ma nafux kemm se jaslu. It-tieni biza' huwa l-biza' li ma jafux jekk din id-darba l-Ewropa hiex se tghin. U dan huwa biza' illi nistghu u għandna nwiġbuh għaliex fil-fatt hemm mekkanizmu ta' solidarjetà illi diġà jinsab fil-liġi tagħna, fid-Direttiva Nru. 55 tas-sena 2001. Li rridu nagħmlu huwa illi nużawha.

S'issa l-Kummissjoni jidher li qieghda tagħti żewġ raġunijiet għaliex ma użathiex. L-ewwel nett illi m'hemmx maġġoranza fil-Kunsill tal-Ministri. Jiena nappella lill-President Barroso illi ma jagħtiniex din ir-raġuni. Il-Kummissjoni għandha tiehu hi t-tmexxija politika, l-inizjattiva politika biex tagħmel proposta sabiex dan il-mekkanizmu ta' solidarjetà jithaddem.

Il-Kummissjoni qieghda tghid ukoll illi għad m'hemmx numri kbar biżżejjed. Izda noqogħdu attenti. In-numri jistghu jkunu zghar ħafna għall-Ewropa kollha imma kbar ħafna għal pajjiz wiehed waħdu illi jkun qieghed jilqagħhom.

Għaldaqstant, jiena nappella direttament lill-President Barroso biex ihaddem il-mekkanizmu ta' solidarjetà u lill-President Van Rompuy biex jgħid lill-Kunsill tal-Ministri sabiex jagħti solidarjetà konkreta.

2-065

Tunne Kelam (PPE). – Madam President, the results of the European Council could be seen as politically and

institutionally satisfactory, but the message from today's debate is that the crisis is not over. President Barroso has said that the economic situation remains difficult and uncertain, Mr Verhofstadt has confirmed that we are filling in the holes, but that the crisis has not been solved, and President Van Rompuy has said that the problems remain.

This is the result of past mistakes and the lack of appropriate instruments. We need to draw conclusions about how these past mistakes happened and how the staggering debt burden and deficits were created. What was wrong with the policies of Member States and the EU institutions? Without thorough analysis and conclusions, that should become a commitment for all involved, we cannot avoid repeating the same mistakes. The central issue remains enhancing competitiveness. I hope that the Commission's new Single Market Act will be truly ambitious. At least the digital single market topic has made a breakthrough into EU priorities.

Last but not least, this week the new Estonian Government will be confirmed. At the recent elections, Estonian voters demonstrated anti-European tendencies, returning the existing Government with an increased majority despite heavy cuts in the budget ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

2-066

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, there is much to commend the Council conclusions as we look to the future – perhaps less so when we deal with the present and the past.

I was interested in the comments made by Catherine Day, a senior Commission official, in Ireland last week when she said that the shine had gone off Ireland. I hope that does not mean each of us individually, and I hope that, given the results of the stress tests and the very strong action of the new government, the shine will come back to Ireland. I hope, too, that it comes back to our people, who are very depressed and disillusioned by a feeling that they carry a very heavy burden for the rest of the European Union.

I would ask those who wag their fingers in anger about incorrect behaviour by individual countries and citizens to please remember that there were others who also joined in at the party – I speak of European banks, who tried to profit from the boom that existed not just in Ireland, but elsewhere.

However, there is a ray of hope in the Irish media this morning. I see that global finance giants are backing our economy in the wake of the stress tests, and I hope that they realise that the Irish have fixed a problem for the rest of Europe, and will show us much-needed solidarity on interest rates.

2-067

Jörg Leichtfried (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin! Geschätzte Herren Präsidenten, ich hätte einige Fragen an Sie. Es ist gut, dass man zu einer Einigung gekommen ist. Es ist

gut, dass die europäische Wirtschaft und die europäische Währung jetzt besser geschützt sind. Aber ist Schützen allein genug? Ist es nicht notwendig, auch weiter zu gehen? Ist es nicht notwendig, einen Aufschwung zu bewirken, damit das, was wir schützen, auch bewahrt werden kann? Hier geschieht meines Erachtens zu wenig und das Falsche.

Warum investiert die Europäische Union in den Export von Gurken, Bananen und Rindviechern, und nicht in Universitäten, in Wissen, in Schulen? Das ist etwas, über das wir nachdenken müssen. Und wenn Sie sagen, wir haben kein Geld dafür, dann könnte man vielleicht umschichten. Man muss auch überlegen, ob man vielleicht zu neuen Einnahmen kommt, und zwar von denen, die bisher immer von dieser unsäglichen Situation profitiert haben.

Herr Barroso, warum ist Ihre Kommission in Wahrheit gegen eine Finanztransaktionssteuer? Beantworten Sie mir das bitte. Sie müssen sich einmal entscheiden, ob Sie auf der Seite der Finanzindustrie oder der Bürgerinnen und Bürger stehen!

2-068

Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE). – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, je voudrais remercier les présidents des groupes politiques d'avoir annulé leur réunion de la Conférence des présidents pour que ce débat, conformément à l'article 15, ait lieu en plénière.

Concernant le mécanisme de stabilité, je voudrais poser la question du contrôle politique, dans le prolongement de ce qu'a dit Alain Lamassoure, et notamment également, le problème de la régulation de ce mécanisme, et savoir qui va donner la décharge budgétaire de cet instrument financier.

Je terminerai mon propos en me demandant si le moment ne serait pas venu que la Commission nous fasse un rapport global sur les soutiens publics aux établissements de crédit, et notamment sur l'ensemble des flux financiers et sur les dettes souveraines.

Et, enfin, je proposerai que la possibilité de créer une agence de notation publique européenne soit étudiée, face aux grands problèmes que nous avons avec les agences privées, car la notation d'un État, c'est quelque chose de très différent de celle d'une entreprise privée.

2-069

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, al principio de su intervención, el señor Van Rompuy ha señalado que en cuarenta y nueve días ha habido tres Consejos Europeos decisorios y una Cumbre. Eso significa que lo que antes era un acontecimiento trimestral o semestral ahora es la forma habitual de gobernar la Unión para responder de manera inmediata a los retos inmediatos.

Pero más allá de los retos inmediatos está el horizonte de la Unión, y el horizonte de la Unión depende de nuestra capacidad para competir. ¿Qué tenemos, en estos

momentos, para generar conocimientos? Pocas universidades entre las mejores del mundo, un porcentaje de investigación y desarrollo por debajo del de los países emergentes y los países desarrollados y, al mismo tiempo, empresas escasamente implicadas en la investigación.

Tenemos que conseguir dimensión europea, universidades europeas coordinadas entre sí y programas que generen la excelencia y la cooperación.

2-070

Graham Watson (ALDE). – Madam President, the Presidents of the Council and the Commission spoke of the Euro Plus Pact and of the single market. I have a question about each.

Do they agree with the President of the European Central Bank that a far larger European stability mechanism will be needed? If they do not agree, is it simply because true professionals can rarely admit in public what they know to be true in private?

The only participant in the single market which implements the rules 100% is Norway. Since the real stress test in the crisis we face will not be of any bank or any nuclear installation, but of the solidarity of European Union Member States, do the Presidents of the Commission and Council believe that there are good chances of greater solidarity than we have seen in the past?

2-071

Jaroslav Paška (EFD) – Jednou z tém rokovania Rady Európskej únie bolo aj definovanie nového krízového mechanizmu eurozóny. Aj keď predsedovia prítomných vlád našli zhodu na vytvorení stáleho eurovalu, ukazuje sa, že o jeho konečnej podobe budú musieť ešte diskutovať s odborníkmi vo svojich krajinách. Keď sa totiž pani Radičová, predsedníčka slovenskej vlády, vrátila z Bruselu domov, dozvedela sa, že pre svoju pozíciu deklarovanú na rokovaní Rady nemá v národnom parlamente dostatočnú podporu.

Bez korektného a precízneho dopracovania mechanizmu riadeného bankrotu nesolventných krajín, aktivovaného aj v rámci eurozóny, sa totiž navrhnutý stály mechanizmus stáva skôr trvalým nástrojom zadlžovania Európy. A preto ho v takejto podobe nemôže akceptovať žiaden zodpovedný národný parlament. Skúste preto, prosím, vážený pán predseda Rady Európskej únie, viac zohľadniť pri politických návrhoch aj kvalifikované odborné stanoviská.

2-072

Andrew Henry William Brons (NI). – Madam President, paragraph 5 of the report from the meeting says that policy measures will be presented to correct harmful and persistent macroeconomic imbalances and improve competitiveness, but in the introduction the talk is of promoting trade with third countries.

Imports from third countries, particularly the so-called emergent economies, are the greatest single cause of

trade imbalances and the inability to compete. It would be impossible for developed economies to compete with manufactured imports from these countries without driving our wages down to their levels.

Indeed, this is hinted at in the section on page 16, on fostering competitiveness. It says 'there will be assessments of wage and productivity developments and competitive adjustment needs'. Whatever does this mean?

It could only mean one thing. Wages must be adjusted downwards to make goods competitive with those of the emergent economies. While principles such as free trade are sacrosanct, the economic interests of European workers, it seems, are dispensable.

2-073

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Madam President, I do not like to be in tow or obligated to anybody and neither do the Irish people – an independent race. For that reason the recent EU-IMF bail-out hurt the Irish people badly. However, I do not share the opinion that Europe is to blame for it. It was largely due to Ireland's incorporated banks, regulator and government, not the Irish people – but the Irish people are now being forced to pay the price and the burden is too large.

For that reason I would ask two things: one, the interest rate should be reduced, and I would like to thank Commissioner Rehn and President Barroso for their vibes in that regard. Secondly, I think bondholders will have to pay a price – if not a haircut then, at the very least, they deserve a bit of a shave. Individuals do not get a guaranteed interest-free investment and neither should bondholders. If those two things were done then we might be able to make progress.

2-074

Marc Tarabella (S&D). – Madame la Présidente, Messieurs les Présidents, chers collègues, les conclusions du Conseil sur la politique économique et le pacte euro plus ouvrent une véritable boîte de Pandore européenne d'où ne surgissent que des maux auxquels les citoyens européens devront faire face. Remise en cause des protections sociales et de l'indexation des salaires, liaison de la productivité et des salaires, baisse du pouvoir d'achat, augmentation de l'âge de la retraite ne sont que quelques exemples de la crise d'austérité qui nous attend. Je suis atterré de voir que le Conseil n'a clairement pas su tirer les leçons de la crise.

Bien sûr, nous avons besoin d'une politique de responsabilité budgétaire et de rigueur, personne ne le conteste, mais nous ne devons pas faire peser tous les efforts sur les citoyens, qui représentent notre seule opportunité de pouvoir sortir de cette crise par le haut. Vous oubliez trop rapidement le secteur financier et bancaire qui doit aussi supporter les efforts indispensables, et surtout se responsabiliser.

Quand verrons-nous enfin une taxe sur les transactions financières? Alors que 16 millions d'Européens sont au chômage, que les prix flambent et que les secousses

spéculatives font trembler le continent, le Conseil fait porter la charge des sacrifices sur le travail et les travailleurs, non pas sur le capital, et c'est inadmissible.

2-075

Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D). – Van Rompuy elnök úr az Euró Plusz Paktumot a jövő gazdasági koordináció új szakaszaként értékelte, és ez makrogazdasági koordináció terén tényleg egy teljesen új korszak. Hasonlóképpen ítélte meg Orbán Viktor miniszterelnök úr, az Unió soros elnöke, aki a jövő európai gazdasági rendszerének a pilléréként fogalmazott. Sajnálatos ugyanakkor, hogy Magyarország neve nem szerepelt abban a felsorolásban, amit Van Rompuy úr elmondott, hiszen Magyarország nem vesz részt sajnálatos módon az Euró Plusz Paktumban. Nagyon sok magyar állampolgár, szakértő közgazdász sem érti, miért döntött így a magyar kormány, hiszen Magyarország egy nyitott gazdasággal rendelkező kis ország, és nem igaz az az indoklás, hogy ez akadályozta volna az adóversenyt, mindössze a társasági adóalap harmonizációjáról lenne szó. Kár, hogy Magyarország kimaradt belőle.

2-076

Franz Obermayr (NI). – Frau Präsidentin! Die EU ist Meister der Verdrängung. Jahrzehntlang wurde Gaddafi als seriöser Partner behandelt, Jahrzehntlang wurden die Gefahren der Atomenergie verdrängt, und nun pumpen wir weiter in einen Rettungsschirm, der offensichtlich nicht funktioniert. Warum sieht man nicht ein, dass die Euro-Krise durch den Rettungsschirm nicht zu bewältigen ist? Nach Griechenland wurde nun auch Portugal durch US-Ratingagenturen herabgestuft, und das Rettungspaket nutzt letztlich nur Banken und Spekulanten, die auf bankrotte Euro-Staaten wetten.

Ich sage daher: Schluss mit dem Rettungsschirm und den geplanten Eurobonds! Bleiben die Bankrotteurstaaten in der Eurozone, so ist das der Anfang vom Ende des Euros. Verwenden wir daher die Milliarden für die Rettungspakete doch lieber, um die Flüchtlingsströme aus Nordafrika mittels nachhaltiger Projekte vor Ort abzuwenden, oder um tatsächlich die Unabhängigkeit von Kernenergie sicherzustellen! Das Geld wäre hier sicherlich besser investiert, als es als Spielgeld in die internationalen Rating-Spielkasinos zu gehen.

2-077

Ana Gomes (S&D). – Quem empurra Portugal para uma suposta ajuda não quer realmente ajudar, quer é fazer mais dinheiro afundando-nos e afundando o euro. Porque nesta Europa, onde solidariedade, coesão e método comunitário passaram a ser palavras ocas, a suposta ajuda é só para pagar aos bancos que nos empurraram para a espiral de endividamento em que agora nos enterram, e tudo à custa dos cidadãos, com as receitas neoliberais do Pacto Euro Plus, sem investimento para relançar crescimento e emprego, nem eurobonds, nem imposto sobre as transacções financeiras, nem medidas para travar os desequilíbrios macroeconómicos que destroem o euro.

Nesta Europa, onde há bancos demasiado grandes para falir, mas se deixa afundar Estados e povos, será

cegueira ou captura por interesses que explicam que Comissão e Conselho tenham desistido de controlar os paraísos fiscais. Será possível sanear, regular e supervisionar o sistema financeiro, deixando intocáveis esses buracos negros instrumentais da corrupção, da fraude e da evasão fiscal e criminalidade organizada?

2-078

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D) – V prvom rade chcem upozorniť na nesprávny leitmotív záverov zo stretnutia Rady, a to, že máme hospodársky rásť a zároveň aj šetriť. Posadnutosť fiškálnou konsolidáciou v období krízy sa nám môže stať totiž osudnou. Našou jednoznačnou prioritou by mala byť obnova zamestnanosti a udržateľného hospodárskeho rastu.

Kolegyne a kolegovia, na krízu doplácajú najmä občania. Jednak strácajú zamestnanie, tvrdo sa ich dotýkajú úsporné opatrenia vlád a navyše im hrozí, že hotovosť potrebná na posilnenie eurovalu pôjde výlučne z ich daní. Ale podieľať by sa na posilnení eurovalu mali predovšetkým hráči z finančného sektora.

Pán prezident, pán predseda Komisie, to čo teraz Únia potrebuje, je koordinácia hospodárskych a sociálnych politik s cieľom obnoviť zamestnanosť a dostať sa z krízy. A tiež jednoznačný konsenzus o záchrane eura, do ktorej bude zapojený súkromný finančný sektor.

2-079

Angelika Werthmann (NI). – Frau Präsidentin! Durch die Vertragsänderung wurde der ESM auf den Weg gebracht. Ich appelliere nochmals an alle, sich an die entsprechenden Kriterien zu halten. Denn dass ein anderer Mitgliedstaat „zum Handkuss kommt“, vor allem die Bürgerinnen und Bürger, ist angesichts der vorherrschenden, nach wie vor anhaltenden Strukturkrise unverantwortlich. Der ESM kann nur und ausschließlich seine Berechtigung haben, wenn alle Staaten ihre Haushaltsverpflichtungen einhalten und sich zur Sparsamkeit verpflichten.

Die Japan-Krise hat uns gezeigt, wie „sicher“ die Atomkraft sein kann. Die Natur ist stärker als der Mensch. Dass die Stresstests mit mehr Vorsicht angegangen werden als die letzte Woche verordneten Grenzwerte, können wir angesichts der Geschichte mit Tschernobyl nur hoffen. Schluss mit den AKW! Konzentrieren wir uns endlich auf erneuerbare Energien! Das Seekabelprojekt NorGer zum Beispiel könnte 60 AKW ersetzen.

2-080

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Gerai, kad Europos Vadovų Taryboje pavyko susitari dėl kai kurių Europai itin svarbių klausimų. Kaip vieną iš prioritetų norėčiau išskirti Europos semestro klausimą ir jo svarbą. Manau, kad prioritetas turėtų būti teikiamas patikimų valstybių narių biudžetų, socialinio teisingumo atkūrimui ir fiskaliniam tvarumui, o tai sudarytų sąlygas greitesniam valstybių narių ekonomikos atsigavimui ir stabilumui. Labai svarbu, kad konsolidavimo pastangos būtų papildomos struktūrinėmis reformomis, ypač Europos Sąjungoje įgyvendinant strategijoje „Europa 2020“

numatytus prioritetus. Ypač svarbus vaidmuo taip pat turėtų tekti Komisijai, kuri turėtų itin atsakingai prižiūrėti valstybių narių veiksmus bei sekti konkrečių priemonių įgyvendinimą pagal nacionalines stabilumo ir konvergencijos programas. Be to, didelis susirūpinimas ir toliau išlieka dėl Europos centrinio banko, Tarybos ir Europos Komisijos požiūrio į komercinių bankų padėtį, taip pat užsienio reitingų agentūrų veiksmų.

2-081

José Manuel Barroso, Président de la Commission. – Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, en ce qui concerne l'évaluation du dernier Conseil européen, je crois que l'analyse que j'ai présentée était assez équilibrée, assez raisonnable.

Je pense qu'il est juste de reconnaître qu'on a fait d'importants progrès sur la structure. Si nous comparons ce que nous avons maintenant avec ce que nous n'avions pas auparavant, c'est sans doute un progrès important. Il y a eu, par exemple, la création d'un mécanisme permanent de stabilité, qui n'était même pas prévu par le traité. D'ailleurs, ce Parlement, à une écrasante majorité, a soutenu une réforme limitée du traité pour créer un nouvel instrument, un instrument qui n'existait même pas avant.

Donc, soyons honnêtes intellectuellement dans l'évaluation. Je crois qu'il y a eu des progrès importants en termes de réaction à la crise, en termes de leçons tirées à propos des insuffisances que nous avons vues dans le passé, soit au niveau des instruments, soit au niveau des politiques. Mais en même temps, j'ai dit, très clairement d'ailleurs, que ce ne serait peut-être pas suffisant. C'est une chose d'avoir la structure, l'architecture, mais c'est une autre chose de disposer des politiques à appliquer. Et, effectivement, le véritable test de succès consiste à voir, après cela, ce que les gouvernements, et aussi nos institutions, pourront faire en termes de substance. La substance est plus importante que les instruments.

Mais, en même temps, je vous ai dit, avec, je crois, une grande transparence, que lorsqu'on parle d'ambition, la Commission aurait préféré aller plus loin dans certains éléments. Nous avons souligné par exemple que, pour le mécanisme permanent de stabilité, nous étions en faveur de plus de flexibilité. Le consensus à ce niveau plus élevé d'ambition n'a pas été possible, malheureusement. Ceci dit, je crois que ce serait une erreur de rejeter quand même les acquis qu'on a enregistrés.

À propos de l'ambition d'ailleurs, je voudrais souligner cet aspect important, parce que certains ont suggéré que la Commission fasse d'autres propositions. Pratiquement tout ce que vous avez dit, la Commission l'a déjà proposé. Le 9 mai 2010, la Commission – moi-même et le commissaire Rehn – avons déposé une proposition législative relative à une approche complètement communautaire en termes de mécanisme de stabilité.

Nous avons proposé la mutualisation, par exemple, de la gestion de la dette, ce qu'on appelle en anglais *joint and*

several guarantees. Cela a été refusé par nos États membres. Pas par vous, mais les États membres sont essentiels, mon cher Monsieur Verhofstadt. Nous avons présenté le texte au sommet de la zone euro. Cela a été refusé par une grande majorité d'États membres. C'est la réalité!

Sur la question concrète de l'unanimité ou de la règle de la majorité pour le mécanisme permanent de stabilité, moi-même, j'ai proposé cela, j'ai insisté, d'ailleurs en la présence du Président du Conseil européen, avec certains chefs d'État et de gouvernement, pour qu'ils puissent accepter une règle de majorité qualifiée. Cela a été refusé!

Donc, on peut toujours insister, mais il faut que les clauses soient claires et vous devez savoir exactement à qui adresser vos demandes. La Commission a fait des propositions ambitieuses, comme d'ailleurs en matière de *stress test*, c'est la Commission européenne et la Banque centrale européenne qui ont proposé des tests crédibles, transparents, pour la Banque européenne.

En ce qui concerne les eurobonds, cela fait, je crois, au moins trente ans que la Commission parle d'eurobonds. Cela a été refusé par certains de nos États membres. Moi-même j'ai proposé ici – et je vous dis que je vais le faire pour les perspectives financières – que l'on puisse maintenant avoir au moins des *project bonds* pour des financements d'investissement au niveau du projet de notre budget européen. Nous verrons, à ce moment, qui sera là au rendez-vous pour soutenir cette approche en faveur de l'investissement européen. Et peut-être que là, certains d'entre vous pourraient nous convaincre avec leurs propres partis européens de soutenir cette approche plus ambitieuse en matière de perspectives financières. C'est peut-être là une occasion pour nous de travailler de façon encore plus étroite. Voilà pour la question de l'ambition sur le plan européen.

(Applaudissements)

Même en ce qui concerne la question sociale, dont j'aimerais vous parler, la Commission a beaucoup lutté pour que, dans la stratégie 2020, l'accent soit davantage mis sur les aspects sociaux, ainsi que sur l'éducation. Mais cela n'a pas été facile. Certains gouvernements disaient que sur la base du principe de la subsidiarité, ce n'était pas à l'Europe, ce n'était pas à l'Union européenne, de mener une action directe sur les aspects sociaux et l'éducation.

Essayons maintenant, dans le cadre de la stratégie 2020 – où il a quand même été possible d'avoir un certain consensus pour inclure, par exemple, la lutte contre la pauvreté et l'exclusion sociale –, de développer cette politique, et aussi de favoriser l'investissement, notamment dans l'éducation et dans l'innovation.

Mais sur ce plan-là, laissez-moi vous dire quelque chose, dont vous n'êtes peut-être pas au courant. La Commission a présenté, il y a quelque temps déjà, il y a deux ans je crois, qu'une aide alimentaire d'urgence soit

prévue pour certains Européens, parce qu'il y a aussi, maintenant, en Europe, des gens qui ne mangent pas à leur faim. Récemment, avec le président du groupe PPE, Joseph Daul, j'ai visité ici la banque alimentaire contre la faim au Bas-Rhin. Il y a des problèmes de pauvreté en Europe. Eh bien, saviez-vous qu'il y a deux gouvernements qui ont mis la Commission devant la Cour de justice parce que la Commission avait mis en place un mécanisme d'aide pour les gens les plus pauvres en Europe? Voilà la situation!

Soyons absolument clairs. La Commission est pour une Europe plus ambitieuse en matière de gouvernance, pour une croissance équitable, pour plus de justice sociale sur le plan européen. Mais en même temps, il faut avoir avec nous le Parlement et les États membres. Et il faut lutter pour cela. Donc, à mon avis, ce serait se tromper complètement de cible que de s'en prendre à la Commission quand celle-ci a été à l'avant-garde de la lutte pour une Europe plus sociale, plus juste, plus équitable et pour une gouvernance beaucoup plus sérieuse.

En même temps, soyons absolument clairs là-dessus aussi. Je crois que l'on ne sert pas l'Europe quand on dit que le problème actuel, c'est le problème de l'Europe, comme s'il n'y avait pas de responsabilité chez certains gouvernements, qui ont laissé leur dette arriver à des niveaux insoutenables, ou alors leurs banques avoir une croissance qui est plusieurs fois celle de leur produit intérieur brut. Il y a aussi une responsabilité des gouvernements. C'est essentiel, cette responsabilité. Et c'est pourquoi nous devons maintenant trouver des réponses de solidarité, mais aussi des responsabilités. C'est pourquoi, par exemple, je suis fier que la Commission et moi-même ayons soutenu la proposition visant à diminuer les taux d'intérêt que paie la Grèce, et nous sommes en train de faire la même chose maintenant pour l'Irlande. Nous pensons que c'est juste, non seulement pour ne pas imposer des coûts extrêmement lourds à nos concitoyens grecs ou irlandais, mais aussi pour assurer la soutenabilité de la dette. Et donc, c'est dans cet esprit de solidarité et de responsabilité que nous pouvons trouver des réponses communes qui permettront aussi, je l'espère, d'éviter un problème que certains d'entre vous ont mentionné et qui me préoccupe, à savoir le problème d'une certaine division en Europe, notamment une division entre Nord et Sud, entre centre et périphérie. Je crois que l'Europe que nous voulons bâtir, c'est une Europe de la solidarité, pas une Europe de première et deuxième classes, mais une Europe dans laquelle tous les Européens et les Européennes puissent se reconnaître.

2-082

financial transaction tax, I have already defended, in word and in deed, the financial transaction tax in the G20 on behalf of the European Union. This was rejected by a huge number of our G20 partners.

The question that we are now discussing is whether, at European level, we can – or we should – have a financial transaction tax or not. Let us be honest, once again.

Several Member States fundamentally oppose it. They will not agree. What I said at the last European Council was that the Commission is now making impact assessments of different options for the financial sector and will soon come forward with proposals. It was very important that the Commission made that announcement to the European Council because at least in the conclusions of the European Council there is a commitment to look at the proposals that the Commission will put forward for financial taxation. I believe that, in terms of justice, it is important that the financial sector – and to a large extent at least some of the behaviour in the financial sector was at the origin of this crisis – also contributes to the response to the crisis. I think this is basic in terms of fairness. That is my own position and, I have no doubt, the position of the Commission. I will come forward with proposals on this matter.

The same goes for the CCCTB. There is some opposition in some quarters in the Council, but the Commission has put forward the proposal and we will fight for it because we believe the CCCTB is important for the completion of the single market. This is exactly the approach we are defending.

We have been discussing process and instruments for a very long time. Now is the time to put process and instruments at the service of the substance. Process and instruments are important, but they are at the service of the substance and cannot substitute for it. The challenge we need to resolve is our economic renewal. The truth is that, in order to be able to invest, we need confidence. Confidence depends on our capacity to modernise, to innovate and to become more sustainable and more competitive. Let us not confuse cause and effect. Investment will be attracted if we implement Europe 2020 quickly and decisively, and if we pursue our goals of a Europe that is sustainable and competitive in the spirit of solidarity and also in solidarity with all the Member States, including Portugal.

2-083

Mon ami, Martin Schulz, vous savez très bien qu'en tant que président de la Commission, je ne peux pas intervenir dans la politique intérieure portugaise. Si un jour vous n'êtes plus président du groupe socialiste et que vous avez d'autres fonctions, je suis sûr que vous exercerez ces nouvelles fonctions en toute indépendance et que vous n'allez pas intervenir dans les questions intérieures de votre groupe.

Mais, en même temps, je dois vous dire qu'effectivement, une crise politique au Portugal n'a pas rendu les choses plus faciles, alors que le Portugal avait déjà une situation assez difficile. Mais il faut que nous, les institutions européennes, respectons aussi la démocratie nationale, les décisions du parlement, et nous espérons maintenant que le Portugal va trouver les meilleures solutions.

En tout cas, la Commission est aux côtés du Portugal pour parvenir à trouver les meilleures solutions dans le

cadre, bien sûr, du respect des engagements pris par le Portugal, et de certaines responsabilités que le Portugal a aussi vis-à-vis de ses partenaires européens. Je crois que c'est dans cet esprit de solidarité active et de responsabilité que nous pouvons répondre à la crise.

Aujourd'hui, j'ai vu ici un sentiment plutôt pessimiste, il est vrai. D'ailleurs, en tant que représentants élus des Européens, vous reflétez le sentiment dominant en Europe. Mais s'il est normal que nous soyons préoccupés, je crois que nous devons avoir le courage politique et la clairvoyance de montrer de la confiance dans notre projet européen, parce que je crois que ce n'est pas avec du pessimisme que l'on va pouvoir redonner confiance en l'Europe. La Commission est prête à continuer à travailler avec enthousiasme avec vous, avec le Conseil européen, avec le Conseil, avec toutes les institutions, pour une Europe plus forte, plus soutenable, plus équitable, plus juste et plus compétitive.

(Applaudissements)

2-084

Herman Van Rompuy, *Conseil européen*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je suis content de pouvoir parler devant un auditoire aussi vaste, le plus vaste depuis que je suis devenu président du Conseil,

(Applaudissements)

mais je crois savoir que ce n'est pas uniquement pour moi que vous vous êtes rendus dans l'hémicycle.

D'abord, je vous remercie pour toutes vos remarques, aussi bien positives que négatives. Cela m'a frappé d'autant plus qu'au sein du Conseil européen, on doit avoir l'unanimité et on essaie d'avoir l'unanimité avec tous vos collègues, de tous vos partis, Premiers ministres et chefs d'État. Il y a des socialistes, il y a des démocrates chrétiens, il y a des conservateurs, il y a des libéraux, tous appartenant à vos familles politiques et, chaque fois, on essaie et on réussit quand même à avoir des accords parmi eux.

On a dit tout à l'heure que je devais être l'idéaliste de service, le fabricant de rêves! Je ne crois pas que ce soit mon rôle, mais ce que je fais, en tout cas, dans la mesure du possible – et le président de la Commission en est témoin –, c'est d'agir en sorte que, dans la plupart des cas, on puisse avoir une convergence entre les propositions de la Commission et le résultat du Conseil européen. Je vous donne l'exemple de la *task force*, où les propositions de la Commission ont été la base de la *task force* sur la gouvernance économique, et où le résultat est très proche des propositions de la Commission. Et j'essaierai, ou on essaiera avec le Parlement, d'améliorer encore ces propositions. Donc, mon rôle est un rôle de chercheur de consensus, mais aussi dans le sens le plus communautaire possible, et je crois que, dans certains domaines cruciaux, j'ai réussi à remplir ce rôle.

En ce qui concerne le "pacte euro plus" – vous savez, le petit papier qui a servi de point de départ à nos discussions, et le document final du "pacte euro plus" –, plusieurs d'entre vous, appartenant même à des groupes politiques sceptiques ont dit qu'il fallait que leur pays rejoigne le "pacte euro plus". C'est probablement parce qu'il n'est pas si mal que cela. On a réussi à trouver un compromis entre les objectifs ambitieux, pour que les économies restent compétitives et que les finances publiques restent soutenables, et l'exécution sur le plan national, parce qu'il s'agit, dans la plupart des cas, de décisions nationales qu'on doit prendre.

2-085

Ma deuxième remarque est une remarque de méthodologie en quelque sorte. Beaucoup de critiques par rapport à l'Europe sont des critiques justifiées sur le fond, mais pas en concordance avec le traité. Par exemple, toute la politique nucléaire, le *Energy Mix*, relève de la compétence nationale, je n'y peux rien. Même la sûreté et la sécurité des sites nucléaires relèvent en très grande partie de la compétence nationale. Il y a des compétences communautaires, des compétences de l'Europe, et on a essayé maintenant, dans les conclusions du Conseil européen, de les valoriser le plus possible. Je crois que la Commission n'a jamais eu un rôle aussi important dans la sécurité nucléaire, que depuis le Conseil européen d'il y a quelques jours. Mais on doit travailler dans le cadre du traité.

On a parlé des salaires minimaux dans certains pays, c'est une compétence nationale. On a parlé d'inégalités, de précarité, d'injustice, mais il s'agit, dans la plupart des cas, de mesures s'inscrivant dans un cadre national. Mais je voudrais ajouter que pas mal de mesures, qui doivent être prises maintenant quant à la compétitivité et aux finances publiques, sont des mesures, qu'en fait, les gouvernements nationaux auraient dû prendre, même sans contrainte européenne. Le niveau européen exerce une pression supplémentaire parce qu'il y a, pour 17 pays au moins, une monnaie communautaire qu'on doit défendre. Mais, dans la plupart des pays, les mesures qu'on doit prendre sont des mesures qu'on doit prendre pour son propre intérêt, pour ses propres nationaux, pour assurer l'avenir de son propre pays. Et l'Europe y ajoute une pression supplémentaire.

Il ne faut donc pas faire de faux procès à l'Union européenne. Est-ce que nos mesures de gouvernance sont trop faibles? Eh bien, le Conseil travaillera avec le Parlement européen pour améliorer la gouvernance économique et, comme dans d'autres cas, je suis certain qu'on trouvera des compromis. Il se peut qu'il y ait un gouverneur d'une banque centrale d'un des 17 pays qui ait certaines critiques par rapport à la gouvernance économique, mais je peux vous citer d'autres gouverneurs, d'autres directeurs de pays voisins aux Pays-Bas, qui ont une opinion tout à fait contraire. Si c'est nécessaire, je vous donnerai les noms et je vous donnerai les citations, c'est un petit peu facile de travailler ainsi.

Quant à la crise actuelle, chers collègues, il y a l'avenir, et là, il y a des instruments sur lesquels ont été prises des décisions importantes, mais il y a bien sûr le passé. Je vous l'ai dit, le passé, on doit le gérer. Même avec les meilleurs instruments qu'on puisse inventer – la facilité, la stabilité, le changement de traité, la gouvernance économique, le pacte –, on ne résout pas les problèmes des pays en difficulté, on ne résout pas les problèmes des banques qui sont encore toujours sous pression. Il y a donc l'avenir et il y a le passé.

Concernant le passé, il y a un manque de politique dans certains États membres et il y a eu un manque de politique au niveau européen. Soyons suffisamment critiques par rapport à nous-mêmes. Mais ce à quoi on doit veiller, et on le fera, et on a déjà pris les mesures nécessaires, c'est que cette crise ne se reproduise plus dans le futur. Mais on doit gérer, entre-temps, comme je vous l'ai dit, les séquelles du passé, aussi bien au niveau de certains pays que vous connaissez et qui sont sous programme – comme la Grèce et l'Irlande –, et d'autres pays dans lesquels on prend des mesures pour éviter qu'ils soient sous programme. Est-ce qu'on aurait pu prendre ces mesures il y a un an? Non! Est-ce qu'il y a eu des erreurs majeures dans le passé? On a miné le pacte de stabilité et de croissance il y a 7-8 ans. Si on n'avait pas fait cela, on aurait eu des instruments beaucoup plus efficaces et on aurait pu éviter beaucoup de crises.

En ce qui concerne la croissance économique, chers collègues, on a, depuis 2010, une croissance économique de 2 % en moyenne, c'est-à-dire que c'est la moyenne de la décennie entre 1999 et 2008. On a une croissance économique en 2010. On a une croissance économique de 2 %, en moyenne, en 2011. Est-ce qu'il faut faire plus? Bien sûr, il faut faire plus. Est-ce que les investissements publics sont le seul instrument? Pas du tout! Le marché intérieur, le marché unique est quelque chose d'extrêmement important. Il faut l'approfondir. Il y a des propositions de la Commission qui sont sur la table et on en reparlera d'ici quelques semaines, lors du Conseil européen de juin, et on va aussi reprendre ce thème en automne.

Finalement, au sujet de la Libye, on peut faire l'objet de beaucoup de critiques. Mais sans l'Europe, sans le leadership européen, on aurait vécu un bain de sang en Libye. Sans l'Europe, il y aurait eu des massacres. Certains d'entre vous ont été très critiques par rapport à l'Union européenne. On a agi à temps! Et sans l'Europe, rien n'aurait été fait au niveau mondial, au niveau des Nations unies. Après toutes les critiques qui ont été émises, je crois qu'on a le droit aussi à cette vérité. Est-ce qu'on a péché en quelque sorte dans le passé ou est-ce qu'on a adopté les bonnes politiques? Non! Est-ce qu'on s'est corrigé? Oui! Et là, le mérite de la correction revient à l'Union européenne.

(Applaudissements)

Un dernier mot dans ma propre langue.

2-086

Ik heb daarstraks mijnheer Eppink gehoord, die teleurgesteld was. Ik ben teleurgesteld in zoveel intellectuele oneerlijkheid. Ik ga daar niet dieper op in. Maar hier met een foto staan zwaaien, wetende dat ik in functie was en dat dit niet mijn persoonlijke overtuiging was, ik moet u zeggen dat ik zeer teleurgesteld ben in mijnheer Eppink.

2-087

IN THE CHAIR: EDWARD McMILLAN-SCOTT
Vice-President

2-088

Martin Schulz (S&D). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte am Ende dieser Debatte eine persönliche Erklärung abgeben. Ich gebe sie nicht nur in meinem Namen, sondern im Namen vieler Kollegen, die die ganze Zeit hier waren und diese Debatte verfolgt haben, ab. Ich habe mich in meiner Zeit im Europäischen Parlament selten so schlecht behandelt gefühlt wie heute im Zusammenspiel zwischen Ihnen und Herrn Barroso. Das will ich Ihnen jetzt ganz klar sagen. Sie, Herr Kommissionspräsident, erzählen uns: „Die Initiativen, die ich ergreifen kann, die eine überwältigende Mehrheit in diesem Haus haben, scheitern, weil die Mitgliedstaaten sie zurückweisen.“ Da gebe ich Ihnen jetzt einen Rat: Legen Sie sie als legislative Entwürfe auf den Tisch! Dann bekommen Sie eine Mehrheit in diesem Haus, und der Rat kann sich nicht mehr dahinter verschanzen.

(Beifall)

Aber verschanzen Sie sich nicht mehr hinter dem Rat!

Und Ihnen, Herr Ratspräsident, will ich Folgendes sagen: Sie sagen uns, dass Sie im Rat Kompromisse zwischen Sozialisten, Liberalen, Konservativen und Christdemokraten finden. Im Rat sitzen souveräne Staats- und Premierminister. Hier versucht ein Ratsvorsitzender, den Lissabon-Vertrag in sein Gegenteil zu verkehren. Das Ergebnis des Lissabon-Vertrags ist nämlich, dass der Rat der Staats- und Regierungschefs immer mehr an sich zieht, gleichzeitig aber sagt: Wir entscheiden auf der Einstimmigkeitsgrundlage. Das war mit dem Lissabon-Vertrag nicht beabsichtigt. Lissabon wollte die Mehrheitsentscheidung als Regelfall in der EU. Sie missinterpretieren den Lissabon-Vertrag!

(Beifall)

Deshalb ist es allerhöchste Zeit, dass das Europäische Parlament das Heft in die Hand nimmt und die Gemeinschaftsmethode selbst verteidigt!

(Beifall)

2-089

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 149)

2-090

Ivo Belet (PPE), schriftelijk. – Voorzitter, de EU heeft de voorbije weken een kwantsprong gemaakt op het vlak van de economische integratie. Het Euro Plus-pact zet ons op weg naar een opgedreven economische samenwerking, mét respect voor de tradities van sociaal overleg zoals die in de lidstaten bestaan. Maar hier mag het werk uiteraard niet ophouden. We moeten nu fase 2 op gang brengen en de weg vrijmaken voor Europese investeringsprojecten waarmee we ook onze EU 2020-agenda in de praktijk brengen.

Commissievoorzitter Barroso zegt hier toe dat hij met een voorstel zal komen voor de invoering van een belasting op financiële transacties. Die middelen moeten we aangrijpen om de broodnodige, grensoverschrijdende investeringen te doen, met name in energie-infrastructuur, aangevuld met Europese projectobligaties en geld voor publiek-private samenwerking. Dat is de enige manier om de burgers ervan te overtuigen dat Europa, meer dan ooit, hun garantie is op een welvarende toekomst.

2-091

George Sabin Cutaş (S&D), în scris. – Prin intermediul Pactului Euro Plus și al Mecanismului European de Stabilitate, statele membre vor primi asistența financiară de care au nevoie în schimbul unei coordonări mai strânse a politicilor lor economice. Cele două propuneri reprezintă astfel un tandem pozitiv, în special dacă ne raportăm la propunerea de coordonare a politicilor de taxare - reformă necesară într-o uniune de state ce urmăresc să împartă aceeași monedă. De asemenea, Mecanismul European de Stabilitate, prin capacitatea sa de intervenție de 500 de miliarde de euro, funcționează precum un Fond Monetar European abilitat să împrumute bani și să cumpere obligațiuni direct de la state, acționând în același timp împotriva speculațiilor financiare.

Cu toate acestea, anumite propuneri din cadrul Pactului nu sunt viabile. Austeritatea fiscală și flexibilizarea extremă a pieței de muncă vor întârzia creșterea economică, vor menține șomajul la cote ridicate și vor crea instabilitate în ceea ce privește forța de muncă. Consider că este nevoie de consolidare fiscală graduală și de salvagardarea modelului social european pentru a pune bazele unei creșteri economice solide.

2-092

Diane Dodds (NI), in writing. – Much has been said in this plenary session on the effect of the bailout package on the Republic of Ireland. However, it must be recognised that this crisis also has a huge knock-on effect on my own constituency of Northern Ireland, which shares a land border with the Republic. There is a large quantity of cross border movement in terms of finance, services and people for employment purposes. Banking institutions from the Republic of Ireland also have a considerable stake in Northern Ireland. Therefore the liquidity problem these banks are now facing are directly impacting on businesses in Northern Ireland,

particularly SMEs, in terms of access to financing. At a time when SMEs are struggling to survive an already dire economic climate, this is only helping to depress a difficult situation. At present, 30 per cent of everything manufactured or produced in Northern Ireland goes directly to market in the Republic of Ireland. Therefore a weak market in the Republic has direct and serious ramifications for business and employment in my constituency. In light of this serious situation I call on President Barroso to acknowledge this and use the taskforce to look at ways to improve the situation we now find ourselves in.

2-093

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – O último Conselho Europeu tomou um conjunto de decisões que, a serem levadas à prática, constituirão um inusitado, violento e perigoso ataque aos trabalhadores e aos povos europeus, consubstanciado no redominado "pacto para o euro mais" (certamente para esconder os seus verdadeiros autores - a Alemanha e a França - já que a anterior denominação, "pacto para a competitividade", de imediato os denunciaria). Conjuntamente com a chamada "governança económica", estamos perante um ataque também aos Estados-Membros que se encontram numa situação mais vulnerável do ponto de vista económico e social, isto perante uma autêntica sentença de dependência económica e de atraso.

Ambos os instrumentos se articulam com a anunciada alteração – por procedimento simplificado e sem realização de quaisquer referendos – ao Tratado de Lisboa, visando instituir a chamada “condicionalidade” associada ao Mecanismo Europeu de Estabilidade. De acordo com as conclusões do Conselho, tratar-se-á de uma “rigorosa condicionalidade política, no âmbito de um programa de ajustamento macroeconómico”, processo cujo desenvolvimento e aplicação serão conduzidos conjuntamente pela Comissão Europeia, o BCE e o FMI.

No fundo, estamos perante um processo de concentração do poder político e económico já não apenas num directório de potências, ao serviço dos grandes grupos económicos e financeiros, mas nas próprias instituições do capital transnacional.

2-094

Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE), *írásban*. – Fontos, hogy egy-egy nehéz, egész Európa életében sorsdöntő időszakban együtt értékeljük az előttünk álló célkitűzéseket, és az azok irányába történt pozitív változásokat. A magyar soros elnökség a gazdasági kormányzás, a stabilitási mechanizmus és az európai szemeszter témakörében immár másodszorra is átütő sikert ért el. Az Európai Tanács legutóbbi, március végi ülésének keretében zajló tárgyalássorozaton sikerült megállapodni az EU alapszerződésének korlátozott módosításában is, amelynek célja az euróvezet és az euró stabilitásának fokozása volt. A tanácsulésen a magyar elnökség az ésszerű, betartható és felelős gazdaságpolitika mellett tette le voksát, ahol az európai szemeszter intézményesítésén túl a stabilitási mechanizmust is megerősítette. Ki kell emelnünk azonban, hogy a

gazdasági kormányzás elemei semmilyen módon nem moshatók egybe az Euró Plusz Paktummal, mely jelen szakaszában egy kormányközi megállapodás. Bár lehetséges, hogy a paktum jó, de az egységes belső piacot nem lehet szerződésen kívüli, kormányközi megállapodásokkal szabályozni. A paktum tisztázatlan pontja – adóharmonizáció tartalma – miatt egyelőre Magyarország nem kívánja teljes egészében alkalmazni az egyezséget, hisz versenylőnyünk fokozásában, és ezen keresztül hosszú távon a valós munkahelyteremtésben, valamint a gazdasági növekedésben vagyunk érdekelték.

2-095

Vilja Savisaar-Toomast (ALDE), *kirjalikult*. – Lugupeetud juhataja, lugupeetud kolleegid! 24.–25.03 toimunud Euroopa Ülemkogul jõuti mitme otsuseni, mida pean oluliseks ning mida ei saanud enam edasi lükata. Kõige olulisemaks otsuseks Euroopa majanduspoliitikaga seonduvalt pean Euro Plus Pacti, mis näeb ette ühise tegevuskava ja eesmärgid. Neli peamist eesmärki on edendada konkurentsivõimet, edendada tööhõivet, suurendada avaliku sektori rahastamise jätkusuutlikkust ja taastada finantsstabiilsus. Eeltoodud paktiga liitusid peale euroala ka mitu teist liikmesmaad, näiteks Läti, Leedu, Poola, Taani, Rumeenia ja Bulgaaria. Leian, et praegusel ajal on äärmiselt oluline jõuda ühiste kokkulepeteni, millega kehtestatakse võrdsed reeglid ja ühtsed mehhanismid soovitud eesmärkide saavutamiseks. Eriti tahan tunnustada neid liikmesmaid, kes ei ole euroala liikmed, ent siiski käesoleva paktiga liitusid. Loodetavasti kaasneb ühtsete reeglite kehtestamisega ka riikide arusaamade ühtlustumine, mis eriti puudutab avaliku sektori rahastamise jätkusuutlikkust, et tulevikus välistada olukordi, mis said osaks Kreekale ja Iirimale. Samas ei saa ainult käesolevate otsustega piirduda, kuna need annavad siiski vaid lühiajalist tulemust. On vaja välja töötada lahendused tuleviku investeeringute teostamiseks, olgu see siis läbi eurovõlakirjade või mõne muu lahenduse kaudu. Aitäh!

2-096

4 - Voting time

2-097

President. – The next item is the vote.

(For the results and other details on the vote: see Minutes)

2-098

4.1 - Mobilisation of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund: Poland - Podkarpackie - Manufacture of machinery (A7-0059/2011, Barbara Matera) (vote)

2-099

4.2 - Migration flows arising from instability: scope and role of EU foreign policy (A7-0075/2011, Fiorello Provera) (vote)

2-100

4.3 - Role of women in agriculture and rural areas (A7-0016/2011, Elisabeth Jeggle) (vote)

2-101

4.4 - EU funding in the area of decommissioning nuclear power plants in the new Member States (A7-0054/2011, Marian-Jean Marinescu) (vote)

2-102

4.5 - Mobilisation of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund: Czech Republic - UNILEVER (A7-0060/2011, Barbara Matera) (vote)

2-103

4.6 - Dual-use items and technology (A7-0028/2011, Jörg Leichtfried) (vote)

2-104

– *Before the final vote:*

2-105

Jörg Leichtfried, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Abstimmung hat ein Ergebnis gebracht, über das man inhaltlich diskutieren kann, aber wir sind jetzt sehr nahe an der Position des Rates, und ich würde jetzt in Übereinstimmung mit den Schattenberichterstattern beantragen, dass die Endabstimmung verschoben wird, weil die Möglichkeit, dass wir eine komplette Einigung mit dem Rat finden, jetzt sehr groß ist.

2-106

(The final vote was postponed)

2-107

4.7 - Officially supported export credits (A7-0364/2010, Yannick Jadot) (vote)

2-108

– *Before the vote on Amendment 10:*

2-109

Helmut Scholz, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, I would like to announce that the GUE/NGL Group wishes to withdraw the roll-call vote on both parts of amendment 10.

2-110

– *Before the final vote:*

2-111

Yannick Jadot, *rapporteur*. – Monsieur le Président, comme lors du vote précédent, les rapporteurs fictifs et moi-même avons décidé de ne pas soumettre au vote de cette plénière la résolution législative pour poursuivre les négociations avec le Conseil, en espérant qu'il entende le vote de ce Parlement aujourd'hui.

2-112

(The final vote was postponed)

2-113

4.8 - EU policy framework to fight violence against women (A7-0065/2011, Eva-Britt Svensson) (vote)

2-114

President. – That concludes the vote.

2-115

5 - Explanations of vote

2-116

Oral explanations of vote

2-117

Report: Fiorello Provera (A7-0075/2011)

2-118

Jens Rohde (ALDE). – Hr. formand! De seneste interne spændinger og uroligheder i Tunesien, Egypten og Libyen samt andre arabiske lande har ført til massive migrationsstrømme med tilsvarende udfordringer for Europa. Vi skal selvfølgelig være klar til at tackle sådanne situationer, sådanne strømninger. Det skal vi finde ud af at gøre i fællesskab ved, at vi i solidaritet med hinanden sørger for at løfte de udfordringer, som opstår, når vores fælles ramme er presset udefra.

Derfor glæder det mig, at Parlamentet i dag har vedtaget en politik for håndteringen af migrationsstrømme som følge af ustabilitet. Det glæder mig især, at Parlamentets beslutning sætter fokus på at styrke grænseagenturet Frontex' rolle. Det har vi i Venstre kæmpet for meget længe. Navnlig under den nuværende krise i Nordafrika har Frontex vist sig at være et særdeles vigtigt redskab til håndtering af migrationsstrømme for regionen. Nu mangler vi bare, at Frontex kan rykke hurtigere ud, når det endelig gælder.

2-119

Pino Arlacchi (S&D). – Mr President, I voted in favour of this report because it represents a first step towards an EU policy on migration flows arising from instability. In this regard it is important that this Parliament speaks out against this hysterical vision of a looming invasion of migrants and asylum seekers coming from the South.

We are not going to be overwhelmed by millions of people escaping political deprivation and tyrannies. Many people are afraid that asylum seekers are arriving in greater numbers, straining our buckling welfare systems. This claim is good to gain votes and build support for harsh immigration policies, but it is not backed by the facts. The overall number of people claiming asylum in the West dropped by more than 40% over the past decade according to data just released by the United Nations.

2-120

Salvatore Iacolino (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io ho sostenuto e votato questo dossier del collega Provera perché ritengo sia un passo avanti concreto e incisivo nell'auspicata direzione della solidarietà, prevista peraltro dall'articolo 80 con riferimento alla solidarietà all'interno degli Stati membri

dell'Unione europea, e con uno sguardo chiaro e definito nei confronti di chi si trova in una posizione di grande difficoltà, come in questa fase in particolare il Nord Africa.

Rispetto dei diritti umani, cooperazione internazionale, rapporti bilaterali ma, nel contempo, organizzazioni regionali quali la Lega araba e l'Unione africana che possono dare un valore aggiunto in un processo di pacificazione stabile e duraturo. Confidiamo che i passi avanti siano impostati anche attraverso interventi su aree omogenee che valorizzino sotto il profilo dell'economia realtà che hanno bisogno di essere sostenute e assistite in un percorso di crescita costante e continuo.

2-121

Mitro Repo (S&D). – Arvoisa puhemies, haluan vielä todeta, että epävakaudesta johtuvat muuttovirrat muodostavat todellisen haasteen Euroopan unionille. Kyse on yksittäisistä ihmiskohtaloista, joissa kunkin ihmisen tarina on erilainen. He ovat liikkeellä epätoivosta, mutta heitä kaikkia yhdistää toivo paremmasta.

Euroopasta on löydyttävä sympatiaa ja tahtoa auttaa. Euroopan integraatio on onnistunut yhteinen hanke, jolla olemme luoneet vaurautta, vakautta ja turvaa – eräänlaisen hyvinvoinnin kehdon. Muuttoaaltoon on hankalaa ja kallista reagoida sen jälkeen, kun se jo kolkuttaa Euroopan portteja.

Lampedusan saaren esimerkki osoittaa, kuinka ulkopoliittisista turvallisuuskysymyksistä voi tulla hetkessä sisäpoliittisia, ja sen vuoksi pelkkä kehitysyhteistyö ei enää riitä. Eurooppa tarvitsee kokonaisvaltaisen, ennaltaehkäisevän suunnitelman, joka käsittää turvallisuuteen, alueelliseen yhteistyöhön, kauppapolitiikkaan, ilmastonmuutokseen, ihmisoikeuksien suojeluun ja demokratiakehitykseen liittyvät näkökohdat. Näin on toimittava.

2-122

Carlo Fidanza (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel dibattito europeo sui flussi migratori spesso ci si sente dire: "Quale problema può avere un paese di quasi sessanta milioni di abitanti come l'Italia ad accogliere poche decine di migliaia di immigrati?".

In questa domanda si prescinde, spesso strumentalmente, da due dati. Primo, gran parte di questi immigrati vogliono raggiungere altri paesi dell'Unione europea. Secondo, negli ultimi due anni sono sbarcate sulle coste italiane meno di 4.000 persone, grazie agli accordi bilaterali con la Libia e la Tunisia. Negli ultimi due mesi, dopo la crisi politica, siamo già a 22.000 persone.

Oggi l'Italia è una pentola a pressione. Da un lato il flusso dal Nord Africa, in particolare il flusso di migranti economici dalla Tunisia, non si arresta. Dall'altro, la Francia, a Ventimiglia, respinge i migranti perché senza permesso di soggiorno.

Se la solidarietà europea esiste è il momento di dimostrarlo, stabilendo insieme a livello comunitario

come affrontare questi flussi, sia nell'emergenza che nel lungo periodo, quali strumenti attuare nei confronti di chi arriva in Europa e quali misure adottare nei paesi di provenienza. Questo testo è un primo passo in questa direzione e per questa ragione ho votato a favore.

2-123

Nicole Sinclair (NI). – Mr President, on a point of order: we are in a Chamber which is meant for discourse, and we obviously all have to show respect for one another. When you have two group Chairs having a private conversation while others are giving speeches, what message does that send out to their colleagues?

2-124

President. – Mr Daul and Mr Schulz, I have been asked whether you could set an example to the House.

2-125

Giommaria Uggias (ALDE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il provvedimento che abbiamo votato oggi fa un po' di chiarezza sul fenomeno dei flussi migratori ed esalta l'azione di Frontex. Credo che questo debba essere considerato positivamente e, in tal senso, anche il voto.

Credo però che questa posizione debba essere accompagnata da una eguale chiarezza da parte degli Stati membri, perché questa è una sfida che riguarda le Istituzioni europee ma riguarda anche la politica degli Stati membri.

Devo dire, però, che questa chiarezza non è stata attuata e praticata finora da tutti gli Stati membri, a iniziare dalla politica del governo italiano, che ha affrontato in maniera molto criticabile e discutibile la situazione di Lampedusa, dove migliaia di migranti sono stati sostanzialmente abbandonati a se stessi laddove una solidarietà – più che giuridica, umana – avrebbe comportato un'attenzione immediata e sicuramente maggiore rispetto a quella che c'è stata, salvo il fatto, poi, di dover affrontare, così come abbiamo fatto in questa sede, il problema giuridico.

2-126

Cristiana Muscardini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se è vero che molti flussi migratori sono causati dall'instabilità, è con un certo pudore che usiamo a sproposito questo termine, perché l'instabilità in effetti è la guerra, il genocidio, la violenza incontrollata, le insurrezioni, la miseria alla quale sono stati condannati questi popoli, anche con il silenzio dell'Unione europea. Poi c'è il desiderio della libertà. La risoluzione che abbiamo votato invoca una politica a Est dell'Unione e i suoi strumenti più appropriati per intervenire sui vari aspetti che determinano questa instabilità.

Mi chiedo quale credibilità potrà avere questa politica estera, dato che le vicende libiche e del Nord Africa hanno dimostrato l'inesistenza di una politica estera dell'Unione. I governi degli Stati sono andati ciascuno per conto proprio, offrendo un desolante spettacolo al mondo e ai popoli che dovremmo aiutare. L'Unione non è stata in grado di offrire una politica d'accoglienza per i profughi se non in misura limitata rispetto alle necessità.

All'isola di Lampedusa e all'Italia non è stata data risposta. Pertanto, votiamo certamente a favore di questo provvedimento, ma invitiamo l'Unione a darsi finalmente una politica estera degna di questo nome.

2-127

Frank Vanhecke (NI). – Ik heb mij over het verslag-Provera van stemming onthouden, in de eerste plaats omdat ik er heel veel duidelijkheid in mis. Er wordt in dat verslag van alles gezegd en voorgesteld, soms zelfs zinnige dingen, wat merkwaardig is in dit Parlement. Toch blijft het in de eerste plaats, jammer genoeg, een verslag van de complete politieke correctheid, dat nergens, niet op één plaats, niet in één paragraaf of één zinsnede, de nieuwe massale immigratie in het reeds overbevolkte continent Europa, want het gaat toch vooral over de landen van het voormalige West-Europa, ook maar fundamenteel in vraag durft te stellen.

Mijn eigen land Vlaanderen is het dichtstbevolkte land van de hele Europese Unie. Een overgrote meerderheid van de Vlamingen wil geen nieuwe immigratie, zeker niet uit landen met culturen en godsdiensten die waarden voorstaan die volstrekt vijandig staan tegenover de onze. Het wordt hoog tijd dat het Europees Parlement eens gaat luisteren naar de eigen Europese burgers.

2-128

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Mr President, I agree that we should take measures in the short term to address the humanitarian crisis in the Mediterranean, ensuring the dignity of the people concerned using instruments such as Frontex. We also need a long-term vision to solve the problems related to migration flows and to help create jobs in the countries of origin of these people.

One of the European Union's key tools is trade policy. The time has come to improve the openness of our markets, starting with countries like Egypt and Tunisia. We also need to establish dialogue with a view to strengthening the regional trade relationship.

We have the example of Turkey and its success both with its customs union and in effectively implementing the necessary democratic reforms. We have to start daring to talk about custom unions and free-trade agreements with the countries of the Mediterranean that are moving towards democracy and reforms.

I would like to finish by calling on the Council to adopt without further delay the Regional Convention on preferential Pan-Euro-Med rules of origin.

2-129

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, the premise of this report is incorrect. The idea that emigration is a product of poverty and desperation, although superficially plausible, turns out to be specious. Emigration, we know historically, more often is the product of rising wealth and rising aspiration. We saw very recently that the great migratory flows from Tunisia came after the restoration of democracy and the end of dictatorship.

The real cause which uproots people and makes them shift themselves hundreds of miles in pursuit of a better life is opportunity. The reality is that in the European Union we have created a situation where we have long-scale structural unemployment and yet are still having to import labour. In our country, the United Kingdom, there are more than 4 million people who are either unemployed or on incapacity benefit and yet every month we are bringing people in from all over the world to do jobs that are not being taken by people born in the United Kingdom. We have trapped millions in the squalor of dependency. We have placed them in a situation where work is no longer part of their mental horizon. If we want to rescue people from that wretched condition, the answer is not in foreign policy but in reform of welfare, so as to restore dignity and independence to our own citizens.

2-130

Syed Kamall (ECR). – Mr President, one of the factors that is often overlooked in any debate on migration is that quite often it is very difficult for those who migrate from one country to another, and they do so under the most difficult of circumstances. Think what it must be like to leave behind your family, your village, your town, all your social ties, your friends, maybe never knowing whether you will see them again or when you will see them again. What makes them leave those countries and seek opportunity, as the previous speaker said, in the West? Well, quite often it is because they are escaping from conditions and governments that are no longer able to command their confidence.

We can help in some ways. Let us look at some of the policies that we have: our fisheries policy, which encourages large fishing boats to plunder the seas off poor African nations, leaving their local fishermen in desperation with no jobs. What do they do then? They seek to migrate. We have our aid policy, which keeps corrupt governments in power, making it less pleasant for people to stay in their countries. That makes people look to go abroad and they come here.

We have to get this right. We have to understand that it is difficult for people to leave their own countries. We should make sure that our policies help people to stay in their own countries.

2-131

Report: Elisabeth Jeggle (A7-0016/2011)

2-132

Jens Rohde (ALDE). – Hr. formand! For de liberale er det fuldstændig afgørende, at vi sikrer ikke bare kvinder, men også mænd i landdistrikterne de samme rettigheder og muligheder, som folk har, når de bosætter sig i byerne. Hvis vi vil opretholde et stærkt europæisk landbrug, der kan levere kvalitetsfødevarer til hele Europa, bliver vi nødt til at sikre, at branchen kan tiltrække såvel arbejdskraft som familier. Det kræver, at vi giver landdistrikterne mulighed for at skabe både vækst, innovation, job og udvikling. Det kræver ikke, at vi pådutter branchen nogle kvoter og nogle unaturlige kønsopdelinger! Derfor er det også godt, at Parlamentet i

dag har vedtaget betænkningen om kvinders rolle i landbrug og länddistrikter og derved sender et meget klart signal om, at også her spiller kvinder en vigtig rolle.

2-133

Mario Pirillo (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nel settore agricolo e rurale le donne hanno sempre avuto un ruolo importante. Sono infatti il 42% della forza lavoro su un totale di circa 27 milioni di lavoratori.

Nonostante questa elevata percentuale, le donne non sono ben rappresentate nelle organizzazioni di settore e sono discriminate nel processo decisionale. Sono tanti i settori in cui migliorare la condizione delle donne, come il riconoscimento di un'adeguata copertura sociale.

Le Istituzioni europee dovrebbero quindi agire per colmare questa disegualianza, monitorando il settore magari attraverso un osservatorio per l'imprenditoria femminile nell'agricoltura, già attivo in Calabria e in altre regioni italiane.

La relazione votata oggi, che ho sostenuto, prende bene in esame anche il problema dell'esodo dalla campagna. Per favorire il mantenimento dell'occupazione occorrono politiche di sostegno e strategie volte alla costruzione di infrastrutture e alla creazione di servizi adeguati alle esigenze della vita moderna da attivare nelle zone rurali.

2-134

Peter Jahr (PPE). – Herr Präsident! Die Lebens- und Arbeitssituation hat sich auch im ländlichen Raum durch den gesellschaftlichen Wandel, den Wandel der sozialen Strukturen und den eklatanten demographischen Wandel gründlich verändert.

Wenn wir die Frauen aller Generationen auf dem Lande halten oder neu für das Landleben bewegen wollen, dann müssen ihre Bedürfnisse und ihre Bedingungen stärker als bisher einen förderpolitischen Niederschlag finden. Dabei ist zu bedenken, dass sich die ländlichen Frauenrealitäten in den vergangenen Jahren gewandelt und stark differenziert haben. Dabei haben die Frauen selbst als Einzelpersonen und frauenpolitische Gruppierungen diesen Wandel mitinitiiert und gestaltet.

Ich finde, unsere Berichterstatterin, Frau Jeggle, hat genau diesen Tatbestand richtig herausgearbeitet und betont, und ich halte deshalb diesen Bericht für sehr, sehr wichtig. Denn wenn wir den ländlichen Raum entwickeln wollen, geht es nicht nur um den Aufbau von Infrastrukturen und um einen Lebensraum für den Tourismus, sondern es geht darum, dass sich auch wieder Familien ansiedeln, und dazu gehören Frauen und Männer gleichermaßen.

2-135

Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR). – Poparłem sprawozdanie pani Jeggle z tego między innymi powodu, że wskazuje ono na to, żeby zapewnić odpowiednie środki finansowe na politykę rolną Unii Europejskiej. Słuszna skądinąd skłonność do

oszczędzania środków europejskich nie może być realizowana kosztem wspólnej polityki rolnej. Jeśli wieś, rolnictwo w Unii Europejskiej nie otrzyma odpowiedniej pomocy, to trudno będzie poprawić rolę kobiet na obszarach wiejskich, trudno będzie zachęcić kobiety, żeby chciały tam żyć w trudnych warunkach, trudno będzie realizować cele tej ważnej polityki, jakimi są bezpieczeństwo żywnościowe, ochrona środowiska i równowaga terytorialna. Powinniśmy o tym pamiętać i przy okazji tego ważnego sprawozdania pani Jeggle raz jeszcze apeluję, żeby skłonności do oszczędzania w Unii Europejskiej nie realizować kosztem wspólnej polityki rolnej.

2-136

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor Presidente, he votado a favor de este informe porque contribuye a combatir la invisibilidad que, hasta ahora, han tenido el trabajo y la contribución de las mujeres en el medio rural.

Sin esta aportación no habría sido posible, ni ayer ni hoy, mantener la población y la actividad fuera de las ciudades. Esta visibilidad tiene que plasmarse en reconocimiento social, pero, además, en prestaciones. La PAC debe incluir la orientación de género en sus programas de ayuda, con iniciativas especiales para el emprendimiento femenino. Además, debe ayudar a financiar servicios y potenciar aspectos como la digitalización del medio rural, que favorecen la igualdad de condiciones de vida en el medio urbano y en el rural.

Por su parte, los sistemas de seguridad social de los Estados también deben reconocer el trabajo de las mujeres en este ámbito, tanto en la vertiente productiva como en la asistencial, especialmente en el cuidado de personas dependientes y de niños.

2-137

Cristiana Muscardini (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, nonostante la presenza del 42% di donne su 26-27 milioni di addetti e il fatto che il 29% delle imprese agricole è gestito da donne, la loro rappresentanza a livello di categoria è quasi nulla e non corrisponde al loro peso.

Ciò non è giusto e non è normale, per cui è necessario che l'Unione dia maggiore spazio alle donne proprio nel settore rurale e trovi adeguate soluzioni per l'insieme delle attività economiche che esse svolgono. Parità di genere, uguaglianza di trattamento, protezione sociale per le madri e riconoscimento del ruolo specifico che le donne portano in agricoltura.

Favorire perciò la formazione continua è uno dei punti fermi sui quali non possiamo più transigere. Condividiamo le proposte della relatrice sull'appoggio a una migliore rappresentazione delle donne in tutti gli organi politici, economici e sociali del settore agricolo, sul sostegno a iniziative di protezione sociale per le coltivatrici dirette, le salariate agricole e le allevatrici stagionali.

Le donne devono trovare un riconoscimento proprio nella riforma della PAC, altrimenti questa riforma sarà inutile e non potremo certo immaginare un futuro sereno con nuovi tagli in agricoltura.

2-138

Daniel Hannan (ECR). – Mr President, I do not know whether you recall the popular television series in our own country *Life on Mars*, the conceit of which was that the leading character, a police officer, is catapulted back, as it seems, to the early 1970s.

I felt rather as he did as I read through the voting list today. Here is the EU coming out with policies on women in agriculture, export credits for favoured companies, special grants to Unilever in the Czech Republic and to machine tool manufacturers in Poland.

The 1970s was a dire period for Europe as a whole and for the United Kingdom in particular: a time of stagflation, of unemployment, of national bankruptcy. But these things did not happen because of some tectonic forces beyond our control. They happened as a result of wrong-headed policy, in particular the idea that governments could pick winners, and that governments should control the economy and make things happen through reallocating resources.

The 27 Member States have moved on, but the European Union has not. We are still in this world of taking money from our taxpayers and giving them to favoured client groups.

Why? Because if we did not do that, what would the European Union be for? As Upton Sinclair once observed, it is very difficult to make a man see something when his job depends upon not seeing it.

2-139

Anna Záborská (PPE) – Je správne, že predložená správa chce zlepšiť postavenie žien na vidieku. Ženu však, žiaľ, vníma len ako pracovníčku či podnikateľku. Nevidí ženu v úlohe matky, ani hodnotu neformálnej, a teda neplatenej práce žien. Ku blahobytu spoločnosti však významne prispieva aj práca žien – matiek v domácnosti a pri starostlivosti o odkázaných členov rodiny.

Táto práca tvorí v európskych štátoch až tretinu HDP, no my sa stále tvárime, že neexistuje. Namiesto uznania tohto prínosu jednostranne tlačíme na ženy, aby sa zamestnali a začali podnikat'. Pritom práve v poľnohospodárstve a na vidieku by ocenenie neformálnej práce žien viedlo k vyššej kvalite života rodín a komunít.

2-140

Report: Marian-Jean Marinescu (A7-0054/2011)

2-141

Jens Rohde (ALDE). – Hr. formand! Det bør altid være op hvert enkelt medlemsland at bestemme sit eget energimix. På den baggrund er det også naturligt, at hvert enkelt medlemsland skal sørge for at betale, hvis det ønsker at afvikle noget af det, som mixet består af. Men lige netop i Litauen, Slovakiet og Bulgarien stod en

række atomkraftværker fra Sovjet-æraen, som langt fra levede op til vores sikkerhedskrav. Derfor var det også nødvendigt og fornuftigt nok at støtte afviklingen heraf.

Problemet er, at den planlægning, der har været der, eller rettere manglen på samme, ganske enkelt ikke må gentage sig. Vi står og kan konstatere, at vi ved udgangen af 2013 samlet vil have brugt 3 mia. EUR. Og vi har endnu ikke fået afviklet værkerne! Det vidner om for dårlig planlægning. Kommissionen må fremlægge en gennemgribende analyse af projekternes finansielle effektivitet, fordi eventuel fremtidig støtte må betinges af, at landene kan bevise, at de har forvaltet de nuværende midler ordentligt.

2-142

Sergej Kozlík (ALDE) – Predložená správa o stave financovania vyradovania jadrových elektrární z prevádzky dáva dobrý obraz o doterajšom stave. Plne sa stotožňujem aj s jedným z kľúčových záverov správy, že vyradovanie týchto zariadení v dotknutých krajinách si bude vyžadovať aj po roku 2013 spoluúčasť európskych prostriedkov. Výlučné financovanie z vlastných zdrojov nebude v silách dotknutých krajín.

Například Slovensko pod politickým tlakom Európskej únie odstavilo v rokoch 2006, 2008 dva plne zrekonštruované bloky jadrovej elektrárne Jaslovské Bohunice. Podľa záverov medzinárodnej atómovej komisie spĺňali všetky bezpečnostné kritériá. Hospodárske dopady tohto kroku sú značné a budú ďalej násobené aj dlhodobými vysokými nákladmi na plnú odstávku týchto zariadení. Európska únia bude musieť rátať s podpornými zdrojmi pre odstávku jadrových elektrární aj v rámci finančného výhľadu na roky 2013 – 2020.

2-143

Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE). – W obliczu ostatnich wydarzeń w Japonii polityka energetyczna, a głównie szeroko rozumiane bezpieczeństwo energetyczne, to temat wywołujący gorące dyskusje we wszystkich zakątkach naszego globu. Katastrofa elektrowni Fukushima pokazała, jak wiele pracy musimy włożyć w tworzenie wydajnej i przyjaznej środowisku, ale przede wszystkim bezpiecznej sieci energetycznej. Problem ten dotyczy nie tylko Azji, ale wszystkich państw na wszystkich kontynentach. Jeśli istnieją elektrownie, które ze względów bezpieczeństwa powinny zostać zamknięte, zróbmy wszystko, aby proces ten przebiegał szybko i efektywnie. Wspomagajmy wszelkie działania prowadzące do powstania nowych, bezpiecznych źródeł energii, a w podejmowaniu wszelkich decyzji niech nadrzędnym argumentem zawsze będzie bezpieczeństwo człowieka. Dziękuję bardzo.

2-144

Salvatore Iacolino (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, non v'è dubbio che un dossier come quello presentato dall'on. Marinescu non poteva non essere sostenuto e condiviso in un contesto seppure caratterizzato ancora oggi dall'ondata emotiva dei fatti di Fukushima. L'approccio del relatore al documento,

assolutamente equilibrato e cauto, mi ha spinto tuttavia al sostegno.

Non v'è dubbio, inoltre, che l'impegno nei confronti di Lituania, Slovacchia e Bulgaria debba essere un impegno sostenuto e coerente, ma che nel contempo una serie di altre attività, quelle chiamate più semplicemente "stress test" ma anche tutte quelle improntate alla cautela, debbano garantire sicurezza al nucleare. Non c'è margine di errore che può essere commesso per le ragioni note a tutti quanti noi.

I programmi di finanziamento erano già previsti da tempo e sono stati assicurati. Confidiamo nell'esito concreto e positivo dell'intera operazione che segna un passo avanti nella direzione auspicata da tutti quanti noi.

2-145

Paolo Bartolozzi (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'argomento della previsione di adeguate risorse finanziarie per garantire i processi di disattivazione degli impianti nucleari è un problema già affrontato dalla legislazione dell'Unione europea sulla sicurezza del settore nucleare ed è oggi di grande attualità, ovviamente alla luce dei recenti avvenimenti internazionali e delle conseguenti decisioni dei governi dell'Unione in proposito.

Il lavoro dell'onorevole Marinescu, al quale abbiamo espresso il nostro appoggio, affronta i casi specifici di alcuni paesi che, al momento della loro adesione, hanno assunto particolari obblighi in materia di disattivazione degli impianti nucleari e che hanno ricevuto proprio per questa attività un sostegno speciale dall'Unione europea.

Al di là dei casi specifici, da questo argomento è doveroso stabilire un effettivo controllo di verifica nonché di esame delle centrali nucleari presenti nel territorio dell'Unione. Alto sembra infatti essere il numero di reattori che si stima dovranno essere disattivati nel prossimo futuro in territorio comunitario.

Sarà quindi essenziale assicurare meccanismi di garanzia, anche e soprattutto in questi casi, per l'accantonamento di adeguate risorse finanziarie necessarie a far fronte alle necessità, sia ordinarie che straordinarie.

2-146

Giommaria Uggias (ALDE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho sostenuto questo dossier da antinuclearista convinto, non solo perché credo che la dismissione di queste centrali sia un vantaggio per l'intera collettività, ma anche perché mi auguro che non ci possano essere altre realizzazioni.

Noi oggi ci troviamo davanti a una polveriera in tutta l'Europa. La gestione delle centrali nucleari per finalità civili è una gestione che riposa oramai su protocolli ingegneristici superati, anacronistici. Possiamo dire che questa è una sicurezza sempre più teorica e tutto va bene finché non succede qualcosa. Infatti, ci troviamo di fronte a protocolli di cinquant'anni fa che non trovano nella realtà tutela rispetto a eventi che possono essere

sempre più imprevedibili. Non erano prevedibili gli attacchi terroristici e non erano prevedibili gli eventi naturali e calamitosi – e non si tratta solo di terremoti – che sempre più spesso, purtroppo, si manifestano nel nostro mondo disastrato.

2-147

Alajos Mészáros (PPE). – Köszönöm, Elnök Úr! Támogattam a jelentést, amely közvetlenül érinti az én országomat, Szlovákiát is. 2004-ben a litván, szlovák és bolgár kormány csatlakozási szerződésükben vállalták, hogy fokozatosan leállítják atomreaktoraik egy részét. A bezárás rendkívüli gazdasági terheket jelentett, így az EU vállalta, hogy 2013 végéig pénzügyi támogatást nyújt a leszereléshez. A nukleáris leszereléssel kapcsolatban korlátozottak az uniós tapasztalatok. A leállítás közvetlen hatással lehet az érintett ország és a környező tagállamok energiaellátására is.

A negatív következmények kezelése érdekében elő kell mozdítani az alternatív, alacsony szénkibocsátású és versenyképes energiaforrások fejlesztését. Ugyanakkor elegendő pénzügyi forrást kell biztosítanunk arra, hogy a biztonsági előírásokkal összhangban történjenek a leállítási műveletek. A leállítási folyamatokban szerzett tapasztalatokat az Unió fel tudja használni majd a gazdasági élettartamuk végén járó atomerőműveknél. Az eredmények alapján 2013-ra előtekintve feltételezhető, hogy a több beruházási projektek majdnem befejeződnek és az új leszerelési és irányítási struktúrák már a rendelkezésünkre fognak állni. Köszönöm szépen.

2-148

Μιχάλης Τρεμόπουλος (Verts/ALE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, υπερηγήφισα την έκθεση Marinescu, ακριβώς γιατί στη νοτιοανατολική και ανατολική Ευρώπη υπάρχει μια βαριά κληρονομιά εξαιρετικά επικίνδυνων πυρηνικών αντιδραστήρων, όπως στη Βουλγαρία, τη Ρουμανία και τη Σλοβακία. Όλα αυτά τα χρόνια ξοδεύτηκαν, όμως, δισεκατομμύρια ευρώ των ευρωπαϊκών πολιτών προκειμένου να εκσυγχρονιστούν και να επιτύχουν παράταση της ζωής τους. Πρόκειται ουσιαστικά για επιδότηση του πυρηνικού λόμπυ που αναλάμβανε τις μετασκευές. Η Φουκουσίμα μας έχει δείξει για άλλη μια φορά ότι οι αντιδραστήρες αυτοί πρέπει να κλείσουν, όμως τέτοιες οικονομικές προβλέψεις δεν έχουν υπολογιστεί στο κόστος λειτουργίας των αντιδραστήρων και αυτό αποτελεί μια τεράστια και σκανδαλώδη επιχορήγηση για έναν επικίνδυνο, δαπανηρό και ρυπογόνο τρόπο παραγωγής ενέργειας. Και τώρα, όμως, μπορούμε να αλλάξουμε πολιτική βούληση. Μετατρέψτε άμεσα τις επιδοτήσεις για μετασκευές στους μη ασφαλείς αντιδραστήρες σε χρηματοδότηση για το κλείσιμό τους. Παγώστε όλους τους νέους αντιδραστήρες που σχεδιάζονται. Μεταφέρετε πόρους από τις χρηματοδοτήσεις της Ευρατόμ και τις πλουσιοπάροχες επιχορηγήσεις του ITER. Εκτρέψτε τους πόρους που προορίζονται για μελέτες και κατασκευές νέων αντιδραστήρων σε μια οικονομία βασισμένη 100% σε ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας μέχρι το 2050. Είμαστε σε κατάσταση ανάγκης και πρέπει οπωσδήποτε να ανταποκριθούμε.

2-149

Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE). – Sveikinu pranešėją su griežtu, bet dažnomis vietomis tikrai teisingu pranešimu. Noriu pabrėžti ir atkreipti kolegų dėmesį, kad Lietuva kartu su Slovakija ir Bulgarija įvykdė savo stojimo sutartyse numatytus įsipareigojimus ir iki numatyto laiko uždarė senus sovietinius branduolinius reaktorius. Dauguma su Ignalinos uždarymu susijusių projektų įgyvendinti arba įgyvendinami. Aišku, tam tikrų sunkumų iškyla. Pradėjus dirbti naujajai Lietuvos vyriausybei ir Ignalinos atominės elektrinės valdybai, tikimasi patraukti teisinėn atsakomybėn tuos asmenis, kurie ne visiškai tinkamai organizavo darbą, taip pat peržiūrėti susitarimą dėl panaudoto branduolinio kuro saugyklos statybų, išsiderant kuo palankesnes sąlygas. Visiškai pritariu, kad būtina visiškai skaidriai valdyti lėšas ir naudoti išteklius, tokiu būdu užtikrinant branduolinię saugumą. Tačiau pasinaudodama proga, kalbant apie naujas atominės elektrines, norėčiau atkreipti kolegų dėmesį į Europos Sąjungos pasienyje, Rusijoje ir Baltarusijoje, planuojamas elektrines su bandomaisiais reaktoriais. Į tai turėtų būti sutelktas mūsų dėmesys.

2-150

Report: Barbara Matera (A7-0060/2011)

2-151

Jens Rohde (ALDE). – Hr. formand! Jeg var faktisk ikke klar over, at vi overhovedet kunne få lov at afgive stemmeforklaring i forbindelse med denne beslutning, men jeg vil så gøre det ganske kort. Som udgangspunkt er Venstre i Danmark (altså det liberale parti i Danmark) imod Globaliseringsfonden. Men når først man har vedtaget at oprette en globaliseringsfond, og når først der er blevet sendt ansøgninger ind, og de pågældende lande opfylder de krav, som er opstillet i forbindelse med Globaliseringsfonden, så skal man selvfølgelig også efterkomme ansøgningen. Derfor stemte vi ja.

2-152

Nicole Sinclair (NI). – Mr President, I voted against both the Matera reports on the mobilisation of the Globalisation Adjustment Fund, for the Czech Republic and for Poland, not because I feel any ill will against those countries – far from it. I am just very mindful of my own constituents in the West Midlands, and indeed their contribution to the GBP 48 million that the United Kingdom pays to the European Union every single day.

Let me tell you a few things about the West Midlands: we have the largest youth unemployment and our motor industry was decimated, partly due to the European Union funding jobs in Slovakia that took away essential jobs from the Ryton plant.

In 2004 it was, of course, the United Kingdom that bore the brunt of the EU enlargement, because it was the only one not to put up any barriers. That cost more in public services. Another example of an expense that my constituents have is that we contribute towards child benefit for people in Eastern Europe. People come over to the United Kingdom, work in the United Kingdom and claim for children who are resident in Eastern European countries.

What we would like to do, and what I would like to see, is that GBP 48 million a day being kept in the United Kingdom and spent on essential public services, and not handed over, when the EU's accounts have not been audited for 14 years.

2-153

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, bhí áthas orm tacaíocht a thabhairt do na moltaí seo ó Bhairbre de Brún agus tá súil agam go n-éireoidh thar barr leis na hoibríthe i bPoblacht na Seice agus sa Pholainn. Tá amhras orm, áfach, go mbeidh déistean agus ísle brí orthu i ndeireadh na dála, mar a chonaic mé i mo dháilcheantar féin, go háirithe i Dell i Luimneach agus i Waterford Crystal i bPort Láirge.

2-154

The EAGGF is a wonderful concept but, unfortunately, it is too inflexible. As a result of this, much of the funding returns to the European Union. I would suggest that, where there is funding left over, the Member State concerned should be able to make proposals to the Commission on how best to utilise it on behalf of the workers.

2-155

Má dhéantar sin, cabhróidh sé go mór leis na hoibríthe atá as obair agus cabhróidh sé go mór le hionmhá an Aontais Eorpaigh.

2-156

Report: Eva-Britt Svensson (A7-0065/2011)

2-157

Jens Rohde (ALDE). – Hr. formand! Vold mod kvinder er et problem, som eksisterer i hele verden, og det er selvfølgelig vigtigt, at man forholder sig til det - både som menneske og ud fra et politisk synspunkt. Derfor må vi selvfølgelig også forholde os til det på europæisk niveau. Blot ville jeg ønske, at Udvalget om Kvinders Rettigheder og Ligestilling, når vi diskuterer disse problemer, i stedet for at lave et juletræ pyntet med forskellige handlingsinitiativer så formåede at fokusere lidt stærkere på, hvilke initiativer man rent faktisk ønsker, at Den Europæiske Union skal fokusere på. Det tror jeg nemlig alt andet lige vil give noget mere tyngde, vil give mere effekt til handlingen og dermed være bedre for kvinderne og sådan set også for troværdigheden af de initiativer, vi foreslår her i Parlamentet.

2-158

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). – Mr President, violence against women is not a private issue. It is a crime to be persecuted. We need to break the silence. Respecting culture and religion is important but it should never be an excuse for honour killing, genital mutilation, trafficking, domestic violence and forced marriages. The Stockholm Programme provides a new policy framework to enhance the fight against violence on women and calls for concrete action. I encourage the Commission to come forward with a strategy which includes practical proposals.

I voted in favour of this report because I believe we must join forces across political parties to denounce and combat all forms of violence against women. I support

the principle and most of the proposals, but judicial and criminal law measures should be taken at national level. That is what we are doing in Sweden. In fact combating violence is at the centre of the women's organisation of my party, providing practical action and raising awareness not only to protect women, but also to empower women and to develop a culture of respect for women's dignity. I have started a social media campaign on this which everybody is welcome to join.

2-159

Silvia Costa (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che votando a favore di questa relazione dell'onorevole Svensson – com'è stato detto anche da altre colleghe – noi ci impegniamo perché sia rispettato l'impegno preso dalla Commissione europea di adottare, entro il 2011, una comunicazione per avviare una strategia e un piano d'azione europeo contro la violenza nei confronti delle donne, che abbiano approccio complessivo, cioè che comprendano tutte le fattispecie, dalla violenza sessuale alla violenza domestica e alle mutilazioni genitali femminili, ma anche – io mi auguro – tutte le nuove forme di violenza. Penso alla vera e propria induzione alla violenza, che spesso è perpetrata da certa pubblicità e dai media, e penso anche alle forme di vero e proprio ricatto e violazione dei diritti umani delle donne sul luogo di lavoro laddove intendano diventare madri o quando sono lavoratrici e madri.

Dopo l'attuazione e l'approvazione della direttiva sulla tratta degli esseri umani, che ha visto il Parlamento europeo molto impegnato, e di quella sull'ordine di protezione europeo, credo che sarebbe importante una vera e propria direttiva nel nuovo quadro giuridico creato da Lisbona e dal programma di Stoccolma su questo tema.

2-160

Licia Ronzulli (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, finché qualsiasi forma di violenza contro le donne non sarà completamente eliminata, non potremo mai dire di avere una società moderna finalmente democratica. Ancora una volta il Parlamento europeo rivolge l'attenzione a questo brutale fenomeno che, purtroppo, rimane drammaticamente attuale.

I dati parlano chiaro: almeno una donna su cinque subisce violenze fisiche o sessuali nel corso della sua vita e addirittura, per le donne tra i 15 e i 44 anni, la violenza è la prima causa di morte e di invalidità, ancora più del cancro o degli incidenti stradali.

Per questo motivo è necessaria una vera e propria mobilitazione permanente che porti alla creazione di uno strumento giuridico globale per la lotta contro tutte le forme di violenza nei confronti delle donne. Oggi deve partire un segnale forte. L'obiettivo finale è uno solo: questo virus letale non deve più trovare terreno fertile.

2-161

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor Presidente, la violencia contra las mujeres es la consecuencia directa de la discriminación; por ello

necesitamos una política integral con una atención especial a los niños de las mujeres maltratadas.

Es necesario que tengan derecho a asistencia jurídica y psicológica gratuita, centros de acogida y prestaciones económicas que promuevan su autonomía, juzgados especializados, protocolos de actuación y formación especial para el personal sanitario, policial y judicial, y que se elaboren estadísticas y recojan datos para conocer la dimensión real del problema y aplicar las políticas más adecuadas a nivel europeo.

2-162

Frank Vanhecke (NI). – Ik heb mij bij de eindstemming over het verslag-Svensson onthouden en ik maak dus van mijn stemverklaring gebruik om te zeggen dat ook voor mij uiteraard het geweld tegen vrouwen schokkend en onaanvaardbaar is.

Ik heb mij echter bij de eindstemming onthouden, omdat ik van oordeel ben dat dit verslag werkelijk bukt van de inbreuken op het door mij gekoesterde subsidiariteitsbeginsel en ik niet geloof dat het oprichten van nieuwe Europese bureaucratie, waarnemingscentra of andere wenselijk is, integendeel. Ik stoor mij trouwens ook aan de politieke correctheid waardoor in dit hele verslag niet één keer het woord "islam" voorkomt, hoewel die godsdienst vol achterlijke normen en principes vanzelfsprekend een grote rol speelt bij de achterstelling van vrouwen en bij het geweld tegen vrouwen. In de islamitische wereld vanzelfsprekend, maar jammer genoeg ook bij ons. Laat ons een kat een kat noemen en de islam in zijn hedendaagse werkelijkheid achterlijk en vrouwvijandig.

2-163

Anna Záborská (PPE) – Vítam správu pani Svenson, pretože posúva diskusiu o právach žien dopredu. Pri odsúdení násilia voči tehotným ženám správa hovorí, citujem: „páchateľ ním ubližuje viac ako jednej osobe“. Roky sa snažím o to, aby práva žien nestáli v opozícii proti právu nenarodených detí. Žiaľ správa pani Svenson tento konflikt ešte neprekonala.

Obmedzovanie reprodukčných práv žien, pod ktorými sa dnes v prvom rade rozumie právo na potrat, sa ešte stále pokladá za druh násilia voči ženám. Ak však medzi ľudské osoby konečne započítame aj nenarodené deti, potom umelo vyvolaný potrat je aktom násilia voči nenarodenému dieťaťu.

Pri príprave stratégie a boja proti všetkým formám násilia by Komisia mala nájsť súlad medzi právami žien a právami nenarodených detí. Nová stratégia by mala chrániť ženy, no zároveň obsahovať aj mechanizmy na ochranu nenarodených detí. Vyplýva to aj z predloženej správy, len treba pozorne čítať.

2-164

Nicole Sinclair (NI). – Mr President, I voted against the Svensson report. Obviously I totally denounce violence, especially violence against women, so why did I then vote against this report? I voted against it because, as a colleague of mine said a bit earlier, it is a bit of a

time warp. It brings us back to the 1970s and political correctness and is very naive in that element. It just wants to replay the fights of the early 70s.

I also am a bit concerned about the criminal nature it wants to bring in. This is what the European Union does, is it not? It brings itself in on an issue that everyone can agree on – how awful violence against women is – and then sets things up and brings in criminal law. Then, before you know it, this is extended to more and more areas.

Shame on the European Union for choosing such a subject, even if it is an own-initiative report, because this is where it starts. This is where the power grab starts and shame on it. What we need is real action on violence against women at Member State level. Leave things alone and stop using this subject.

2-165

Written explanations of vote

2-166

Report: Barbara Matera (A7-0059/2011)

2-167

Isaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), por escrito. – La solicitud cumple los requisitos exigidos por la FEAG y se refiere a 200 de los 594 despidos que se produjeron en nueve meses en tres empresas polacas que se dedicaban a la fabricación de maquinaria y equipos y redujeron en un 58% sus exportaciones. El 20% de los afectados tiene más de 54 años y el 10%, más de 64. Estas ayudas permitirán mejorar la formación a los despedidos para su futura incorporación a nuevos empleos.

2-168

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – A situação da agricultura e as dificuldades que enfrenta o mundo rural são indissociáveis da profunda crise sistémica e das políticas vigentes, como é o caso da PAC, principal responsável pela degradação contínua da actividade agrícola em alguns Estados-Membros, estando toda ela voltada para os interesses dos grandes agrários e da agro-indústria do norte da Europa, destruindo a agricultura familiar e comprometendo a viabilidade das pequenas e médias explorações.

O papel das mulheres na agricultura e no desenvolvimento das zonas rurais é de extrema importância, representando elas cerca de 42% dos trabalhadores agrícolas, sendo uma pedra angular na manutenção da actividade e garantindo um combate efectivo à desertificação das zonas rurais.

O relatório aprovado, apesar de carecer de uma crítica realista à PAC, é, na generalidade, positivo na abordagem que apresenta e como valoriza o papel das mulheres. Refere a *promoção da igualdade entre os sexos* enquanto *objectivo fundamental da UE e dos seus Estados-Membros*, bem como a criação de melhores condições de vida nas zonas rurais, contrariando o fenómeno da desertificação, para o que se torna indispensável a defesa de *infra-estruturas de transporte de qualidade* e a melhoria do *acesso aos transportes*

para todos no sentido de combater a *exclusão social e a desigualdade na sociedade que afecta prioritariamente as mulheres*.

2-169

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Este relatório permite a mobilização do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização - *Podkarpackie Machinery*, situada na Polónia. Registe-se que a Polónia solicitou assistência no tocante a 594 despedimentos de trabalhadores em três empresas da divisão de fabrico de máquinas e equipamento na região NUTS II de Podkarpackie.

A Comissão Europeia propôs a mobilização da quantia de 453.570 euros, tendo em conta que as empresas verificam os critérios de elegibilidade previstos no Regulamento FEG, relacionando os despedimentos com o impacto da crise económica e financeira, que resultou na queda das exportações das empresas *Huta Stalowa Wola SA*, *HSW - ZZN* e *DEZAMET SA* em 47%, 34%, e 58%, respectivamente. O resultado, afirmam, foi uma considerável diminuição da produção de máquinas e equipamentos, ficando assim demonstrado o efeito da crise para as empresas em causa neste país.

Os 594 despedimentos têm graves repercussões para as condições de vida, o emprego e a economia local, pelo que a mobilização do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização se reveste de extrema importância no apoio aos trabalhadores afectados. Por isso, votámos favoravelmente, embora pensemos que o mais importante seria evitar o encerramento das empresas e o desemprego.

2-170

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), na piśmie. – Europejski Fundusz Dostosowania do Globalizacji został utworzony w celu udzielenia dodatkowego wsparcia pracownikom dotkniętym konsekwencjami poważnych zmian strukturalnych w handlu światowym. Dzisiaj Parlament Europejski zagłosował nad wnioskiem o zatwierdzenie ponad 450 tys. euro dla zwalnianych pracowników z trzech firm usytuowanych na Podkarpaciu. Chciałabym podkreślić, że unijne wsparcie to poważny zastrzyk dla regionu, który reprezentuję, pozwoli bowiem zwolnionym pracownikom wrócić na rynek pracy, a środki zostaną przeznaczone na szkolenia, przekwalifikowanie, nowy sprzęt, czy pomoc w samozatrudnieniu. Podkarpacie jest jednym z biedniejszych regionów w Polsce, dlatego bardzo cieszę się, że tutaj trafia unijna pomoc. Dziękuję wszystkim, którzy zagłosowali za wsparciem finansowym.

2-171

Barbara Matera (PPE), per iscritto. – Mi compiacio per l'approvazione dello stanziamento di 453.000 euro provenienti dal fondo FEG a favore dei lavoratori polacchi licenziati nel settore della costruzione di macchinari. A seguito delle raccomandazioni della commissione per i bilanci, la Commissione europea ha iscritto circa 50 milioni di euro in stanziamenti di pagamento alla linea di bilancio relativa al FEG nel bilancio 2011. Questo ci consente di approvare uno stanziamento dei fondi necessari, senza intaccare altre

linee di bilancio già dedicate al finanziamento di azioni importanti rispetto agli obiettivi e ai programmi dell'Unione.

2-172

David Martin (S&D), *in writing*. – I voted for this report giving support through the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund to 594 workers made redundant in Poland. The EUR 0.45 million will be used to retrain and support workers through a difficult transition.

2-173

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL), *par écrit*. – Une fois de plus nous voici condamnés à voter une aumône dérisoire de l'UE pour les victimes de ses politiques de délocalisation. La logique du Fonds européen d'ajustement à la mondialisation est intolérable. Je ne m'abstiens qu'en pensant aux travailleuses et aux travailleurs polonais que cette aide hypocrite peut soulager un peu dans leur peine.

2-174

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Der Europäische Fonds zur Anpassung an die Globalisierung wurde errichtet, um Arbeitnehmer, die in Folge der globalen Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise entlassen worden sind, zu schützen. Polen hat Unterstützung beantragt, betreffend 594 Entlassungen in drei Unternehmen in der Region Podkarpackie/Polen. Es ist gut und richtig, eine personenbezogene Unterstützung für Arbeitnehmer zu leisten, die infolge der Globalisierung und der Wirtschaftskrise entlassen wurden, wodurch die Wiedereingliederung in den Arbeitsmarkt unterstützt wird. Daher habe ich dafür gestimmt.

2-175

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – We have requested that the institutions involved, as usually on those cases, make the necessary efforts to accelerate the mobilisation of the EGF.

Moreover, Parliament appreciates in this sense the improved procedure put in place by the Commission, following the Parliament's request for accelerating the release of grants, aimed at presenting to the budgetary authority the Commission's assessment on the eligibility of an EGF application together with the proposal to mobilise the Fund and hopes that further improvements in the procedure will be reached in the framework of the upcoming reviews of the Fund.

However, it also recalls the institutions' commitment to ensuring a smooth and rapid procedure for the adoption of the decisions on the mobilisation of the EGF, providing one-off, time-limited individual support geared to helping workers who have been made redundant as a result of globalisation and the financial and economic crisis, points out the role that the EGF can play in the reintegration of workers made redundant into the labour market and, however, calls for an evaluation on the long-term integration of these workers into the labour market as a direct result of the EGF-funded measures.

2-176

Licia Ronzulli (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Signor Presidente, lo scorso 15 febbraio la Commissione ha adottato una proposta di decisione sulla mobilitazione del FEG a favore della Polonia, con l'obiettivo di sostenere il reinserimento nel mercato del lavoro dei lavoratori licenziati a causa della crisi finanziaria ed economica globale. La domanda riguarda 594 esuberanti (di cui 200 ammessi all'assistenza) in tre imprese operanti nella divisione 28 NACE Rev. 2 (confezione di articoli d'abbigliamento) nella regione NUTS II Podkarpackie, durante il periodo di riferimento di nove mesi dal 1° giugno 2009 al 1° marzo 2010. Il mio voto positivo alla risoluzione odierna ribadisce il parere favorevole già espresso in sede di commissione per l'occupazione e gli affari sociali.

2-177

Peter Skinner (S&D), *in writing*. – Whilst voting for this report, I consider it ironic that this fund exists when not all EU countries utilise it. The share of this fund remaining at year end is repatriated to Member States as part of their 'rebate'. Yet failure by some countries, like the UK, to use this fund, which is its established right, in cases like the Twining Tea plant closure in Andover, raises certain questions. Those pretending to understand the benefits/disbenefits of the rebate query whether or not it is more correct and efficient for countries to make direct use of EGAF monies at local level.

The second irony concerns political and economic participation – engaging at all EU levels of added value. For the UK to maintain the right not to participate in funds managed at EU level because later benefits may flow is, in this case, uncertain and perhaps even plain wrong.

The UK is renouncing access to funding on a principle of not applying for this fund in order to receive a rebate. For those seeking help to return to work – in Sandwich, Kent and Andover, Hampshire – there is little justification in saying 'no', and this is another UK Government let-down.

2-178

Report: Fiorello Provera (A7-0075/2011)

2-179

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Signor Presidente, l'instabilità politica, sociale ed economica, la mancanza di sicurezza e la repressione politica dei regimi autoritari sono i fattori principali alla base della migrazione e delle ondate migratorie che si riversano senza sosta su alcuni paesi del bacino del Mediterraneo, mettendoli nelle condizioni di non riuscire a gestire le numerose difficoltà che comportano le emergenze umanitarie.

In queste ultime settimane è impossibile ignorare le migliaia di migranti che hanno raggiunto Lampedusa a seguito dei disordini nei paesi del Nord Africa. Il 90% di queste persone sono giovani di età compresa tra i 15 e i 35 anni, che rischiano la vita con la speranza di trovare opportunità migliori. Nonostante gli sforzi straordinari del governo italiano, delle amministrazioni locali e della

Croce Rossa Italiana, la situazione sull'isola è emergenziale: gli sbarchi non accennano a fermarsi e si sconta il ritardo dell'UE che ha tempi burocratici inconciliabili con la situazione.

Oggi, l'UE ha il dovere di sviluppare una politica efficiente e globale in materia di migrazione che preveda la realizzazione di un sistema europeo di asilo, l'attuazione di un programma di reinserimento su base obbligatoria, capace di realizzare un'equa distribuzione delle responsabilità, e accordi con gli Stati per incoraggiare lo sviluppo.

2-180

Alfredo Antonozzi (PPE), *per iscritto*. – I recenti avvenimenti che hanno avuto luogo e che stanno accadendo tuttora sulle sponde opposte del Mediterraneo testimoniano come l'instabilità di questa regione e i conseguenti flussi migratori rappresentino per l'Unione europea una sfida da dover affrontare.

Il fenomeno migratorio è preoccupante per gli sviluppi e le tensioni che può provocare, sia nelle relazioni tra i paesi d'origine e i paesi di destinazione dei migranti, ma anche tra i paesi d'origine e i paesi di transito degli stessi. È necessario rafforzare la politica di prevenzione, ottimizzando le risorse finanziarie e migliorando le esistenti strutture istituzionali. Dobbiamo circoscrivere l'immigrazione illegale e, in tal senso, ritengo che l'estensione degli accordi di migrazione costituisca un rimedio efficace per ottenere dei risultati nel breve termine e ridurre l'instabilità dei flussi migratori.

Condivido l'analisi contenuta nella relazione e, in particolare, sono d'accordo sul fatto di inserire, nella preparazione post 2013 degli strumenti delle relazioni esterne, un meccanismo bilaterale che consenta un monitoraggio attivo dello stato della protezione delle minoranze, ovvero di altri gruppi che possano essere oggetto di violazioni e soffrire di una dimensione di instabilità. Per questo ho dato il mio voto favorevole a questa relazione.

2-181

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), *por escrito*. – He votado a favor de este informe porque aborda de manera realista, al fijar objetivos a medio y largo plazo, un problema cuyo origen está en el desequilibrio entre países desarrollados y los que no lo son, y en las violaciones de los derechos humanos en muchas partes del mundo.

El informe apunta procedimientos para prevenir la inmigración ilegal, pretende implicar en el enfoque global de este problema a los países emergentes y a todos los implicados desde el origen, en el tránsito y hasta el destino. Igualmente, me parece especialmente positivo insistir en la idea de condicionar las políticas de cooperación al grado de respeto a los derechos humanos y las referencias que se hacen a la protección de los colectivos más desfavorecidos, como las mujeres o los menores no acompañados.

2-182

Vito Bonsignore (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Ho votato a favore della relazione del collega Provera perché ritengo sia un passo avanti nell'auspicata direzione della solidarietà fra gli Stati.

Nelle ultime settimane, in particolare, l'Italia è la meta di migliaia di migranti in fuga dai paesi del Nord Africa. Di fronte a una così difficile situazione l'UE non può lasciare solo il mio paese, ma deve adoperarsi affinché si rispettino i trattati e in particolare l'articolo 80 del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea.

Al contempo, è necessario ottimizzare le risorse finanziarie e le strutture esistenti. Il ruolo dell'agenzia per le frontiere Frontex, ad esempio, va rafforzato e maggiormente finanziato. Protezione dei diritti umani, accresciute risorse finanziarie, sviluppo delle democrazie, Stato di diritto e accordi bilaterali sono strumenti che, se opportunamente applicati, possono contribuire certamente a prevenire le migrazioni di massa.

2-183

Jan Březina (PPE), *písemně*. – Souhlasím s tím, že je třeba přijít s ucelenou, dlouhodobou strategií EU pro nestabilní státy, jež bude řešit základní příčiny migračních toků. Nesdílím však přesvědčení, že by Rada měla předložit akční plán sdílení zátěže vycházející ze zásady solidarity uvedených v článku 80 SFEU. Znovuúsídlování uprchlíků z tohoto regionu by mělo být odpovědností těch států, do kterých tyto uprchlíci míří, a v případě, že se jejich příliv stává neúnosným, mělo by být reakcí zpřísnění azylové a imigrační politiky EU. Výzvy směřující k vytvoření společného azylového systému EU a společného programu EU pro znovusídlování považuji v tomto kontextu za znepokojivé. Vytvoření komplexního přístupu Komise k legální migraci je dobrá myšlenka, ale neměly by na ni navazovat úvahy o zohlednění potřeby pracovní síly pro evropský trh práce a kapacity každého členského státu pro přijímání a integraci migrantů. Řízení migračních toků by mělo zůstat primárně v kompetenci členských států.

2-184

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Os fluxos migratórios têm causas. Entre elas avultam factores como as guerras e os conflitos armados, as violações sistemáticas dos direitos humanos, os conflitos e a repressão étnica e religiosa. Mas também as catástrofes naturais e a pobreza resultante da falta de estruturas económicas e democráticas adequadas estão entre as causas mais frequentes dos fluxos migratórios.

Os efeitos da crise do capitalismo à escala mundial e as consequências do seu desenvolvimento irregular e assimétrico estão a agravar a situação económica e social em numerosos países. As revoltas no mundo árabe são também expressão deste fenómeno, que tende a conferir igualmente maior débito aos fluxos migratórios. A este respeito, a União Europeia tem frequentemente um discurso hipócrita, desenvolvendo uma política de dois pesos e duas medidas. Por um lado, afirma defender os direitos humanos em países terceiros, não deixando

até de ter deles uma visão instrumental quando se trata de atacar alguns desses países. Por outro lado, é conivente com a persistência de situações graves, como a que se verifica em Lampedusa, Itália.

Exigem-se medidas de prevenção destes fluxos migratórios, assentes numa genuína política de cooperação e de ajuda ao desenvolvimento, na solidariedade e na promoção da paz, incluindo a resolução pacífica de conflitos, o que hoje não acontece.

2-185

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Sabemos que as guerras e os conflitos armados, as tensões étnicas, as violações sistemáticas dos direitos humanos – como a recusa em permitir que as pessoas pratiquem a sua religião –, as catástrofes naturais, a pobreza resultante da falta de estruturas económicas e democráticas adequadas são as principais causas dos fluxos migratórios.

Na situação actual, a situação tende a agravar-se com a crise que o capitalismo está a sofrer e com as suas consequências sociais, incluindo as revoltas nos países árabes.

Por isso, a União Europeia não pode continuar a sua política hipócrita de dois pesos e duas medidas, de afirmar defender direitos humanos em países terceiros, mas deixar que situações graves como a de Lampedusa persistam.

É preciso ter uma política de prevenção, de medidas de cooperação para o desenvolvimento com uma visão política mais abrangente que inclua sobretudo a solidariedade e a salvaguarda dos direitos humanos, o que hoje não acontece.

A Comissão Europeia e o próprio Parlamento Europeu dão geralmente prioridade aos seus interesses económicos e geoestratégicos e esquecem a solidariedade e os próprios Objectivos de Desenvolvimento do Milénio, aprovando directivas vergonhosas, como a Directiva do retorno.

Por isso, votámos contra este relatório, pese embora uma ou outra referência positiva.

2-186

Bruno Gollnisch (NI), par écrit. – J'aimerais apporter mon soutien aux habitants de Lampedusa confrontés à la surpopulation, à l'insécurité, à des problèmes d'approvisionnement et peut-être sanitaires, mais qui, aux yeux de ce Parlement, passent après les dizaines de milliers de clandestins qui s'échouent sur leurs côtes. J'aimerais également dire aux autorités italiennes que c'est vers l'Afrique et non l'Europe, que les bateaux qu'elles affrètent doivent rapatrier ces illégaux. Ces derniers viennent majoritairement de Tunisie, pays où se déroule, paraît-il, une formidable aventure démocratique à laquelle ils se doivent de participer. Nous ne pouvons continuer à accueillir tous ceux qui se sentent mal dans leur pays, parce qu'il y pleut... ou pas; parce que c'est une dictature... ou parce que ce n'en est plus une; parce qu'il est sous-développé, ou parce qu'il se développe! La

principale raison qui pousse ces migrants est purement économique.

Nos politiques d'aide au développement doivent encourager la fixation des populations dans leur propre pays, et même être conditionnées à cela et au retour de leurs citoyens. Il n'y a pas, contrairement à ce que dit le rapporteur, un "droit" à émigrer. Mais il y a un droit absolu des populations européennes, celles au premier chef dont vous avez la charge, de dire "STOP" et d'être entendues.

2-187

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE), in writing. – The Provera report deals with a number of important issues relating to migration and highlights the importance of human rights. Human rights have been at the heart of campaigns in Scotland and the UK to end the detention of children seeking asylum. The UK Government has vowed to end this obscenity – but to date they have fallen short.

2-188

David Martin (S&D), in writing. – I voted for this report, which welcomes the Commission's recent proposals on legal migration for non-asylum seekers, and urges it to develop further instruments to establish a common immigration policy, to manage economic migration with a view to promoting economic and social progress in receiving, transit and origin countries, and to enhance social cohesion by improving the integration of migrants. It emphasises the need for adequate information to be provided on possibilities for legal immigration to the EU, in order to prevent illegal migration, make better use of the EU schemes for legal immigration, clarify current prospects and opportunities within the EU and give the lie to the false promises made by traffickers, thereby limiting the profits generated for organised crime and human traffickers by the need for people to move. It calls on the Commission to foster protection measures for vulnerable groups and people (mainly women and children) who often become victims of trafficking and sexual exploitation, and urges it to build up information centres on possibilities for migration to the EU in third countries. It calls, however, for a balanced approach between promoting legal migration into the EU and ensuring that the EU has the capacity to receive and successfully integrate migrants;

2-189

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL), par écrit. – Ce texte ne parvient pas à cacher la vérité, malgré le flot de bons sentiments répandu. L'UE s'inquiète de la chute des dictateurs qu'elle soutenait en échange d'une gestion des "flux migratoires" à ses frontières. L'idée d'une arrivée massive de réfugiés victimes de ces systèmes dictatoriaux ne l'inquiétait pas, et pour cause. C'est l'arrivée de la démocratie qui l'inquiète.

L'Europe aura pourtant besoin de 230 millions d'immigrant(e)s d'ici à 2030, c'est la Commission européenne elle-même qui le dit. Ce texte prône, par ailleurs, l'application de sanctions aux États qui ne respecteront pas les principes inscrits dans les accords de libre-échange et ceux prônés par le FMI. À peine libérés

du joug des despotes locaux, les tyrans de l'extérieur se rappellent au bon souvenir des révolutions arabes. Arrogant et brutal. Je vote contre.

2-190

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Aufgrund der anhaltenden Migrationsströme in Europa erscheint es umso wichtiger, gegen eine Legalisierung von Wirtschaftsflüchtlingen aufzutreten. Es ist wichtig, Entwicklungsländer dahingehend zu fördern, damit diese Menschen in ihren Ländern bleiben. Es nützt nichts, Menschen aus Entwicklungsländern in den Arbeitsmarkt einwandern zu lassen, zumal die Arbeitslosenrate des Euro-Raumes momentan bei 9,9 % liegt. Der Bericht von Herrn Provera war ursprünglich sehr gut und ausgewogen, ist aber durch diverse Änderungsanträge leider in die falsche Richtung abgeändert worden. Deswegen habe ich dagegen gestimmt.

2-191

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – Migration flows arising from instability are a challenge for the European Union. Wars and armed conflicts, ethnic tension, systematic violations of human rights – such as the refusal to allow people to practise their religious faith – natural disasters and the lack of proper economic and democratic structures are the main causes of this type of migration flow.

This phenomenon is particularly worrying because it may give rise to or exacerbate tensions, not only between countries of origin and countries of destination, but also between countries of origin and transit countries. In order to meet this challenge effectively, the European Union must implement a policy of prevention, employing the most appropriate foreign policy instruments with a view to addressing the causes of instability directly, so that emigration becomes an opportunity, not a desperate necessity.

A European policy on regulating migration should combine development cooperation measures with a more comprehensive political vision encompassing security, regional cooperation, bilateral agreements with countries of origin and transit countries, the safeguarding of human rights and democratisation.

2-192

Licia Ronzulli (PPE), *per iscritto*. – La gestione dei flussi migratori causati dall'instabilità politica rappresenta una sfida fondamentale per l'UE. Guerre e conflitti armati, tensioni etniche, violazioni sistematiche dei diritti umani, disastri naturali e l'assenza di valide strutture economiche e democratiche sono le cause principali di questi flussi.

Ritengo necessario fin d'ora attuare una politica di prevenzione, mettendo in campo gli strumenti più appropriati per intervenire sulle cause delle instabilità. La politica estera europea dovrebbe concentrarsi sulle fonti dell'instabilità e sulle difficoltà strutturali nei paesi d'origine. Ritengo che questo testo rappresenti per l'UE uno strumento in più per delineare una politica coerente ed efficace sul fenomeno dei flussi migratori,

indirizzando le scelte sulla strada più opportuna per ricostituire condizioni di stabilità politica, economica e sociale.

2-193

Oreste Rossi (EFD), *per iscritto*. – Sulla relazione in oggetto la mia posizione è fortemente contraria. Il motto "Uniti nella diversità" prevede che ognuno sia padrone a casa propria e non può e non deve essere l'UE che ci impone di accettare ospiti sgraditi. Vedersi negare il diritto di respingere al paese di origine i clandestini va contro ogni regola di buon senso. Se non si rispetta la legalità, si rischia l'invasione di milioni di disperati in fuga. Bisogna aiutare chi soffre ma a casa loro, impedendo il traffico di esseri umani.

Rigetto fortemente l'accusa all'Europa di razzismo e xenofobia perché sono stanco di assistere agli scioperi dei tunisini illegali perché non vengono dati loro i soldi per comperare le sigarette, al rifiuto di mangiare cibo contenente tonno perché sa di pesce, alla pretesa di ricevere, una volta sbarcati in Italia, casa e lavoro, ovviamente gratis, alla faccia dei disoccupati e dei poveri che nel nostro paese vivono da sempre.

Si sprecano i complimenti all'Alto rappresentante baronessa Ashton che in realtà non ha saputo minimamente gestire l'attuale situazione di crisi del Maghreb. Ciliegina sulla torta, il considerare perseguitati o con pochi diritti, e quindi degni di particolari attenzioni, lesbiche, gay, bisessuali, transessuali e transgender.

2-194

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), *schriftelijk*. – Deze resolutie heeft de verdienste het debat over het migratiebeleid van de Unie weer aan te zwengelen, al had de tekst concreter en sterker gemogen. Net nu de situatie in Noord-Afrika grote migratiestromen op gang brengt, schiet de EU tekort door geen duidelijke verantwoordelijkheid op te nemen. Frontex kan niet het enige instrument zijn bij de aanpak van de vluchtelingen crisis. Europa moet ook dringend een actieplan voor de lastenverdeling ontwikkelen om te helpen bij het hervestigen van vluchtelingen uit de regio en om steun te bieden aan ontheemden. Ik betreur het feit dat in de huidige omstandigheden het opschorten van de overeenkomst inzake samenwerking tussen de EU en Libië blijkbaar de enig beschikbare optie was. Niet het verscherpen van de grenscontroles aan de Unie moet de eerste bekommernis zijn in dergelijke akkoorden maar het toezicht op de bekrachtiging en naleving van het Verdrag van Genève. Ik hoop dat de resolutie een eerste stap is op weg naar een meer globale aanpak van de vluchtelingenproblematiek, opdat mensen op een meer humane manier benaderd worden.

2-195

Michèle Striffler (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport Provera sur les "flux migratoires liés à l'instabilité: portée et rôle de la politique étrangère de l'Union européenne". En effet, une coordination entre la politique étrangère et la politique en matière d'immigration est indispensable. Il faut se concentrer sur

les causes profondes de l'instabilité de certaines régions du monde et gérer efficacement les flux migratoires. En effet, une politique de gestion des flux migratoires doit se combiner efficacement avec la politique européenne de coopération au développement, en prenant en compte les aspects de la sécurité, de la coopération régionale dans les pays du Sud et des accords de coopération avec les pays d'origine et de transit. Concernant la place centrale de certains pays tiers dans cette politique, je suis persuadée que la signature d'accords de coopération entre ces États et l'Union européenne est absolument primordiale afin de combattre l'immigration illégale. À cet égard, il est nécessaire de restaurer l'accord de coopération entre la Libye et l'Union européenne – qui est, pour l'heure, suspendu.

2-196

Angelika Werthmann (NI), *schriftlich*. – Ich habe für diesen Bericht gestimmt. Wie darin hervorgehoben wird, führen die derzeitigen Migrationsströme zu teilweise massiven Spannungen zwischen Herkunfts- und Aufnahmeländern, mit den Transitländern und auch innerhalb der Aufnahmeländer. Als präventive Maßnahme schlägt Kollege Provera vor, die Ursache für Migration an der Wurzel zu fassen und den Mangel an demokratischer und wirtschaftlicher Stabilität in den Aufnahmeländern in die europäische Außenpolitik aufzunehmen. Das Europäische Parlament hat mehrfach in verschiedenen Berichten im Bereich Entwicklungspolitik die Kommission und speziell Lady Ashton aufgefordert, die Menschenrechtssituation in allen Verhandlungen zum Thema zu machen und ausschließlich in diesem Paket Unterstützungen und Handelserleichterungen zu gewähren. Diese Forderung sei an dieser Stelle noch einmal bekräftigt.

2-197

Report: Elisabeth Jeggle (A7-0016/2011)

2-198

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Signor Presidente, sostengo con piacere la relazione della collega Jeggle, in quanto focalizza l'attenzione su quel 42% di donne che vivono nelle zone rurali e che svolgono una funzione indispensabile ai fini dello sviluppo di queste aree, nonché alla loro stabilizzazione e modernizzazione, sviluppando nuove forme imprenditoriali. Grazie al loro impegno, queste donne hanno dimostrato di poter contribuire all'evoluzione dei tradizionali modi di vivere e produrre nelle campagne, creando delle attività economiche capaci di offrire occupazione e che consentono di conciliare gli obblighi familiari con l'attività lavorativa.

Con l'obiettivo di garantire condizioni di vita equivalenti in tutte le regioni e di evitare lo sviluppo unilaterale dei centri urbani, è necessario dotare tutto lo spazio rurale delle più moderne infrastrutture IT, con un accesso adeguato alla banda larga, e sviluppare imprese elettroniche come l'*e-business* che consentano di gestire l'attività economica a prescindere dalla distanza dai centri urbani.

Si dovrà altresì migliorare la formazione delle donne e l'accesso agevolato al credito a sostegno dell'imprenditorialità femminile. Le politiche di protezione sociale che verranno intraprese, dovranno anche tener conto delle condizioni di vita delle donne migranti impiegate come lavoratrici stagionali nelle aziende agricole, con particolare riferimento alla necessità di garantire ad esse un alloggio adeguato, l'assicurazione medica e adeguati servizi sanitari.

2-199

Liam Aylward (ALDE), *i scribhinn*. – Ós rud é gur mná iad 42% dóibh siúd atá bainteach le hearnáil na talmhaíochta, is léir go bhfuil ról tábhachtach ag mná i gceantair tuaithe agus i ngnó na feirme. Ní foláir aitheantas agus tacaíocht a thabhairt do mhná agus don mhéid atá á dhéanamh acu i gcúrsaí talmhaíochta agus i saol na tuaithe agus, chuige sin, tacaím leis an dtuarascáil thábhachtach seo. Ní mór aitheantas mar is cóir i mbeartais talmhaíochta an AE amach anseo a thabhairt do ról na mban. Tacaím lena bhfuil sa tuarascáil maidir le sár-obair ghréasáin na mban ó thaobh ceantair tuaithe a spreagadh agus comhionannas agus iniamh sóisialta faoin tuath a chur chun cinn. Ní mór breis tacaíochta pholaitiúla a thabhairt dóibh ar leibhéal áitiúil, náisiúnta agus Eorpach. In Éirinn, mar shampla, is eagraíocht thábhachtach láidir i gceantair tuaithe í Bantracht na Tuaithe, a chéiliúraigh 100 bliain ar an bhfód le déanaí, a bhfuil thart ar 11 000 ball aici agus atá ag tabhairt tacaíochta do mhná na tuaithe le tamall fada anuas. Ní mór tacaíocht mar is ceart a thabhairt do na heagraíochtaí áitiúla sin agus iad a bheith san áireamh i mbeartais talmhaíochta an AE amach anseo.

2-200

George Becali (NI), *în scris*. – Problema femeilor din mediul rural este actuală și reală pentru Uniune. Este însă foarte acută și urgentă pentru unele state membre noi, cum ar fi și România, în care ponderea zonelor rurale este foarte ridicată, cu o rată a ocupării extrem de scăzută. Avem nevoie de o abordare adecvată și care să aibă susținere financiară în viitoarea PAC pentru a obține rezultate în crearea unor condiții de viață atractive pentru femeile și bărbații din aceste zone. Sunt de acord cu ideea formulată de doamna Jeggle privind o rețea europeană a femeilor din mediul rural, susținută și ca urmare a măsurilor din pilonul II al PAC, dar și cu ideea că reforma PAC ar trebui să acorde prioritate accesului femeilor din zonele rurale la servicii și ajutoare, conforme cu nevoile fiecărui stat membru.

2-201

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), *raštu*. – Balsavau už ši pranešimą, nes manau, kad regionų vystymasis šiandien tampa ypač aktuali klausimu, kuomet dėl kintančių visuomenės bei socialinių struktūrų, vertybių bei didėjančios individualizacijos kaimo vietovės yra vis rečiau apgyvendinamos. Visiškai sutinku, jog viena iš svarbių priemonių, kuri įgalintų pakeisti šią ryškėjančią urbanizacijos tendenciją, yra tinkamų gyvenimo ir darbo sąlygų kaimo vietovėse sukūrimas. Patirtis rodo, kad gyvenimo kokybė ir ekonominė galia kaimo vietovėse yra glaudžiai susijusi būtent su moterimis ir jų atliekamų

vaidmeniu ūkiuose. Dėl to itin svarbu imtis pranešime siūlomų priemonių, kurios įgalintų moteris įgyvendinti savo gyvenimo planus, būti ekonomiškai nepriklausomas bei įveikti su šeima susijusias užduotis taip pat sėkmingai, kaip jos šiandien tai gali padaryti miestuose. Kaip tokios priemonės pranešime įvardijami ir toliau teikiamas bei plečiamas moterų švietimas, konsultavimas specifiniais su žemės ūkiu susijusiais klausimais, ES paramos žemės ūkiui bei verslui kaimo vietovėse tęstinumas, būtinosios infrastruktūros, taip pat ir IT infrastruktūros plėtra, galimybė pasinaudoti ankstyvu išėjimu į pensiją ir daugelis kitų priemonių.

2-202

Vito Bonsignore (PPE), per iscritto. – Mi complimento con la collega e relatrice Jeggle per il lavoro svolto, attraverso cui è stato possibile apprezzare pubblicamente in quest'Aula il ruolo "multifunzionale" della donna nel settore agricolo. Questo ruolo non è ancora adeguatamente riconosciuto, nonostante il 42% di circa 27 milioni di lavoratori impiegati nel settore sia rappresentato da donne e quasi il 29% delle aziende agricole sia gestito da una donna.

Ho votato a favore di questo documento perché condivido la necessità di riconoscere il ruolo specifico che le donne svolgono in agricoltura. Ritengo altresì doveroso che si individuino le esigenze specifiche delle donne nelle zone rurali e che a loro vadano adeguate le strategie future a partire dalla prossima riforma della PAC. L'Unione europea non può trascurare le aspirazioni professionali, familiari e sociali delle donne che vivono in ambienti rurali. Per permettere ciò è però opportuno, da parte delle Istituzioni europee, garantire adeguati servizi di sostegno e un'offerta innovativa che non sia orientata esclusivamente al mercato.

Condivido infine le proposte della relatrice soprattutto in merito a una migliore rappresentanza femminile negli organismi politici, economici e sociali del mondo agricolo.

2-203

Nessa Childers (S&D), in writing. – Moves by the European Parliament today to support and strengthen the contribution of women to Europe's vital agriculture sector are welcome. The 'Women in Agriculture' report is backed by a significant majority of MEPs and is a timely measure. Not many people realise that 42 % of those working regularly in the agricultural sector are women. I welcome this report.

2-204

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), în scris. – Având în vedere faptul că principiul egalității între sexe este promovată prin legislația europeană și reprezintă una dintre cerințele fundamentale ale Strategiei europene pentru anul 2020, consider oportună includerea acestui aspect în viitoarea politică agricolă comună, inclusiv prin utilizarea de noi instrumente care să promoveze acest principiu. Cred că viitoarea politică agricolă comună trebuie să fie o politică echitabilă, inclusiv pentru femei.

2-205

Göran Färm, Anna Hedh, Olle Ludvigsson, Marita Ulvskog och Åsa Westlund (S&D), skriftlig. – Vi röstade för betänkandet om kvinnors roll i jordbruket eftersom vi tycker att det är fundamentalt att bekämpa bristande jämställdhet i samhället. Betänkandet belyser även vikten av att det finns en fungerande infrastruktur och ett grundutbud av vissa tjänster, t.ex. bredband och barnomsorg, även på landsbygden och inte bara i städerna. Vi vill emellertid understryka att vi inte anser att jordbruket bör ha kvar samma andel av budgeten i nästa fleråriga budgetram, utan att jordbrukets totala andel tvärtom bör minska väsentligt.

2-206

Ida Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Todas as políticas da União Europeia e dos Estados-Membros devem ter em conta a promoção da igualdade e dos direitos das mulheres, bem como do combate às discriminações em função do sexo. Por isso, impõe-se que se dê particular importância à situação das mulheres na agricultura e no mundo rural cuja vida se ressentem da profunda crise em que as políticas vigentes, como a PAC e outras, mergulharam o mundo rural.

As mulheres, que representam cerca de 42 % dos 26,7 milhões de pessoas que trabalham na agricultura, são particularmente afectadas pelo encerramento das centenas de milhares de pequenas e médias explorações agrícolas e pelo processo de destruição da agricultura familiar, que resultaram das sucessivas reformas da PAC. São também, tal como nas demais áreas de actividade, vítimas do desemprego, da precariedade laboral, dos baixos salários e da pobreza, o que é agravado pelas políticas anti-sociais impostas a pretexto da crise.

Daí que, mais do que palavras vazias de conteúdo, precisemos de uma ruptura com as políticas que geraram a actual situação. É preciso valorizar o papel das mulheres, os seus direitos, a igualdade, os serviços públicos nos meios rurais de saúde, ensino, oferta cultural e de lazer, equipamentos sociais...

(Declaração encurtada por força do artigo 170.º do Regimento)

2-207

Mathieu Grosch (PPE), schriftlich. – Dieser Bericht ist sehr zu unterstützen, da er auf die besondere Rolle der Frauen in bäuerlichen Betrieben und in ländlichen Gebieten aufmerksam macht und gleichzeitig Lösungen für bestehende Herausforderungen anbietet. Diese Lösungen tragen dazu bei, die Arbeits- und Lebenssituation im ländlichen Raum für Frauen attraktiver zu gestalten. Teil dieser Lösung sind ein bezahlbarer und erreichbarer Zugang zu unterstützenden Diensten, Versorgungseinrichtungen, wie Kindergärten, ambulante Pflegestationen etc. und die entsprechende Infrastruktur. Zudem ist vorgeschlagen, EU-Fördergelder einzusetzen, um die ländliche Lebensqualität zu steigern.

Unabdingbar ist zudem eine verstärkte Möglichkeit zur schulischen, beruflichen und akademischen Aus- und

Weiterbildung, aber auch die Verbesserung der sozialen Absicherung von Frauen im ländlichen Raum. Dies wird nicht nur den Frauen in ländlichen Gebieten zugute kommen, sondern auch dem ländlichen Raum als integriertem Wirtschafts- und Lebensraum selbst eine nachhaltige Entwicklung bescheren.

2-208

Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE), kirjallinen. – Arvoisa puhemies, naisten elämä maaseudulla on viime vuosikymmeninä muuttunut ja monipuolistunut. Perinteiset maaseudun työpaikat ovat vähentyneet. Samalla tilalle on tullut uusia elämänmuotoja, joissa esimerkiksi naisten tausta, koulutus ja asema työmarkkinoilla eroavat toisistaan hyvinkin paljon. Nämä muutokset on otettava paremmin huomioon myös unionin tukipolitiikassa, jotta maaseudun naisten työ- ja perhe-elämä voidaan paremmin sovittaa yhteen.

Naiset ovat koulutuksellaan ja ammattitaidoillaan edistäneet maaseudun perinteisten elinkeinojen kehittämistä viime vuosina. Monenlaiset muun muassa palveluihin ja maatilamatkailuun keskittyvät innovatiiviset maatalousyritykset ovat elävöittäneet maaseudun elinkeinorakennetta merkittävästi. Innovatiivisten maatalousyritysten perustamista ja kehittämistä on tuettava myös jatkossa.

Lopuksi haluaisin muistuttaa, että sukupuolten tasa-arvon edistäminen on yksi EU:n ja jäsenvaltioiden tärkeimmistä tavoitteista. Täten unionin yhteiseen maatalouspolitiikkaankin on sisällytettävä tasa-arvon edistämisen periaate.

2-209

Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE), na piśmie. – Panie Przewodniczący, Szanowni Państwo! Głosowałiśmy dzisiaj w Strasburgu nad sprawozdaniem w sprawie roli kobiet w rolnictwie i na obszarach wiejskich. Sama pochodzę ze wsi, jestem mieszkanką wsi i był czas, kiedy ciężko pracowałam w gospodarstwie rodziców. Z pełną odpowiedzialnością mogę stwierdzić, że kobiety na wsi dzięki swojej ciężkiej pracy oraz determinacji mają wpływ nie tylko na rozwój i unowocześnienie gospodarstw, ale często na pobudzenie aktywności całej społeczności wiejskiej. Działając w kołach gospodyń wiejskich, pielęgnując tradycję i rodzinne obyczaje, a także z sukcesem wdrażając nowe rozwiązania w dziedzinie prowadzenia gospodarstw rolnych stanowią grupą, którą należy wspierać, promować i podkreślać jej wartość. Dziękując wszystkim kobietom wiejskim, zarówno w Polsce jak i w całej Unii Europejskiej, za ich ciężką pracę i wkład w rozwój regionów, chciałabym poinformować, że głosowałam za sprawozdaniem pani Elisabeth Jeggle. Dziękuję.

2-210

David Martin (S&D), in writing. – I welcome this report's recognition of the important role women play in agricultural production and the need to adapt certain policies and conditions to assist them. However, I do not believe this should be used as a justification to throw even more money at the CAP.

2-211

Barbara Matera (PPE), per iscritto. – Ho espresso il mio voto favorevole in quanto credo fortemente che si debba recuperare la centralità della donna lì dove il suo operato è fondamentale all'andamento o al recupero di quella economia locale che concorre alla crescita generale dei nostri paesi.

Il ruolo delle donne nel settore agricolo, infatti, ha subito forti cambiamenti negli ultimi decenni, divenendo sempre più multifunzionale. Per questo motivo, è necessario un intervento delle Istituzioni europee volto a evitare l'esodo delle donne dalle campagne o comunque volto a incentivare il ritorno di queste ultime alla vita rurale. Un sostegno alle donne e ai loro progetti permetterebbe di compiere passi avanti per lo sviluppo delle comunità rurali nel loro insieme.

Occorre offrire alle donne che operano nel settore agricolo la possibilità di realizzare i propri progetti di vita, rendendosi economicamente indipendenti, anche per far fronte alle responsabilità familiari. I posti di lavoro nell'agricoltura devono restare attrattivi per le donne in modo che possano inserirsi per eseguire le loro molteplici competenze professionali. In questo periodo di crisi finanziaria ed economica, risulta fondamentale offrire condizioni di lavoro equivalenti sia nelle campagne che nelle città, in modo tale da ripopolare territori che possano rappresentare un volano della ripresa economica di una determinata regione europea.

2-212

Andreas Mölzer (NI), schriftlich. – Im ländlichen Bereich ist die Rolle der Frau immer noch eine untergeordnete. Dem Bericht zu Folge sollte auf die Bedürfnisse der Frauen gerade in nicht urbanen Gebieten besser eingegangen werden. Es sollten Möglichkeiten der Fort- und Weiterbildung sowie bessere Anbindungen zu Kinderbetreuungsstätten geboten werden. Auch Bäuerinnen tragen immer mehr zur Diversifizierung und Marktanpassung der Betriebe bei, wodurch sich die Multifunktionalität der Landwirtschaft deutlich erhöht hat. Um die Landwirtschaft für Frauen weiter als attraktive Arbeitsstätte und auch Lebensraum beibehalten zu können, sollte Frauen die Möglichkeit gegeben werden, Entscheidungen in Gremien und Bündeln zu beeinflussen. Ebenso ist eine nachhaltige Absicherung von Frauen in der Landwirtschaft unumgänglich, um ihnen auch dadurch einen Anreiz zum Bleiben zu geben. Ich habe für diesen Bericht gestimmt, da dem Bauernsterben auf verschiedenen Ebenen Einhalt geboten werden muss.

2-213

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), în scris. – Am votat în favoarea Raportului Jeggle, pe care îl apreciez, ca deputat ales în România, stat în care există un număr important de persoane implicate în activități agricole. Doresc, cu toate acestea, să precizez că sunt de părere că raportul ar fi trebuit să fie mai ferm în ceea ce privește condițiile de trai din mediul rural. Avem nevoie de un Fond european agricol pentru dezvoltare rurală puternic finanțat pentru a permite reducerea discrepanțelor între mediul rural și cel urban. În cadrul acestui fond, o

componentă obligatorie trebuie să rămână investițiile în modernizarea infrastructurii fizice de bază. De asemenea, ar fi fost utile referiri suplimentare la îmbătrânirea populației rurale și la importanța programelor destinate pensionării timpurii a fermierilor și instalării tinerilor fermieri.

2-214

Rolandas Paksas (EFD), raštu. – Balsavau už šią rezoliuciją, kuria siekiama didinti moterų vaidmenį žemės ūkio sektoriuje ir gerinti jų padėtį kaimo vietovėse, suteikiant daugiau socialinių garantijų bei skatinant užimtumą ir verslumą. Visų pirma, turime dėti visas pastangas, kad būtų sukurta efektyviai veikianti socialinė apsaugos sistema, kuri sudarytų galimybes išeiti į pensiją pirma laiko, gauti atitinkamas motinystės išmokas. Siekiant sudaryti palankias sąlygas verslumo skatinimui, visos kaimo vietovės turi būti aprūpintos naujausia IT infrastruktūra. Efektyvus plačiajuosčio ryšio paslaugų teikimas yra vienas pagrindinių veiksmų, sąlygojančių mažų ir vidutinių įmonių veiklos augimą kaimo vietovėse. Be to, turime dėti visas pastangas, kad kaimo vietovėse būtų išsaugotos bendruomenės ir sudarytos galimybės derinti šeimyninį ir profesinį gyvenimą. Atsižvelgiant į tai, būtina užtikrinti, kad kaimo vietovėse gyvenantys asmenys gautų aukštos kokybės sveikatos priežiūros, švietimo, vaikų priežiūros ir kitas kasdieniniams poreikiams patenkinti skirtas paslaugas, kurios sudarytų palankesnes gyvenimo sąlygas ir mažintų socialinę atskirtį.

Valstybės narės, naudodamosi struktūrinių fondų lėšomis, turi kurti ir įgyvendinti iniciatyvas, kuriomis būtų skatinamas moterų dalyvavimas darbo rinkoje, mažinama socialinė nelygybė ir sprendžiamos problemos, susijusios su transporto infrastruktūra. Taip pat didesnis dėmesys turi būti skiriamas ūkininkų organizacijoms bei sukurtas Europos kaimo moterų tinklas tam, kad kaimo vietovių plėtros programos būtų visapusiškai įgyvendinamos.

2-215

Rovana Plumb (S&D), in writing. – Women are very important for the agricultural sector and the rural world and their presence there is increasingly obvious. It is therefore important to highlight the role that women play in farm businesses and in rural areas, taking particular account of its multifunctional nature. If we want to keep women of all generations living in the countryside or encourage them to move there, then support policies must reflect their needs and circumstances more strongly than has been the case in the past. In rural areas, as elsewhere, women expect to be able to realise their own plans for their lives, to be economically independent and to meet family challenges.

The European Commission should increase the budgetary allocations for the ESF in order to provide adequate resources for measures to improve education and training for improving labour market access and combating unemployment and measures and activities under the Social Inclusion Strategy and the EU 2020 flagship initiative on combating poverty and social exclusion in favour of disadvantaged and vulnerable

persons, especially women, including those confronted with precarious and insecure contracts. The Member States should contribute in particular to a definite improvement of the social situation of women in agriculture in Europe.

2-216

Frédérique Ries (ALDE), par écrit. – Et si l'agricultrice était l'avenir de la politique agricole commune? Un brin provocatrice, cette déclaration est en grande partie fondée lorsque l'on se réfère à l'importance de la population féminine dans la vie en milieu rural et sur l'exploitation agricole. Selon les statistiques, dans l'Union européenne, les agricultrices représentent 43% de la main d'œuvre agricole et 20% des femmes sont chefs d'exploitation, sans compter les conjointes dont le travail n'est souvent pas comptabilisé.

À l'heure de la spécialisation des exploitations agricoles, l'esprit créatif des femmes est un plus indéniable qui, couplé à leur plus grande préoccupation d'un environnement durable et de qualité, mérite d'être reconnu et soutenu à l'échelon européen. C'est le choix fait ce midi par le Parlement européen qui, en adoptant le rapport Jeggle, a souligné l'importance que les femmes joueront à l'avenir dans la revalorisation du milieu rural. Comme l'écrit avec à propos le rapporteur dans l'exposé des motifs: "L'expérience montre en effet que la qualité de vie et la puissance économique dépendent, principalement dans les régions rurales, de la présence des femmes et de leur engagement". Une manière simple et moderne de porter un regard nouveau sur le métier d'agriculteur.

2-217

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), in writing. – Women are the backbone of the agricultural sector and the rural world and their presence there is increasingly obvious. It is therefore important to highlight the role that women play in farm businesses and in rural areas, taking particular account of the multifunctional nature of these businesses. In this context, there are opportunities to provide practical support measures for women in agriculture. Greater account must be taken of the wide range of vocational skills, interests and achievements of women, so that jobs in farming remain an attractive option for them. This will entail women having a full share in the resources that underpin farming as a way of life and a type of business. Women farmers must have a share in rights and duties that is commensurate with their co-responsibility for the farm business, including through the representation of interests on agricultural bodies and by having a real share in farm income.

Ensuring adequate social cover for all women who work in agriculture is another indispensable factor in modern sustainable farming. Experience with systems of agricultural social security in the EU Member States should be taken into account and should, in the medium term, contribute to a definite improvement of the social situation of women in agriculture in Europe.

2-218

Licia Ronzulli (PPE), per iscritto. – In Europa lo sviluppo sostenibile delle zone rurali è da sempre

considerato una priorità, al fine di garantire condizioni di vita ottimali per uomini e donne che decidono di intraprendere questa specifica attività.

Attualmente, nell'Unione europea 26,7 milioni di persone sono occupate nel settore agricolo. Tra questi il 42% è costituito da donne e almeno un'azienda agricola su cinque è diretta da una donna. Da questi semplici dati emerge una realtà femminile rurale radicalmente diversa da quella degli scorsi decenni, dove le donne hanno giocato un ruolo da protagoniste in questi mutamenti, con situazioni sociali ed economiche molto diverse tra gli Stati.

Condivido quindi il testo di questa relazione, in quanto evidenzia la necessità di pianificare strategie europee di sostegno per le aree rurali "a misura di donna", in modo da contribuire nel medio termine a un miglioramento della loro condizione sociale e lavorativa.

2-219

Oreste Rossi (EFD), per iscritto. – La relazione sul ruolo delle donne nell'agricoltura e nelle zone rurali non può che vederci favorevoli perché noi crediamo ancora nell'agricoltore professionale che vive del reddito derivante dalla propria azienda.

Le donne, per le loro tipicità legate alla maternità e al ruolo abituale di assistenza agli altri membri della famiglia, sono indubbiamente soggetti svantaggiati in un ambito agricolo. I tempi dell'agricoltura non sono scanditi da orari fissi ma devono tenere conto delle esigenze stagionali, dei periodi vegetativi e dell'eventuale presenza di animali di allevamento. Ci sono periodi in cui i giorni lavorativi saranno di 12-13 ore comprensivi di festività e altri più tranquilli. È evidente che una donna imprenditrice agricola, ad esempio in maternità, non può rinunciare a lavorare il terreno se quel periodo lo richiede, perché altrimenti non disporrebbe di un reddito per tutto l'anno.

Le necessità di una donna agricoltore sono quindi diverse da quelle di un'altra lavoratrice, per cui è fondamentale che siano loro garantiti servizi adeguati e dedicati, conto tenendo del fatto che quasi sempre le aziende agricole sono localizzate lontano dai servizi pubblici, siano questi di trasporto, di assistenza o sociali.

2-220

Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), na piśmie. – Poparłam sprawozdanie w sprawie roli kobiet w rolnictwie i na obszarach wiejskich. W szczególności opowiadam się za rozwiązaniami zmierzającymi do zwiększenia zatrudnienia kobiet na obszarach wiejskich. W Polsce kobiety są bardziej dotknięte bezrobociem niż mężczyźni, zwłaszcza na wsi. Duży odsetek bezrobotnych na wsi stanowią kobiety w wieku do 34 roku życia. Są to najczęściej osoby wykształcone, które nie mogą znaleźć pracy odpowiadającej ich kwalifikacjom. To jest szczególnie niebezpieczny trend, gdyż właśnie młodzi powinni mieć większe szanse na przebicie się na rynku pracy. Prowadzi to w dłuższej perspektywie do feminizacji bezrobocia na wsi, a tym samym do wzrostu ubóstwa wśród młodych kobiet. Wiele z nich decyduje

się na wyjazd do miasta w poszukiwaniu pracy, co z kolei oznacza starzenie się ludności wiejskiej, spadek przyrostu naturalnego i ogólne pogorszenie warunków życia mieszkańców wsi.

W związku z tym, popieram założenie, żeby w nowym rozporządzeniu EFRROW przewidziano specjalne środki mające na celu wsparcie kobiet w przyszłym okresie programowania na lata 2014-2020. Może to przynieść korzystne skutki dla zatrudnienia kobiet na obszarach wiejskich. Opowiadam się także za zapewnieniem, w ramach systemów socjalnych, odpowiednich świadczeń dla kobiet mieszkających na obszarach wiejskich. Muszą one uwzględniać gorszą sytuację zarobkową kobiet, co rzutuje na ich uprawnienia emerytalne.

2-221

Brian Simpson (S&D), in writing. – The EPLP supports the aim of Elisabeth Jeggle's report 'Role of Women in agriculture and rural areas' to highlight the sector specific problems faced by women working in agriculture and many of the measures proposed to strengthen their position. The report addresses the specific needs of women working in agriculture, by proposing a series of recommendations which take account both of their living conditions and their role and contribution to the development of the rural economy. However, the EPLP does not agree with the Paragraph 4, which speaks against further reducing the proportion of the total budget accounted by agricultural expenditure. We would like to see significant reprioritisation within the Multiannual Financial Framework to fully fund Europe 2020 priorities that have the greatest impact on raising employment and growth levels.

2-222

Marc Tarabella (S&D), par écrit. – Je suis satisfait de l'adoption du rapport de Mme Jeggle, dans lequel je me suis personnellement impliqué. En effet, la PAC a une valeur sociale en reconnaissant aux femmes un rôle fondamental dans la conservation des perspectives d'avenir en matière de vie et de prospérité en région rurale (considérant que 41 % des 14,6 millions de personnes occupées dans l'agriculture de l'Union européenne sont des femmes).

Il s'agit notamment de promouvoir l'attitude entrepreneuriale et les compétences des femmes dans l'agriculture, d'équiper les zones rurales d'infrastructures modernes qui leur permettent de concilier vie professionnelle et vie familiale (via la création de crèches, par exemple), de viser une plus grande représentativité des femmes au sein des organes politiques, économiques et sociaux du secteur agricole (en visant clairement une parité absolue), de mettre en place une sécurité sociale adéquate pour les femmes travaillant dans l'agriculture ainsi que d'assurer la propriété partagée des exploitations agricoles. Si "la première égalité, c'est l'équité", la reconnaissance du rôle des femmes dans l'agriculture prend toute sa dimension.

2-223

Thomas Ulmer (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Ich habe dem Bericht zugestimmt. Weiterhin ist für den ländlichen Raum eine aktive Förderpolitik notwendig, um Frauen bessere Erwerbschancen und Perspektiven zu bieten. Qualifizierte Landwirtinnen müssen vielseitig ausgebildet sein und unternehmerisch handeln und denken können. Dazu gehört auf dem Land eine optimale Infrastruktur in den Bereichen Bildung, Weiterbildung, Schulen und Kinderbetreuung ebenso wie der uneingeschränkte Zugang zu modernen Informationstechnologien. Weiterhin müssen Frauennetzwerke und der Zugang von Unternehmerinnen zu Krediten und Investitionsmöglichkeiten erweitert werden.

2-224

Angelika Werthmann (NI), *schriftlich*. – Ich habe für den Bericht der Kollegin gestimmt. Der Bericht hebt deutlich hervor, welchen großen Beitrag Frauen in den vergangenen Jahren dazu geleistet haben, eine nachhaltige Entwicklung des ländlichen Raumes voranzutreiben und eine Diversifizierung und Marktanpassung der Betriebe zu erreichen. Damit aber Frauen eine Perspektive auf dem Lande geboten wird, muss die Gemeinsame Agrarpolitik vermehrt frauenspezifische Aspekte mitberücksichtigen, unter anderem (wie im Bericht ausgeführt), indem spezifische Bildungs- und Beratungskonzepte angeboten werden und infrastrukturtechnische Hilfestellung geboten wird.

2-225

Report: Marian-Jean Marinescu (A7-0054/2011)

2-226

George Becali (NI), *în scris*. – Am votat în favoarea raportului colegului nostru privind acordarea asistenței financiare solicitate de Lituania, Slovacia și Bulgaria pentru închiderea unor centrale nucleare. E simplu de constatat că, dacă nu alocăm resurse corespunzătoare, ne putem confrunta cu consecințe extrem de grave asupra mediului și sănătății umane. Sigur că resursele alocate trebuie gestionate corect și transparent. E grav că nu avem o echipă de coordonare și expertiză UE unică pentru toate cele 3 proiecte care să supravegheze elaborarea unui plan și a unui calendar clar, utilizarea corectă a sumelor deja alocate și care sunt necesitățile pentru finalizarea închiderilor în condiții sigure.

2-227

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), *por escrito*. – La desgracia de Japón nos ha hecho reflexionar a todos sobre la seguridad nuclear. Las ayudas al cierre de las centrales de Lituania, Eslovaquia y Bulgaria que disponían de tecnología obsoleta contribuyen a atenuar las consecuencias del gasto excepcional que supone el cierre anticipado de las mismas para 2013. La ayuda va dirigida a la mejora medioambiental y la modernización de nuevos sistemas eléctricos y a la mejora de la seguridad del suministro. He apoyado esta iniciativa porque este debe ser también el futuro para otras centrales nucleares europeas con tecnologías obsoletas.

2-228

Vito Bonsignore (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Ho votato a favore della relazione del collega Marinescu che pone

l'accento su un problema oggi di grande attualità. Alla luce di quanto accaduto in Giappone, infatti, ci si interroga ora sulla sicurezza delle centrali nucleari esistenti e funzionanti anche in Europa.

L'impegno preso da Lituania, Bulgaria e Slovacchia in sede di negoziati di adesione all'UE, vale a dire smantellare i vecchi reattori nucleari per i quali non era possibile un adeguamento agli standard di sicurezza minimi richiesti, deve essere un impegno sostenuto e coerente a fronte del quale l'Unione europea ha stabilito da tempo e assicurato programmi di sostegno e finanziamento. Auspicio che i lavori di smantellamento procedano con sollecitudine e garantiscano la massima sicurezza per i cittadini e per l'ambiente. Mi auguro altresì che si riescano a recuperare i ritardi in parte cumulati e terminare le operazioni entro i termini stabiliti.

Mi preme infine sottolineare, al di là dei casi specifici, la necessità di provvedere a controlli di verifica anche per altri reattori presenti in Europa, responsabilizzando le istituzioni nella gestione della sicurezza sia per gli impianti esistenti sia per i nuovi, se in futuro se ne dovessero costruire.

2-229

Robert Dušek (S&D), *písemně*. – Zpráva o účinnosti financování EU v oblasti vyřazování jaderných elektráren z provozu v nových členských státech předkládá souhrn provedeného financování ze strany EU pro odpojení a demontáž jaderných elektráren Ignalina v Litvě, Bohunice na Slovensku a Kozloduj v Bulharsku. Litva, Slovensko a Bulharsko se v rámci jednání o přistoupení do EU zavázaly uzavřít a následně vyřadit z provozu jmenované jaderné elektrárny, které dle jednání G7 nebylo možno v rámci přijatelných finančních nákladů modernizovat a ve kterých nebylo možno zajistit minimální normy bezpečnosti. EU se zavázala financovat toto uzavření a vyřazování z provozu a finanční rámec plní. Vítám, že EU může podobné aktivity podporovat. Vyřazování starých a málo bezpečných jaderných elektráren v Evropě je nezbytností pro udržitelný život a zdraví evropských občanů.

Doufám, že budou podobně uzavřeny a vyřazeny z provozu také nejstarší jaderné elektrárny ve Francii. Německo se k podobnému kroku po havárii v Japonsku ihned odhodlalo. Pro přijetí zprávy budu hlasovat, neboť je nutné dokončit proces uzavření a vyřazení z provozu jaderných elektráren Ignalina, Bohunice a Kozloduj za odpovídající finanční spoluúčasti EU.

2-230

Ida Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Sabemos que a idade média dos reatores em funcionamento nas centrais nucleares, existentes em cerca de metade dos Estados-Membros da União Europeia, é relativamente elevada, o que nos coloca perante a necessidade de desmantelamento de alguns destes reatores, por razões de segurança e de defesa e salvaguarda da saúde das populações e do ambiente.

No caso dos novos Estados-Membros, confrontados que foram com exigências de desmantelamento de diversas unidades, parece-nos correcto que possam contar com o apoio comunitário para concretizar, de forma adequada e segura, os processos de desmantelamento.

Estes processos não devem descurar a necessária manutenção e vigilância após o encerramento, o tratamento dos resíduos, a sua armazenagem e descontaminação, a requalificação ambiental das instalações e o apoio à substituição da capacidade de produção energética das centrais desmanteladas, dando especial atenção à sustentabilidade ambiental e à eficiência energética.

Por último, registe-se que também devem ser tidas em conta as consequências sociais destes processos, garantindo, para além de todas as condições de segurança - antes, durante e depois do desmantelamento - aos trabalhadores, também a salvaguarda do emprego e de outros direitos dos trabalhadores.

2-231

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – Paragraph 7 of the Marinescu report notes that the decommissioning of certain nuclear power stations in Lithuania, Slovakia and Bulgaria ‘should be assigned the highest priority in the interests of the safety and health of all the people of Europe’. I fully agree with that statement but would go further: a complete move away from nuclear power in all Member States would be in the interests of the safety and health of our people.

2-232

David Martin (S&D), *in writing*. – I voted for this report which deals with the three countries, Lithuania, Slovakia and Bulgaria, that operated old soviet design nuclear reactors which the international community, in line with the G7 multilateral programme of action adopted at the Munich G7 summit in 1992, concluded could not be upgraded to meet the minimum required safety standards at an economically acceptable cost. In the context of the negotiations for accession to the European Union, the three countries took the commitment to close and subsequently decommission these nuclear reactors on fixed dates. In recognition of the fact that the early closure represented an exceptional financial burden and as act of solidarity, the European Union committed itself to provide adequate additional financial assistance for decommissioning these reactor units until the end of 2013.

2-233

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL), *par écrit*. – Ce rapport traite du démantèlement de centrales nucléaires vétustes qui représentent un danger immédiat pour la santé de toutes les Européennes et de tous les Européens. Il ne remet en cause qu'à demi-mot, le volet dit "énergétique" de l'assistance financière de l'UE à ce démantèlement.

Ce parlement doit condamner clairement ces financements de nouvelles centrales nucléaires. Il ne le fait pas, pas plus qu'il ne demande la pourtant nécessaire sortie du nucléaire. Quelques jours à peine après la catastrophe

de Fukushima, c'est faire preuve d'un aveuglement criminel. J'appelle à la mise en place immédiate d'un plan européen de sortie du nucléaire. Je vote pour, en pensant au financement du démantèlement des centrales concernées par ce rapport.

2-234

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Nachrüstungen, um den vorgeschriebenen minimalen Sicherheitsanforderungen zu entsprechen, wären für einige atomare Reaktoren in Litauen, der Slowakei und Bulgarien gar nicht oder nur zu unwirtschaftlich hohen Kosten möglich gewesen. Mit dem EU-Beitritt wurden den mittel- und osteuropäischen Staaten Stilllegungsbeihilfen für schrottreife Reaktoren gewährt. Bis zum Jahr 2009 wurden rund 1.300 Mio. Euro an Litauen (Ignalina), die Slowakei (Bohunice V1) und Bulgarien (Kosloduj) ausgezahlt. Bis Ende 2013 ist die EU zu weiteren Zahlungen verpflichtet. Im Zuge der russisch-ukrainischen Gaskrise erwog die Slowakei eine Reaktivierung des stillgelegten Schrott-AKW Bohunice, um den durch ausbleibende russische Gaslieferungen entstandenen Energiemangel auszugleichen. Japan hat uns gezeigt, wie leicht ein AKW außer Kontrolle geraten kann. Daher ist es umso wichtiger, dass Schrottreaktoren stillgelegt werden, zugleich aber auch Alternativen aufgebaut werden, um eine Reaktivierung über die Hintertür zu verhindern. Ich habe also für den Bericht gestimmt.

2-235

Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), *în scris*. – Indiscutabil, este în interesul siguranței și al sănătății tuturor cetățenilor Europei ca UE și statele membre să acorde prioritate maximă dezafectării centralelor nucleare vizate din noile state membre. Dar o atenție egală ar trebui acordată și eliminării pericolelor din proximitatea imediată a Uniunii Europene, iar aici atrag atenția asupra urgenței identificării și mobilizării a fondurilor necesare pentru construirea unui nou sarcofag masiv peste reactorul centralei de la Cernobîl care a explodat în 1986.

2-236

Rolandas Paksas (EFD), *raštu*. – Pritariu šiai rezoliucijai dėl ES lėšų panaudojimo branduolinių elektrinių eksploatavimo nutraukimui Lietuvoje, Slovakijoje ir Bulgarijoje veiksmingumo ir efektyvumo. Visų pirma reikia stengtis, kad visi eksploatavimo nutraukimo darbai būtų atlikti laiku tinkamai įgyvendinant visas reikiamas saugumo priemones ir užkertant kelią net minimaliam pavojui žmonių sveikatai ir aplinkai. Jei jau pasiryžome nutraukti Ignalinos ir kitų atominių elektrinių eksploatavimą, visi finansiniai resursai, skirti šiam procesui, turi būti naudojami pagal paskirtį laikantis skaidrumo ir efektyvumo principo. Nacionalinės vadžios institucijos kuo skubiau turi užbaigti detaliusius eksploatavimo nutraukimo planus. Manau, kad Europos Audito Rūmų atlikto audito rezultatai parodys lėšų panaudojimo tikslus ir jų veiksmingumą. Turime dėti visas pastangas, kad išmontavimo ir eksploatavimo nutraukimo atliekų tvarkymo darbai prasidėtų iki 2013 m. Manau, kad tikslinga nustatyti pareigą Komisijai pateikti detalų

finansavimo planą Europos Parlamentui bei nustatyti atsakomybę už Europos Sąjungos paramos panaudojimą. Atsižvelgiant į tai, kad valstybių fonduose, skirtuose branduolinių elektrinių eksploatavimo nutraukimui, nėra sukaupta pakankamai planuotų sumų, yra tikslinga į parengtas strategijas ir planus įtraukti naujas veiklos kryptis bei numatyti atitinkamai papildomų ES lėšų.

2-237

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), in writing. – The three countries, Lithuania, Slovakia and Bulgaria, operated old soviet-design nuclear reactors that the international community, in line with the G7 multilateral programme of action adopted at the Munich G7 summit in 1992, concluded could not be upgraded to meet the minimum required safety standards at an economically acceptable cost. In the context of the negotiations for accession to the European Union, the three countries took the commitment to close and subsequently decommission these nuclear reactors on fixed dates. In recognition of the fact that the early closure represented an exceptional financial burden and as act of solidarity, the European Union committed itself to provide adequate additional financial assistance for decommissioning these reactor units until the end of 2013.

2-238

Licia Ronzulli (PPE), per iscritto. – Ho votato a favore di questa relazione perché ritengo di importanza prioritaria mantenere alta l'attenzione sullo stato di disattivazione delle centrali nucleari di Lituania, Slovacchia e Bulgaria dove, al momento del loro ingresso nell'Unione europea, erano ancora attivi vecchi reattori nucleari di progettazione sovietica, per i quali non era possibile un adeguamento ai più recenti standard di sicurezza a costi sostenibili.

Dopo il recente disastro in Giappone, non è più possibile attardarsi su simili procedure per la sicurezza di tutti i cittadini europei e non solo, e anche gli eccezionali oneri finanziari da assolvere al riguardo non possono più essere una scusante per eventuali ritardi. Per questo motivo, l'Unione europea si è impegnata a fornire un'adeguata assistenza finanziaria per la disattivazione di questi reattori fino alla fine del 2013. Ogni ulteriore ritardo non potrà essere tollerato nell'interesse dell'intera Comunità europea e dovrà essere immediatamente denunciato in tutte le sedi più opportune.

2-239

Oreste Rossi (EFD), per iscritto. – A seguito del disastro nucleare causato dalla centrale del Giappone, legato anche al mancato adeguamento a standard di sicurezza attuali, possiamo dire di aver fatto un'ottima scelta quando, in sede di negoziati di adesione, si erano fissate date di chiusura tassative per tre vecchie centrali nucleari di progettazione sovietica in Lituania, Slovacchia e Bulgaria.

La data di chiusura definitiva e della relativa messa in sicurezza era prevista per il 2013, con un importo di spese a carico dell'Unione europea di quasi tre miliardi di euro. La relazione invita la Commissione, a seguito

dei ritardi e dell'aumento dei costi relativi la messa in sicurezza delle tre centrali, a una maggiore sorveglianza e a verificare quale sia la situazione attuale e quali siano le previsioni sull'attuazione delle diverse fasi del processo di disattivazione in base al calendario iniziale.

2-240

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), schriftelijk. – Litouwen, Slowakije en Bulgarije beschikten over oude, ten tijde van de Sovjet-Unie ontworpen kerncentrales waarvan de internationale gemeenschap vond dat ze niet tegen economisch verantwoorde kosten tot minimumveiligheidsvoorwaarden konden worden opgewaardeerd. De toetredingsonderhandelingen werden gebruikt om de drie kerncentrales op vooraf afgesproken data te sluiten en vervolgens te ontmantelen. Over de periode 1999-2013 werd daarvoor 2,7 miljard euro uitgetrokken. Eind 2009 werd daarvan al 1,8 miljard euro vastgelegd. Toch is er een aanzienlijke vertraging bij de uitvoering van de ontmantelingsprogramma's. Het Europees Parlement vreest dat deze vertraging tot gevaren voor het milieu en de menselijke gezondheid zal leiden. Ik ben tevreden met dit verslag ook al omdat het voltallig Europees Parlement instemde met mijn in de Commissie begrotingscontrole ingediende amendementen waarin wordt aangedrongen op absolute transparantie bij het beheer van de fondsen en de besteding van de middelen daaruit.

Het Europees Parlement stemde ook in met mijn verzoek aan de Commissie om jaarlijks aan het Europees Parlement verslag uit te brengen en mee te delen of de prognose dat de uitgetrokken financiële middelen de komende drie jaar kunnen worden geabsorbeerd, waarheid wordt. Dit verslag vormt de basis om dit proces van zeer nabij te volgen en dat is vanuit menigerlei oogpunt een goede zaak.

2-241

Thomas Ulmer (PPE), schriftlich. – Ich habe dem Bericht zugestimmt. Der Rückbau der Anlagen in Ignalia, Bohunice und Kosloduj verläuft allerdings zu zögerlich, hier ist mehr Engagement von Seiten der nationalen Betreiber zu fordern. Dringend sind für alle Mitgliedstaaten gemeinsame Standards auch für den Rückbau der Anlagen anzumahnen. Verantwortlichkeiten müssen klar definiert werden. Immerhin haben sich die 3 Staaten Litauen, Slowakei und Bulgarien in den Aufnahmeverhandlungen zur EU bereit erklärt, diese 3 unsicheren Kernkraftwerke vom Netz zu nehmen.

2-242

Angelika Werthmann (NI), schriftlich. – Ich habe dem Bericht über die Stilllegung der drei Kernkraftwerke in den Mitgliedstaaten Litauen, Slowakei und Bulgarien zugestimmt. Da die Kernkraftreaktoren nicht einmal den minimalen Sicherheitsanforderungen entsprechen, war deren Abbau eine Bedingung bei den Beitrittsverhandlungen der drei Länder, und die Europäische Union verpflichtete sich, einen Teil der finanziellen Kosten für die Demontage zu übernehmen. Besonders erfreulich ist in diesem Zusammenhang, dass mit der Stilllegung des

Kernkraftwerkes Ignalina in Litauen das einzige Werk des Landes vom Netz genommen wurde.

2-243

Report: Barbara Matera (A7-0060/2011)

2-244

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), por escrito. – La ayuda incluye a 460 de los 664 despedidos por la empresa UNILEVER CR, que se dedicaba al sector del comercio al por menor. el 52,4% de las afectadas son mujeres. El 13% tiene más de 54 años y el 9,1% menos de 24. Conviene destacar que las medidas que ayudarán a la formación de los despedidos serán cofinanciadas por la empresa, que no elude su responsabilidad, y serán puestas en práctica por contratistas y empresas que trabajen en su nombre.

2-245

Jan Březina (PPE), písemně. – Je úspěchem EP, že rozpočet na rok 2011 poprvé vykazuje prostředky na platby ve výši 47 608 950 EUR v rozpočtové položce EGF. EGF byl totiž vytvořen jako oddělený konkrétní nástroj s vlastními cíli a lhůtami, a zaslouží si proto vlastní přidělené prostředky, čímž se zabrání převodům z jiných rozpočtových položek, k nimž docházelo v minulosti a jež by mohly bránit dosahování různých politických cílů. Domnívám se, že EGF prokázal svůj smysl, pouze mne mrzí, že dosud není ve větší míře využíván novými členskými zeměmi. V konečném důsledku tak může vzniknout dojem, že účelem EGF je dostat do starých členských států EU prostředky z rozpočtu EU, na které byly dříve zvyklé například v rámci politiky soudržnosti. Věřím, že historicky první česká žádost o dotaci z EGF je onou pověstnou první vlašťovkou, po které budou následovat další, protože i český průmysl byl postižen globalizací a světovou finanční krizí a i čeští propuštění zaměstnanci si zaslouží evropskou pomoc při snaze o ztížené uplatnění na trhu práce.

2-246

Zuzana Brzobohatá (S&D), písemně. – Evropský fond pro přízpůsobení se globalizaci byl v roce 2006 zřízen jako flexibilní nástroj pro rychlé poskytnutí jednorázové, časově omezené individuální podpory na pomoc pracovníkům, kteří byli propuštěni v důsledku globalizace či finanční a hospodářské krize. Po vypuknutí světové hospodářské a finanční krize jde o první případ uvolnění prostředků z tohoto fondu pro Českou republiku, a to konkrétně na zmírnění důsledků propuštění 634 zaměstnanců společnosti Unilever, která zavřela továrnu v obci Nelahozeves. S ohledem na skutečnost, že 52,4 % propuštěných jsou ženy a více než 13 % propuštěných pracovníků je starších 54 let, považují schválení uvolnění prostředků pro Českou republiku za velmi správné, a také proto jsem zprávu podpořila při hlasování.

2-247

Anne Delvaux (PPE), par écrit. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce rapport, mais également en faveur de l'amendement qui invite à une révision du Fonds européen de mondialisation (FEM). Car, ce que je regrette, c'est que le FEM, sous sa forme actuelle, n'impose pas d'enquête

sur la santé financière, l'évasion fiscale ou la situation en matière d'aides d'État des sociétés multinationales dont la restructuration justifie l'intervention du FEM. J'estime que cette question devrait être abordée lors de la prochaine révision du règlement FEM, sans remettre en question l'accès des travailleurs licenciés au FEM.

2-248

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Mais uma mobilização do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização (FEG). Desta feita, para apoiar os trabalhadores despedidos da fábrica da multinacional Unilever na República Checa.

Como noutras ocasiões, votámos favoravelmente. Mas para além das reservas que sempre fazemos nestas situações, existem particularidades neste processo que merecem ser salientadas: a Comissão Europeia limitou-se a afirmar que a Unilever não recebeu qualquer auxílio estatal ou proveniente de Fundos comunitários para a abertura da fábrica na República Checa, antes ou depois da adesão à UE. Mas a Comissão não informou, como devia e lhe foi solicitado, sobre o que se passa noutras fábricas do grupo, argumentando com a sua não obrigatoriedade no âmbito do Regulamento do FEG.

Mais do que o que se passou no caso concreto da unidade na República Checa, interessa conhecer e avaliar o comportamento do grupo Unilever, a nível da União Europeia. Lamentamos, por isso, a ausência desta informação relativa às ajudas públicas concedidas a este grupo, bem como, em geral, às empresas multinacionais cuja reestruturação justifique a intervenção do FEG.

2-249

Ida Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Esta é mais uma mobilização do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização (FEG) que, neste caso, pretende beneficiar os trabalhadores que foram despedidos da fábrica checa da multinacional Unilever. A posição da Comissão Europeia foi, neste campo, muito polémica, tendo em conta que se limitou a afirmar que a Unilever não recebeu qualquer auxílio estatal ou apoio financeiro de Fundos europeus para a abertura da fábrica na República Checa, antes ou depois da adesão à UE, mas não deu informações sobre o que se passa noutras fábricas do grupo, argumentando com a sua não obrigatoriedade no âmbito do Regulamento do FEG.

Daí que no debate na Comissão do Emprego e dos Assuntos Sociais tivesse chamado a atenção para o facto de nenhuma informação estar disponível em relação ao que se passa com o grupo Unilever, a nível da União Europeia, e tivesse proposto que na revisão do Regulamento se tenha em conta esta questão para que haja um exame à situação financeira, incluindo ajudas públicas das empresas multinacionais cuja reestruturação justifique a intervenção do FEG, sem comprometer o acesso dos trabalhadores despedidos ao respectivo Fundo.

Daí o nosso voto favorável a estas propostas.

2-250

Jiří Havel (S&D), *pisemně*. – Doporučuji hlasovat ve prospěch zprávy paní Barbary Materové o uvolnění prostředků z Evropského fondu pro přizpůsobení se globalizaci (EGF), v jehož rámci je tentokrát podána vůbec první žádost o podporu z České republiky. Považuji za důležité zdůraznit význam tohoto fondu, u jehož kolébky stál právě český sociálnědemokratický komisař Vladimír Špidla. Finanční a následující hospodářské zemětřesení připravilo řadu lidí o zaměstnání v celé Evropě. Prostředky z EGF financují jediné ta opatření, která pomohou najít nové uplatnění na pracovním trhu lidem, jež byli propuštěni, přihlásili se do programů odborného vzdělávání a získali znalosti odpovídající potřebám trhu práce nebo se stali osobami samostatně výdělečně činnými. Dle zprávy paní Materové mohu shrnout, že všechna zmíněná kritéria společnost Unilever splnila. K uzavření výrobního závodu v Nelahozevsi byla společnost Unilever ČR nucena přistoupit pod vlivem ekonomické krize a propouštění postihlo většinu zaměstnanců.

Všem odcházejícím nabídl Unilever program komplexní podpory při hledání nového zaměstnání a při vedení programu firma těsně spolupracovala s místním úřadem práce. Proto mohu souhlasit s uvolněním prostředků dle údajů v této zprávě a s návrhem Komise vyplatit České republice částku 323 820 EUR z rezervy EGF.

2-251

David Martin (S&D), *in writing*. – I welcome this report which releases funds from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund to assist workers made redundant in the Czech Republic. The application relates to 634 redundancies that occurred following the closure of a Unilever plant in Nelahozeves in the last quarter of 2009. Four hundred and sixty redundant workers will benefit from personalised measures supported by EGAF funding to a total of EUR 0.32 million.

2-252

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL), *par écrit*. – C'est en pensant aux travailleuses et aux travailleurs tchèques sacrifiés sur l'autel de la mondialisation que je m'abstiens. La situation précaire dans laquelle ils se trouvent n'est rien d'autre que la conséquence des politiques néolibérales de l'Union européenne que ce fonds avalise et accompagne. Je vote contre, tant l'aumône accordée aux victimes de ces politiques est dérisoire comparée aux profits engrangés par ailleurs.

2-253

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Der Europäische Fonds zur Anpassung an die Globalisierung wurde errichtet, um Arbeitnehmer, die in Folge der globalen Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise entlassen worden sind, zu schützen. Die Tschechische Republik hat Unterstützung für 634 Entlassungen beantragt. Es ist gut und richtig, eine personenbezogene Unterstützung für Arbeitnehmer zu leisten, die infolge der Globalisierung und der Wirtschaftskrise entlassen wurden, wodurch die Wiedereingliederung in den Arbeitsmarkt unterstützt wird. Daher habe ich dafür gestimmt.

2-254

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – As usually in this type of reports, the EP:

1. Requests the institutions involved to make the necessary efforts to accelerate the mobilisation of the EGF; appreciates in this sense the improved procedure put in place by the Commission, following the EP request for accelerating the release of grants, aimed at presenting to the budgetary authority the Commission's assessment on the eligibility of an EGF application together with the proposal to mobilise the Fund; hopes that further improvements in the procedure will be reached in the framework of the upcoming reviews of the Fund;

2. Recalls the institutions' commitment to ensuring a smooth and rapid procedure for the adoption of the decisions on the mobilisation of the EGF, providing one-off, time-limited individual support geared to helping workers who have been made redundant as a result of globalisation and the financial and economic crisis; points out the role that the EGF can play in the reintegration of workers made redundant into the labour market; however, calls for an evaluation on the long-term integration of these workers into the labour market as a direct result of the EGF-funded measures.

2-255

Licia Ronzulli (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Lo scorso 15 febbraio la Commissione ha adottato una proposta di decisione sulla mobilitazione del FEG a favore della Repubblica ceca, al fine di sostenere il reinserimento nel mercato del lavoro dei lavoratori licenziati a causa della crisi finanziaria ed economica globale. La domanda in esame riguarda 634 esuberanti, tutti ammessi all'assistenza del Fondo, presso l'azienda Unilever operante nel settore del commercio al dettaglio nella regione NUTS II di Srední Čechy, durante il periodo di riferimento di quattro mesi che va dal 16 settembre 2009 al 16 gennaio 2010. Il mio voto positivo alla risoluzione odierna ribadisce il parere favorevole già espresso in sede di commissione per l'occupazione e gli affari sociali.

2-256

Olga Sehnalová (S&D), *pisemně*. – Uvolnění prostředků z EGF podpoří opětovné začlenění 460 pracovníků postižených uzavřením podniku UNILEVER v obci Nelahozeves ve středních Čechách v České republice. Vzhledem k tomu, že se bude jednat o významnou pomoc při řešení sociálních dopadů v souvislosti s hromadným propouštěním v této malé obci, hlasovala jsem pro přijetí zprávy.

2-257

Angelika Werthmann (NI), *schriftlich*. – Den Änderungsantrag, den die S&D-Fraktion eingebracht hat und der verlangt, dass bei der Vergabe von Geldern aus dem EGF ein Unternehmen als Ganzes bewertet werden muss, kann ich nur unterstützen. Diesbezügliche Forderungen habe ich bereits mehrmals und nachdrücklich im Budgetausschuss gefordert. Dem Bericht insgesamt konnte ich dennoch nicht zustimmen. Die tschechische Unilever ČR spol.sr.o, die im Einzelhandelssektor tätig ist, hat 634 ArbeiterInnen entlassen

und suchte um Unterstützungsmaßnahmen für diese gesamte entlassene Belegschaft an (üblicherweise werden die individuellen Maßnahmen nur für einen Teil der entlassenen Belegschaft gebraucht, um deren Wiedereingliederung in den Arbeitsmarkt zu unterstützen). Wie bereits in jedem Bericht, in dem das Parlament EGF-Förderungen genehmigt, hervorgehoben wird, dürfen die Förderungen aus dem Strukturfonds nicht als Ersatz für Maßnahmen herangezogen werden, die gemäß den Tarifverträgen den Unternehmen obliegen.

2-258

Report: Jörg Leichtfried (A7-0028/2011)

2-259

George Becali (NI), *în scris*. – Am votat acest raport deoarece controlul exporturilor produselor cu dublă utilizare reprezintă un factor-cheie pentru neproliferarea armelor, inclusiv a armelor de distrugere în masă. Având în vedere volumul mare al schimburilor comerciale transfrontaliere în Uniunea Europeană, punerea în practică a controalelor exporturilor UE de produse cu dublă utilizare se bazează pe măsuri preventive, cum ar fi impunerea unor cerințe de autorizare a exporturilor și a unor proceduri de înregistrare vamală. Controalele exporturilor au un impact puternic asupra politicii comerciale a UE, întrucât pot afecta peste 10% din totalul exporturilor UE.

2-260

George Sabin Cutaș (S&D), *în scris*. – Am votat pentru Propunerea de modificare a regulamentului, deoarece consider că punctele nou introduse vor conduce la o mai mare transparență și democratizare a regimului UE pentru produsele cu dublă utilizare. Astfel, Parlamentul European va putea fi implicat în actualizarea listelor pentru produsele supuse controlului de către regimurile internaționale. Momentan, aceste liste sunt transpuse în mod aproape automat în legislația UE, fără ca Parlamentul să aibă un cuvânt de spus. De asemenea, Grupul de coordonare pentru produse cu dublă utilizare este chemat să prezinte un raport anual Parlamentului, în așa fel încât acesta din urmă să fie pe deplin informat asupra evoluției controlului produselor și tehnologiilor cu utilizare atât civilă, cât și militară.

2-261

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Os controlos da exportação de produtos de dupla utilização têm vindo a ser objecto de medidas ao nível da UE. O principal instrumento de controlo das exportações é o Regulamento (CE) n.º 428/2009, de 2009. Este regulamento introduziu o alargamento do âmbito dos controlos das actividades de corretagem e do trânsito. Apesar de, no relatório, haver uma tentativa de introdução de um maior controlo democrático e de maior transparência, há algumas questões fulcrais que nos impedem de votar a favor.

Com a criação do Grupo de Coordenação da Dupla Utilização, presidido pela Comissão, é da responsabilidade desta a *lista dos exportadores, dos corretores e partes interessadas que foram consultadas de exportadores*. Passa a ser este grupo a decidir quais os

países com que se pode comercializar, retirando essa competência aos Estados-Membros, pondo assim em causa a sua soberania.

Outro aspecto é a entrada de Israel na lista de países de destino de produtos de dupla utilização. Lembremos, por exemplo, os projectos de investigação conjuntos financiados pelo 7.º Programa-Quadro de Investigação, em especial os que decorrem com a participação da Indústria Aeroespacial de Israel – o fabricante dos aviões não tripulados que foram utilizados no ataque à Faixa de Gaza em 2008/2009, causando a morte de dezenas de pessoas.

2-262

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Votámos favoravelmente o retorno à comissão parlamentar respectiva deste relatório para permitir que prossigam as negociações com o Conselho, tendo por base a proposta legislativa com as alterações hoje introduzidas pelo Parlamento Europeu.

Sabemos que a utilização de produtos e tecnologias civis para fins militares carece de uma abordagem que não se esgota no controlo das exportações dos chamados produtos de dupla utilização e de serviços relacionados.

Embora este controlo das exportações seja importante, devendo ser feito de forma criteriosa, sem pôr em causa o acesso dos países em desenvolvimento a produtos e tecnologias necessários ao seu desenvolvimento, é preciso aumentar a transparência de processos e possibilitar o seu escrutínio democrático.

Mas sublinhamos que, também neste domínio, se impõe a coerência com outras políticas da UE e os objectivos visados por este Regulamento. São conhecidos os projectos de investigação conjuntos financiados pelo 7.º Programa-Quadro de Investigação, em especial os que decorrem com a participação da Indústria Aeroespacial de Israel, o fabricante dos aviões não tripulados que foram utilizados no ataque à Faixa de Gaza em 2008/2009, causando a morte de dezenas de pessoas.

2-263

David Martin (S&D), *in writing*. – I welcome this report. Export controls of dual-use items, meaning goods which can be used for both civil and military purposes, have been the subject of EU-level actions for around 15 years. Controlling the export of dual-use goods is a key for the non-proliferation of arms, including weapons of mass destruction. Given the high volume of trade across the borders of the European Union, the enforcement of EU export controls on dual-use goods relies on preventive measures such as the imposition of export licensing requirements and customs registration procedures.

Export controls have a high impact on the EU's trade policy as they can affect more than 10% of all EU exports. The main EU export control tool is the Dual-use Regulation (EC) No 428/2009 of 5 May 2009, which entered into force on 27 August 2009. This new Regulation introduced a number of significant changes

to the scope of dual-use export controls in the European Union. These include the introduction of controls on brokering activities and transit with regard to dual-use items. The Dual-use Regulation includes regularly updated lists of controlled dual-use items that reflect those of the main international export control regimes.

2-264

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Die Ausfuhr von Gütern und Technologien mit doppeltem Verwendungszweck ist innerhalb der EU genau geregelt. Unter diesen Begriff fallen vor allem Güter und Technologien, die auch einem militärischen Zweck dienen können. Um Missbrauch in der Exportwirtschaft zu verhindern, gibt es vier Arten der Ausfuhrgenehmigungen: die allgemeine Ausfuhrgenehmigung der Gemeinschaft, nationale Ausfuhrgenehmigungen, weltweite Ausfuhrgenehmigungen und Einzelausfuhrgenehmigungen. Jede einzelne gilt innerhalb der EU.

Zudem gibt es noch internationale Ausfuhrkontrollregime, denen die EU verpflichtet ist und bei denen die Kommission versucht, das Standing der EU zu verbessern. Dazu zählen die Australische Gruppe, in der die Kommission Vollmitglied ist und an der sich jeder der 27 Staaten sowie die USA, Kanada, Japan, Südkorea und Australien beteiligen, die Gruppe der Kernmateriallieferländer, bei der die Kommission Beobachterstatus hat und sich die EU-27 mit den USA und Russland beteiligen, das Wassenaar-Abkommen, in dem die Kommission keinen Status besitzt, außer Zypern sämtliche EU-Mitgliedstaaten jedoch Vollmitglied sind, und das Trägertechnologie-Kontrollregime bei dem die Kommission auch keinen Status besitzt und nur 19 Mitgliedstaaten Vollmitglieder sind.

Um die Einhaltung des Subsidiaritätsprinzips nicht zu verletzen, habe ich entsprechend abgestimmt.

2-265

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – In AFET/SEDE, as green MEP as rapporteur, we were very successful. The AFET/SEDE opinion proposed to delete the Low Value Shipments CGEA because we were provided with good data proving that there is no positive correlation between a low price and a low security risk, an assumption on which the whole CGEA relied. On the contrary, some very cheap dual use items might be of great risk if they get into the wrong hands. We were also able to delete the part on 'Information Security' of EU007 because among the possible destinations were some non-democratic countries. We also managed to get a broad support in AFET/SEDE for strong wording on the need to respect human rights when it comes to the export of telecommunication equipment because interception technologies, digital data transfer devices for monitoring mobiles phones, etc. are part of this CGEA.

With regard to possible destinations of individual CGEAs we managed to exclude both Israel and India because of their unwillingness to become a State Party to the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). But the most contentious and important issue was the question of

whether it is sufficient to control, notify and register after the export has taken place or prior to the export.

2-266

Licia Ronzulli (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Il controllo delle esportazioni di prodotti a duplice uso, ossia dei beni che possono essere utilizzati sia per scopi civili che militari, costituisce l'oggetto di azioni intraprese a livello europeo da circa quindici anni. Tale controllo è fondamentale per contrastare la proliferazione degli armamenti, comprese le armi di distruzione di massa. Considerato l'elevato volume di scambi commerciali attraverso le frontiere dell'Unione europea, l'attuazione dei controlli sulle esportazioni UE di prodotti a duplice uso deve basarsi su misure preventive quali l'imposizione dell'obbligo di autorizzazione all'esportazione e di procedure di registrazione doganale.

L'approvazione di questa risoluzione costituisce un ulteriore passo in questa direzione. Ho votato a favore di questa relazione perché l'entrata in vigore del trattato di Lisbona fornisce una buona occasione per riaffermare il ruolo dell'Europa e il potere e le responsabilità del Parlamento europeo nel quadro istituzionale dell'UE in merito all'assunzione di questo genere di decisioni. Il regime va riorganizzato in modo più trasparente, mediante l'attuazione degli obblighi previsti dal trattato e attraverso l'adozione di una sua interpretazione congiunta da parte di Parlamento e Commissione nell'ambito del nuovo accordo quadro.

2-267

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE), *schriftelijk*. – De controle op de uitvoer van producten voor tweërlei gebruik - dat wil zeggen goederen die zowel voor civiele als voor militaire doelstellingen kunnen worden ingezet - is van zeer groot belang voor de non-proliferatie van wapens. Het voorliggende standpunt van het EP brengt terecht de verworvenheden van het Verdrag van Lissabon in de EU-wetgeving in. Het EP versterkt ook de democratische controle en de transparantie en het vergroot het gezicht van de EU bij de internationale exportcontroleregelingen. Positief is ook dat de Commissie verplicht wordt verslag uit te brengen over de werking van deze verordening, aangevuld met een uitgebreide effectbeoordeling.

Het moeilijkste discussiepunt tussen Raad, EP en Commissie in dit alles blijft echter de vraag wanneer de controle op de kennisgeving en het registreren van de export moet gebeuren: voor of na de feitelijke export. Wat mij betreft is het cruciaal deze controle voorafgaand aan het exportgebeuren te laten plaatsvinden. Controle achteraf zal in de praktijk er immers altijd toe leiden dat we achter de feiten blijven aanhollen. Het EP heeft zopas besloten enkel te gaan voor controles achteraf. Daarom heb ik uiteindelijk tegen de definitieve versie van het verslag gestemd.

2-268

Report: Yannick Jadot (A7-0364/2010)

2-269

David Martin (S&D), *in writing*. – I voted for this report. I view export credits as an important instrument

for supporting EU enterprises. In light of the increased demand for officially supported export credits, it is of the utmost importance that the newest OECD regulation of this instrument is introduced in Member States as soon as possible. Support for medium- and long-term export credits is a powerful tool which is not yet fully exploited in all Member States and needs to be encouraged. Export credits can help to create jobs by securing financing for projects which otherwise would have more restricted access to capital due to their non-market character. I agree with the rapporteur, who notes that any new legislation in this field must avoid the creation of any new red tape or bureaucracy which would add to already existing costs. European-level supervision of export credits should be introduced as an exception when a distortion of competition within the internal market occurs. The principle of subsidiarity must be upheld.

2-270

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL), par écrit. – Ce rapport demande que des "évaluations des incidences sociales et environnementales" accompagnent les octrois de crédits et d'assurances publiques aux exportations du secteur privé. Il demande aussi que les objectifs en matière de réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre ne soient pas affectés par ces projets. C'est un minimum.

Je vote contre, cependant, pour déplorer amèrement que la commission du commerce international ne cherche pas à se donner les moyens d'arriver à tenir des objectifs sociaux et écologiques dignes de ce nom. Libre concurrence, lutte contre le protectionnisme et empêchement de dénonciation des aides à l'exportation agricole sont autant d'aberrations en la matière que ce texte avalise.

2-271

Andreas Mölzer (NI), schriftlich. – Öffentlich-rechtliche bzw. öffentlich unterstützte Exportkreditagenturen sind wichtige Finanzgeber für die öffentliche Finanzierung privatwirtschaftlicher Projekte auch in Entwicklungsländern. Sie gewinnen in Zeiten angespannter Staatshaushalte noch an Bedeutung für Investitionen europäischer Unternehmen, sofern sie sich nicht mit Steuergeldern refinanzieren müssen. Da die Risikobewertung bei öffentlich-rechtlichen Exportkreditagenturen eine völlig andere ist als bei der Kreditvergabe seitens Privatbanken, kann es – wie das Beispiel China verdeutlicht – zu Wettbewerbsverzerrungen im internationalen Handel kommen. Aus diesem Grunde gibt es eine Reihe von Regulierungen wie OECD- und WTO-Übereinkommen, in denen Rückzahlungsfristen und ein Mindestprämienatz fixiert sind. Für die Bewertung, um Missbrauch auszuschließen und eine Refinanzierung aus Steuergeldern zu verhindern, sind Vorgaben für mehr Transparenz durch die EU-weite Pflicht zur Offenlegung von Jahresbilanzberichten etc. nötig. Ob mit den vorgeschlagenen Maßnahmen mehr Transparenz erreicht wird, ist fraglich. Ich habe mich der Stimme enthalten.

2-272

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), par écrit. – Comme l'a dit le rapporteur, Jadot, le vote d'aujourd'hui renforce la position du Parlement européen sur le sujet et envoie un signal fort au Conseil européen beaucoup trop timoré. Les agences de crédit à l'exportation constituent un important instrument pour l'UE, afin de soutenir le commerce et les investissements des entreprises européennes.

Mais il était urgent de s'attaquer au manque de transparence et de supervision européenne – notamment par le Parlement – entourant leurs activités, quand on sait que plusieurs centaines de millions d'euros transitent par elles chaque année et que les budgets nationaux sont soumis à de fortes contraintes budgétaires.

Moi aussi, je me réjouis que les députés se prononcent une nouvelle fois pour l'élimination progressive des subventions aux énergies fossiles, et encouragent donc la transition écologique, en accord avec les engagements européens et nationaux en matière de changement climatique.

2-273

Licia Ronzulli (PPE), per iscritto. – La maggior parte dei paesi industrializzati dispone di un'agenzia di credito all'esportazione. Tali agenzie rappresentano, nel loro complesso, la principale fonte mondiale di finanziamento ufficiale a favore di progetti del settore privato. Il sostegno finanziario di progetti industriali e infrastrutturali di notevole entità nei paesi in via di sviluppo da parte delle agenzie di credito all'esportazione è notevolmente superiore al finanziamento annuale combinato di tutte le banche multilaterali di sviluppo. Le agenzie facilitano il commercio legale laddove il mercato dei capitali privati è carente. Non dovendo pagare imposte né realizzare profitti, esse hanno una capacità di assorbire i rischi molto più elevata rispetto agli attori privati e beneficiano quindi di un margine di manovra più ampio rispetto alle banche private, anche sui crediti estesi.

Tuttavia, per lo stesso motivo, esse possono creare un'enorme distorsione del commercio se le loro operazioni di finanziamento non sono disciplinate da norme comuni. Ho votato a favore di questa relazione perché i crediti all'esportazione devono essere soggetti a condizioni di rimborso entro un certo termine e all'addebito di un tasso di premio minimo per coprire il rischio di mancato rimborso degli stessi.

2-274

Report: Eva-Britt Svensson (A7-0065/2011)

2-275

Roberta Angelilli (PPE), per iscritto. – In Europa, una donna su quattro è vittima di almeno qualche forma di violenza nell'arco della sua vita. Il costo annuale della violenza si aggira intorno ai 33 miliardi di euro, un dato da non sottovalutare.

Il rispetto del principio della parità di genere è un valore che viene costantemente disatteso scontrandosi con un'ampia gamma di violazioni dei diritti umani che

colpiscono le donne, penalizzandole nella loro salute fisica e psichica, nei loro diritti e nella loro posizione all'interno della società. I pochi dati a nostra disposizione non ci danno una visione globale del fenomeno, ma basta osservare il proprio ambito familiare o lavorativo per constatare come ancora non si riesca a proteggere le donne dalla violenza.

Apprezzo l'impegno assunto dalla Commissione a presentare nel 2011-2012 la "Comunicazione su una strategia di lotta alla violenza contro le donne, la violenza domestica e la mutilazione genitale femminile", che dovrà essere seguita da un piano di azione dell'UE, ma spero anche che venga adottato un approccio politico globale, fatto di azioni giuridiche, giudiziarie, esecutive e sanitarie che possano ridurre efficacemente questo tipo di violenza e le conseguenze che essa comporta, purtroppo anche nei confronti di quel 26% di bambini e dei giovani che hanno segnalato di aver subito violenze fisiche nella loro infanzia.

2-276

Liam Aylward (ALDE), *i scríbhinn*. – Ní mór don chomhphobal idirnáisiúnta cur chuige trasteorainn a chur i bhfeidhm d'fhonn an foréigean in aghaidh na mban a chomhrac. Níl aon amhras ann ach go sáraíonn an foréigean in aghaidh na mban bunchearta agus bunshaoirsí na mban, cearta i leith slándála agus dinít an duine go háirithe. Ní foláir do na Ballstáit an CEDAW (Coinbhinsiún na Náisiún Aontaithe um deireadh a chur le gach Cineál Leatrom in aghaidh Ban), atá sé mar aidhm aige cearta agus saoirsí na mban a áirithiú, a chur i bhfeidhm. Faoi Chonradh Liospóin tá sé de chumas ag an AE forálacha maidir leis an dlí cóiriúil a thabhairt isteach, agus déanann an Conradh tagairt ar leith ar gháinneáil ar dhaoine agus ar an dteacht i dtír gnéasach ar leanáil agus ar mhná. Vótáil mé i bhfabhar na tuarascála seo toisc go gcreidim go bhfuil sé in am ag an AE aghaidh cheart a thabhairt ar an tsaincheist seo agus deashampla a léiriú tríd an reachtaíocht agus an tacaíocht atá ag teastáil chun go gcuirfí deireadh leis an bhforéigean in aghaidh na mban. Ní mór cur chuige ilghnéitheach a ghlacadh d'fhonn éifeacht na mbeart polaitiúil, sóisialta agus dlíthiúil atá á gcur i bhfeidhm a chinntiú.

2-277

George Becali (NI), *în scris*. – Am votat acest raport deoarece violența împotriva femeilor este o problemă atât la nivel internațional, cât și la nivel european. În acest raport se prezintă un pachet de măsuri absolut necesare pentru a garanta o viață decentă femeilor din Europa. Protecția juridică cuprinzătoare și coerentă a integrității femeilor are o importanță capitală. În legislația de la nivelul UE este absolut necesar să se țină seama de vulnerabilitatea extremă a femeilor și copiilor care se confruntă cu violența în cadrul familial. Nu este, însă, suficient să se introducă sau să se aprobe o serie de acte legislative pentru protecția femeilor; urmărirea penală trebuie să devină mai eficientă.

Un domeniu cheie în care s-ar putea multiplica resursele este cel al formării autorităților de poliție din Europa. Poliția este primul organism de aplicare a legii cu care

intră în contact femeile care au fost victime ale violențelor. Una dintre măsurile practice care pot fi luate este instituirea în statele membre a unui număr de urgență pentru violența pe motive de gen. Femeile victime ale violențelor ar putea suna la acest număr pentru a obține asistență imediată.

2-278

Nessa Childers (S&D), *in writing*. – I voted for this report as the situation in Ireland mirrors the problem experienced across Europe. The National Crime Council in 2005 found that one in seven women in Ireland experienced severe abusive behaviour of a physical, sexual or emotional nature from a partner at some times in their lives. The impact of domestic and physical and/or sexual violence should not be underestimated, as it results in severe damage to individuals' physical and mental health giving rise to severe depression and even suicide. However Parliament's report also shows the cost to the exchequer as it is estimated that the cost to society of gender-based violence – in the form of spending on healthcare, the legal system and social services – is EUR 2 million per hour in total in all EU Member States.

In 2009, I had the privilege in becoming the first ambassador of Rape Crisis North East based in Dundalk. This support and counselling service is one of many across Ireland East. These NGOs offer vital support for victims of sexual and domestic violence, yet have to cope with a very difficult funding environment. I hope this report helps fight domestic violence in Europe.

2-279

Karima Delli (Verts/ALE), *par écrit*. – Le Parlement Européen a adopté, ce mardi 5 avril 2011, un rapport sur la lutte contre la violence à l'encontre des femmes. Ce texte revient sur la spécificité des violences faites aux femmes et aux jeunes filles par des hommes: c'est en effet l'un des freins les plus répandus et les plus pernicieux à l'égalité entre les femmes et les hommes. Le rapport d'aujourd'hui permettra de mettre en place un instrument de droit pénal sous la forme d'une directive de l'Union européenne pour lutter contre les violences fondées sur le genre. En effet, il établit une charte européenne, qui garantira un niveau d'assistance minimale incluant le droit à une aide juridique et à des services psychologiques d'urgence gratuits. Par ailleurs, les députés européens demandent à la Commission de créer un observatoire européen sur les violences faites aux femmes. Grâce aux Verts, un amendement adopté demande aussi aux États membres de reconnaître le viol et la violence sexuelle au sein d'un mariage ou d'un autre type de relation intime, comme un crime.

2-280

Anne Delvaux (PPE), *par écrit*. – La violence à l'égard des femmes est un problème qui se pose à l'échelle tant internationale qu'europpéenne. Violences conjugales, prostitution, trafic, il est déplorable de constater que nous ne sommes toujours pas à même de protéger les femmes contre la violence dans nos sociétés. Ces violences fondées sur le genre constituent une infraction aux libertés et droits fondamentaux, de même qu'aux

droitos à la sécurité et à la dignité humaine. Dans cette problématique, il s'agit à la fois de préserver l'intégrité des victimes, mais également de veiller aux principaux intérêts collectifs de la société, comme la liberté et la démocratie. L'Union européenne doit prendre ses responsabilités en introduisant une législation visant à mettre un terme à cette violence.

J'ai donc voté pour l'instauration de mesures comme un mécanisme visant à faciliter l'accès à une aide juridique gratuite, comme un système d'aide financière visant à promouvoir l'autonomie des victimes et faciliter leur retour à la vie normale et au monde du travail. Le respect des droits de l'homme est une valeur fondamentale inscrite dans le traité sur l'Union européenne. Respectons aussi les droits de la femme!

2-281

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – A violência contra as mulheres nas suas múltiplas formas - a violência doméstica, a violência sexual, a prostituição, o tráfico de mulheres, o assédio sexual e moral, a violência contra as mulheres nos seus postos trabalho- representa uma violação grave dos direitos humanos e das liberdades, tanto a nível individual como colectivo, com reflexos sociais negativos profundos. A prevenção e a erradicação da violência contra as mulheres deverão, por isso, constituir objectivos estratégicos essenciais cuja prossecução é indissociável dos avanços civilizacionais pelos quais nos batemos.

Alguns estudos sobre a violência baseada no género estimam que, na Europa, entre um quinto e um quarto da população feminina foi vítima de actos de violência física, pelo menos uma vez durante a sua vida, na fase adulta, e cerca de um décimo sofreu violência sexual. Estima-se também que cerca de 26% das crianças e dos jovens denunciam casos de violência física durante a infância e adolescência, o que é particularmente inquietante, se tivermos em conta premissas baseadas na aprendizagem social, segundo as quais assim se potencia que a vítima de hoje seja o agressor de amanhã.

Seria importante agora levar à prática as orientações contidas neste relatório.

2-282

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Congratulamo-nos com a aprovação deste relatório da Deputada do nosso Grupo, que é também Presidente da Comissão parlamentar dos Direitos da Mulher e da Igualdade dos Géneros, Eva Svenson.

Sabemos que a violência contra as mulheres representa uma violação grave dos direitos humanos e das liberdades, tanto a nível individual como colectivo, com enormes reflexos sociais, considerando que a violência contra as mulheres engloba um amplo leque de ataques aos direitos humanos, incluindo a violência doméstica, violência sexual, a prostituição, o tráfico de mulheres, o assédio sexual e moral, a violência contra as mulheres nos seus postos trabalho.

Por isso, a prevenção e a erradicação da violência contra as mulheres são objectivos estratégicos importantes para os avanços civilizacionais pelos quais pugnamos.

Alguns estudos sobre a violência baseada no género estimam que, na Europa, entre um quinto e um quarto da população feminina foi vítima de actos de violência física pelo menos uma vez durante a sua vida, na fase adulta, e cerca de um décimo sofreu violência sexual. Considera-se também que cerca de 26% das crianças e dos jovens denunciam casos de violência física durante a infância e adolescência, o que é particularmente preocupante, se tivermos em conta premissas baseadas na aprendizagem social...

(Declaração encurtada por força do artigo 170.º do Regimento)

2-283

Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE), par écrit. – Mon groupe est divisé sur le sujet. J'ai voté en faveur de l'amendement 19 et du considérant J sur le mot "prostitution" car je considère que la prostitution est bien une violence faite aux femmes.

2-284

Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE), na piśmie. – Godność człowieka oraz prawo do bezpieczeństwa są niewątpliwie podstawowymi wartościami życia, które muszą być chronione. Samo słowo „przemoc” jest tak silnie nacechowane negatywnymi emocjami, że wspominając o przemocy uwarunkowanej płcią wiele osób stara się odciąć od dyskusji. Jednak my jesteśmy po to, aby stawiać czoła trudnym tematom, aby interweniować w przypadkach, gdy społeczeństwo potrzebuje ukierunkowania w kwestiach politycznych i prawnych. Pamiętajmy, iż przemoc wobec kobiet polegająca na naruszeniu godności, wykorzystaniu seksualnym, przymusowych małżeństwach czy też okaleczeniu nie jest problemem tylko danej płci. Jest to problem całego społeczeństwa, który przyczynia się do ogólnej destrukcji. Rachunek kosztów jest w tym przypadku minimalizowany.

Czyż my wszyscy nie ponosimy wydatków, które są konsekwencją takiej przemocy – kosztów opieki medycznej, psychologicznej, sądowej i socjalnej? Ofiary często nie są zdolne do funkcjonowania w życiu zawodowym. Państwa członkowskie powinny zastanowić się nad opracowaniem planu przeciwdziałania przemocy uwarunkowanej płcią.

2-285

David Martin (S&D), in writing. – I voted for this report. Gender-based violence is always primarily a criminal matter. Society must therefore respond with punishment which is proportional to the seriousness of the crime. In setting priorities for the allocation of society's resources, it is important to have a clear victim's perspective, since it is this group which currently needs special protective measures. This does not exclude devoting resources to individual offenders by, for example, offering conversation therapy and other methods to counteract violent behaviour. This form of

alternative treatment for men who have committed serious assaults on women, however, should never replace the penalty imposed by criminal law. Conversation therapy and other such forms of treatment can only supplement other forms of punishment, such as prison.

Violence is in large measure a consequence of unequal power relations between men and women, and is an expression of a domination/subordination relationship between the perpetrator and victim for these crimes, therefore, conversation therapy in which both victim and perpetrator take part must be regarded as out of the question since the crime is of such a nature that the two can never be equivalent and equal negotiating parties.

2-286

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Obwohl es in den letzten Jahrzehnten und Jahren Fortschritte bei der Bekämpfung von Gewalt gegen Frauen und Kinder gegeben hat, bleibt noch einiges zu tun. Zu denken geben sollten die Abstumpfung und Pseudo-Moral der Gesellschaft. Die Vorstufen der tatsächlichen Gewalt wie Zudringlichkeiten, obszöne Bemerkungen und Belästigungen, die täglich von vielen Migrantinnen an westliche Frauen gerichtet werden, werden zunehmend als normal empfunden. Und der Gipfel der Frauenverachtung ist es dann, wenn eine deutsche Richterinnen bei einer Muslime-Scheidung das im Koran verankerte Züchtigungsrecht des Mannes als Maßstab heranzieht.

Mit der Migration hat die EU Probleme aus aller Herren Länder importiert und damit auch Ehrenmorde, Zwangsheiraten und häusliche Gewalt in patriarchalischen Familienstrukturen. Kultur, Religion und Tradition dürfen nicht zur Rechtfertigung von Gewalttaten herangezogen werden können. Die vorgeschlagene Initiative enthält einige gute Ansätze, geht aber insgesamt zu wenig in die Tiefe, weshalb ich mich der Stimme enthalten habe.

2-287

Rovana Plumb (S&D), *in writing*. – Despite the fact that violence against women has been a topic of debate over several decades, the international community has not managed to put an end to this extremely destructive form of criminality. It is a complex problem which involves protecting the integrity of individual victims of crime but also protecting important common social interests, such as freedom and democracy.

Shelters for women must be provided at national level in order to enable women and children to live a self-determined life free of violence and poverty. Such shelters should offer specialised services, medical treatment, legal aid, psychosocial and therapeutic counselling, legal support during court procedure, support for children affected by violence, etc. The Member States should ensure appropriate funding means in order that women's shelters can fulfil international standards in working with women survivors of violence and their children.

The Member States should provide the required means for women's organisation and NGOs in order to protect and prevent women and their children from violence and poverty, should guarantee social and economic rights of women so that they do not depend on a partner/husband financially and should promote and develop an integration of women on the labour market.

2-288

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – Violence against women is an international as well as a European problem. Despite the fact that violence against women has been a topic of debate over several decades, the international community has not managed to put an end to this extremely destructive form of criminality. It is distressing to see how we still fail to protect women against violence. It is a complex problem which involves protecting the integrity of individual victims of crime but also protecting important common social interests, such as freedom and democracy.

The European Union must therefore shoulder its responsibility and introduce the legislation required to put an end to the violence. I recognise the compilation made by the rapporteur of a number of measures in this strategic report which are absolutely necessary in order to guarantee women in Europe a decent life. However, due to the fact that recital J establishes that prostitution as such is a violation of human rights, and given the effort we are making to regulate such practices, some members of our group had to abstain in the end.

2-289

Oreste Rossi (EFD), *per iscritto*. – La relazione sulla lotta alla violenza contro le donne è un testo sul quale avrei voluto esprimere un voto favorevole perché l'intento era quello di predisporre un intervento globale per proteggere le donne vittime della violenza. Si affrontano in modo chiaro gli abusi sessuali, la prostituzione, la mutilazione genitale femminile, lo *stalking*, la tratta di esseri umani e le violenze domestiche, insomma una serie di violazione dei diritti delle donne.

Il problema, come spesso accade al Parlamento europeo, è che ogni testo va bene per inserire argomenti che invece dovrebbero essere trattati esclusivamente in testi autonomi. In questo caso, si interviene sui diritti delle donne migranti e delle rifugiate costituendo di fatto una categoria privilegiata di donne rispetto alle cittadine europee. Per questo semplice motivo il mio voto è di astensione perché, pur condividendo l'articolato, non posso accettare la strumentalizzazione politica.

2-290

Brian Simpson (S&D), *in writing*. – I will be supporting the Svensson report because it highlights the problem that exists with regard to violence against women. This is not a new issue but it is an issue which has been ignored; swept under the carpet; kept within the family. Now it is right to end this practice and do all we can, not only highlighting this problem but, in bringing forward measures, to tackle the problem and give

women the protection against violence which is their right.

I agree we need to ensure that women suffering violence should have access to legal aid. However, if Member States keep cutting legal aid budgets then this access will not happen. I agree that judges need to be trained in the particularly difficult cases that violence against women raise. But how do we do this when budgets are being slashed?

We need Member States to make this issue a political priority setting out the minimum requirements and obligations that victims of abuse might expect. This report provides us with a framework and deserves our full support, but with this framework we also need some action in this important area and that means action by Member States.

2-291

Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI), *schriftelijk*. – Geweld tegen vrouwen is verwerpelijk en dient met harde hand bestreden te worden. Op dit punt is de PVV het volstrekt eens met dit verslag. Echter, de rol van de islam blijft in dit verslag volstrekt onbenoemd. Slechts eenmaal spreekt het verslag in paragraaf 3 zeer algemeen van 'religieuze praktijken of tradities'. Dit terwijl bekend is dat juist in de islam geweld tegen vrouwen aan de orde van de dag is. De onderdrukking van vrouwen vormt immers een intrinsiek onderdeel van de islam.

De PVV wil dat geweld tegen vrouwen wordt bestreden, maar stemt tegen het voorliggende verslag omdat het de motieven en de achtergrond van de dader onbenoemd laat. Door de islam als een oorzaak van geweld niet expliciet te noemen missen we een uitgelezen kans om deze specifieke vorm van geweld tegen vrouwen aan te pakken.

2-292

Angelika Werthmann (NI), *schriftlich*. – Ich habe für diesen Bericht gestimmt, da die Gewalt gegen Frauen ein weltweites Problem ist, das die Weltgemeinschaft noch immer nicht in den Griff bekommt. Gewalt gegen Frauen zieht sich durch alle Gesellschaftsschichten und ist unabhängig von Kultur, Bildung, Alter und Einkommen. Im eigenen Heim leben Frauen am gefährlichsten - häusliche Gewalt ist die häufigste Ursache von Verletzungen bei Frauen, häufiger als Verkehrsunfälle und Krebs zusammen genommen. Die Betroffenen sind in ihrer Gesundheit, Würde und Sicherheit schwer eingeschränkt und können nicht mehr ihren Vorstellungen nach am gesellschaftlichen Leben und in der Arbeitswelt teilnehmen. Gewalttäter verursachen bei den betroffenen Frauen und auch ihren Kindern lebenslanges Leid und zudem auch ein soziales Problem, denn die Folgekosten im Gesundheits- und Justizbereich gehen in mehrere Milliarden Euro. Gewalttäter gehören demnach zur Verantwortung gezogen und sollten öffentlich angeklagt werden. Gewalt gegen Frauen muss endlich thematisiert werden und ein Ende finden.

2-293

6 - Corrections to votes and voting intentions: see Minutes

2-294

President. – That concludes the explanations of vote.

(The sitting was suspended at 13.25 and resumed at 15.00)

2-295

PRZEWODNICZY: JERZY BUZEK *Przewodniczący*

2-296

7 - Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

2-297

8 - Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

2-298

9 - Tura pytań do przewodniczącego Komisji Europejskiej

2-299

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest tura pytań z udziałem przewodniczącego Komisji.

2-300

Martin Schulz, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich sehe, die Kollegen der EVP-Fraktion sind noch beim Mittagessen. Herr Präsident, ich freue mich, dass Sie mich wieder anlächeln – heute Mittag waren Sie etwas ungehalten über mich, aber die Mittagspause beruhigt halt.

Herr Kommissar Oettinger – der ist Ihnen ja bekannt – hat gesagt, es gäbe Stresstests – ach, da sitzt er, ich habe ihn noch gar nicht gesehen. Herr Oettinger, schön dass Sie da sind! Herr Oettinger – ein gelehriger Schüler von Angela Merkel, er ist jetzt auch gegen Kernenergie, früher war er dafür, aber Fukushima ist sozusagen das moderne Damaskus: Alle Saulus dieser Erde haben jetzt eine helle Sonne am Himmel gesehen. Jedenfalls hat er gesagt, seiner Meinung nach gäbe es ein paar Kraftwerke, die die Stresstests nicht überleben würden. Das finde ich eine interessante Aussage.

Wenn Sie den Verdacht haben, Herr Oettinger, dass es Stresstests gibt, die nicht zu dem gewünschten Ergebnis führen, weil die Anlagen, die diesem Test unterworfen werden sollen, ihn möglicherweise nicht überleben, warum schreitet die Kommission nicht ein und legt diese Anlagen heute bereits still? Denn wenn wir mit den Stresstests das erleben, was mit den Banken geschehen ist, dass wir nämlich hinterher sehen, dass die Stresstests erstens nicht klar genug waren und zweitens die Ergebnisse nicht den tatsächlichen Verhältnissen entsprechend, wäre das bei der Kernenergie sicher unverhältnismäßig gefährlicher als bei den Banken.

Deshalb meine konkrete Frage: Wie kann es sein, dass Sie wissen, dass bestimmte Anlagen Stresstests nicht überleben, und Sie heute nicht einschreiten?

2-301

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission*. – First of all, to know the result of the test we must make the test before. Should any installation fail the test, the question of remedial actions remains open. In cases where an upgrade is technically or economically not feasible, reactors will have to be shut down and decommissioned. However, it is possible to envisage situations where safety upgrades are economically meaningful and technically feasible, so this is what we can commit to at this stage.

Mr Schulz, I believe it was important that the European Council, after intense discussions, agreed on the role of the Commission. I can tell you that the beginning of the discussions was just about the coordination of national regulators and, after I insisted, the Commission was asked to come up with scopes and modalities and also given the task of presenting, before the end of the year, a full report on the findings.

We are going to do this for all the nuclear sites in Europe. We are going to do this in full transparency. It is important to acknowledge that fact. I believe this is progress in terms of nuclear safety.

2-302

Martin Schulz, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Barroso, Sie sind ein cleverer Mann, haben aber meine Frage nicht beantwortet. Deshalb frage ich noch einmal nach. Wenn Herr Oettinger sagt: „Wir haben den Verdacht, dass bestimmte Anlagen, die jetzt am Netz sind, unsere Stresstests nicht überleben werden“, interpretiere ich das so, dass Sie Kenntnis davon haben, dass diese Anlagen so schlecht gesichert sind, dass sie den Kriterien nicht standhalten. Warum schreiten Sie dann nicht bereits heute ein? In meinen Augen ist das eine reale Gefahr.

2-303

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the European Commission*. – Commissioner Oettinger gave a very precautionary and very prudent statement. It may happen, but to check if it can or not, we have to make serious, credible tests. This is what we are going to do, in full transparency and based on the best available expertise.

As you know, it is not within the Commission's competence to shut down the tests. This is a national competence. What we are going to do – and, unlike previously, before the last European Council, we have a clear mandate to do it – is work with the national independent regulators to conduct very serious, credible State stress tests. We are now defining the modalities and the scope of those stress tests.

I would like to tell Mr Schulz that, in these various sensitive matters, we have to be extremely responsible

and not create panic. We have to proceed in a technical way, based on the best scientific expertise.

2-304

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – We all agree that the European Union is more than just a common market and that it is also a political project to ensure that there is democracy on the continent, and that the rule of law and human rights are upheld, promoted and strengthened.

If this were not the case, I do not think there would be much difference between us and China. This is the case in all Member States, including Hungary. The government there has now issued a new draft constitution that is due to be adopted in mid-April. It contains some worrying – in my opinion – references to voting rights for minors, bans on abortion, bans on same-sex marriages, irredentism and curbing institutions to see that they carry out the government's will.

President Barroso, what will the Commission do to defend the common European constitutional principles of democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights as set out in Article 2 of our Treaty, when these are at stake in Member States, as is the case today in Hungary?

2-305

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission*. – We certainly agree that the European Union is not just a common market: it is about values and it is a condition for any Member State to become a member of the European Union to respect those values. One of the values is the rule of law and we have to respect our law. As you know, the adoption of a national constitution is a key step for every Member State, a crucial process which belongs entirely to the people and institutions of that Member State.

It is for the Hungarian institutions to decide on the content of, and the adoption procedure for, the new Constitution, in line with their own national rules and, where relevant, with international and Union law. We will follow the developments on this issue from an EU-law standpoint, but of course we hope that the Hungarian authorities will ensure that the new Constitution which is finally adopted will reflect the values upon which the European Union is founded.

2-306

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – President of the Commission, I understand your answer, but you know that all 27 Member States have to modify their constitutions in accordance with European values. Hungary did that before the accession to the Union. There are even countries that have done this after accession. Poland is doing it at the moment; France is also doing it because there are contradictions between the Lisbon Treaty and some articles of the French Constitution.

It is important that you also oblige Hungary, even after its adoption of the new constitution, to apply these

principles also. It is important for the Commission to look into this.

2-307

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the European Commission*. – The constitution of any country has to reflect and be in accordance with European values: basic European values of democracy, the rule of law, human dignity and respect for fundamental rights. This is a matter that should not even have to be discussed. I have not yet seen a constitution of a European Union Member State which is against those values, but if, theoretically, that were to happen then we would have to act.

As you know, Mr Verhofstadt, we have a very good record on that matter. We recently acted on several very sensitive issues regarding, for instance, the Hungarian media law. The Hungarian Government said at the beginning that, if the Commission identified any kind of incompatibility, it would amend the law, and it has done so.

In other Member States where there have been issues of non-discrimination, the Commission has also taken a very strong stance. From that point of view you can be sure that the Commission will follow these matters very closely.

2-308

Marian-Jean Marinescu, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – The application of the European Semester, starting with this year, will help strengthen budgetary discipline, macroeconomic stability and growth and it will oblige the Member States to change their economic and budgetary policies. In the short term, these new policies could have a significant impact on European citizens' lives in most Member States.

Has the Commission identified, or is it planning to conduct an evaluation of, the consequences that the necessary national procedures will have on the European economic, social and political landscape in the future?

2-309

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission*. – We are taking that exercise very seriously. It was very important to agree on what we called the European Semester, because Member States have now agreed unanimously that matters of economic policy of one may also have an effect on the others, and that those of the others have an effect on their own policies. We are going to make recommendations on this matter, depending also on the programmes that the Member States present to us. But we are doing that to make the lives of our citizens better.

We are making it clear that all the efforts of fiscal consolidation, all the efforts of structural reform, are in fact for growth – for sustainable growth, for inclusive growth – which is the goal of the European Union. This was the overall agreement on what we have called the Europe 2020 Strategy. It is in the light of these priorities that we are going to judge the national programmes that

are now going to be presented and on which we are going to work in partnership with our Member States.

2-310

Marian-Jean Marinescu, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – The most important aspect of this policy is discipline. If the Member States all apply these requirements, the results will be positive. If there are differences between Member States, the results will not be as we all expect.

2-311

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the European Commission*. – I fully agree with you, Mr Marinescu. That is precisely why we need the institutions to be independent and to do their job in full independence and in a true Community spirit, because we have seen in the past that there are sometimes temptations not to adopt decisions or implement them in a uniform, coherent and credible manner.

That is why the Commission will try to do its best to ensure a level playing field and the principles of fairness. Discipline, in terms of respect for agreements reached, is indeed fundamental for the success of the European Union.

2-312

Rebecca Harms, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Sehr geehrter Herr Barroso! Die Kommission hat in der letzten Woche Grenzwerte festgelegt auf der Grundlage einer Verordnung, die immer dann aktiviert wird, wenn es Probleme mit Radioaktivität gibt, und die für Nahrungsmittelimporte gilt, in diesem Fall aus Japan. Die Grenzwerte, die Sie für Produkte aus Japan in Kraft gesetzt haben, liegen in diesem Fall erstaunlich weit über dem, was selbst in Japan für dieselben Produkte gilt. Sie liegen auch über den Werten, die z. B. in den USA – einem Land, das die Atomkraft sehr stark nutzt – in einem solchen Fall für Nahrungsmittel gelten. Diese Werte liegen auch über den Werten, die für die Europäische Union und für die Länder, aus denen wir nach der Katastrophe von Tschernobyl Waren importieren, gegolten haben, und die zum Teil für Cäsium bis heute gelten. Warum ist das so? Warum haben wir diese hohen Grenzwerte?

2-313

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I will, of course, happily respond to Mrs Harms' question even if I thought there was an agreement to have two halves to the debate today – a general part and then one on Japan.

Mrs Harms, you have raised a very important issue. First of all, the emergency measures adopted on 25 March, as regards the import of feed and food from Japan, ensure the safety of the EU consumer and a harmonised enforcement approach across the whole European Union. We believe these measures are proportionate to the risk and they have a wider scope than the measures applied in other major parts of the world like the United States and Canada. To the best of my knowledge, based on the scientific expertise I receive, we believe that these matters and this approach are safe.

Customs ensures that food and feed items can only enter the European Union market if there is assurance that they are safe for consumption. Under the present arrangement, the Japanese authorities themselves – and it is true what Mrs Harms said – enforce even stricter requirements on food products for domestic consumption and exports.

Given the stricter levels that are being imposed in Japan we, the Commission, have decided that it would be correct to amend the present levels in force since 25 March as an additional safeguard measure pending further scientific analysis of the levels established under Euratom Regulation 3954/87. This analysis will be carried out by the Commission, together with appropriate scientific experts, before 30 June so as to arrive at standards that can be applied to imports on a uniform basis.

I should like to underline here that all the checks carried out up to now, by Member States, of Japanese food imports demonstrate negligible levels of radioactivity, which are significantly below current European or Japanese standards. Let me inform you that the Commission will propose to the standing committee on the food chain next Friday a revision of our norms to align these with the Japanese norms. These will then enter into force as of next week. I should emphasise again that this is a purely precautionary measure, which allows initiating the necessary scientific assessments of current permitted levels throughout the world, so that the European Union can demonstrate it is once again applying the highest standards.

2-314

Rebecca Harms, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Barroso, wenn ich Sie jetzt richtig verstanden habe, bedeutet das also, dass durch Tschernobyl-Fallout radioaktiv belasteter Fisch, den wir aus Norwegen importieren, strengeren Grenzwerten genügen muss als radioaktiv belasteter Fisch, den wir aus den Meeren rund um Japan importieren? Ich halte das für falsch und für unverantwortlich und möchte von Ihnen wissen, ob Sie bereit sind, die im internationalen Vergleich sehr hohen Grenzwerte zu korrigieren oder nicht.

2-315

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – Ms Harms, we have to decide on those matters on the basis of scientific evidence. I cannot take decisions solely on the basis of personal opinions. We have a regulation that was established after Chernobyl. It was based on the best scientific evidence. Japan is in an extremely sensitive position with regard to food security, and there are many reasons for this. It has a different threshold to the one we have in Europe. So precisely because of these differing standards between Europe and Japan, we have decided that on a transitional basis we are going to implement the standards of Japan.

The levels permitted are lower, which means that their standards are higher. We are going to implement this for Japan. In the meantime we are going to consult the committee of experts at national level and at European

level so that we can, if appropriate, establish common uniform rules for all imports. I believe this is the best, most proportionate, scientific-based approach. I do not think any other approach would be advisable at this time.

2-316

Jan Zahradil, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Unlike some of my colleagues, I still believe that the European Union is primarily an economic project and that the single market is the core of all that. We have heard a lot about economic governance in recent days and weeks, perhaps too much for my own taste, but very little about growth and competitiveness.

As you know, Mr Barroso, the British Conservative Party forms the most substantial part of my group, and the UK Prime Minister, Mr Cameron, and eight other EU Heads of State and Government sent a letter to you and to President Van Rompuy setting out very clear ways of getting Europe back into growth after the financial crisis. Last week, Mr Cameron also published a pamphlet entitled ‘Let us choose growth’, which I can only encourage all Members of this House to read.

So what are your particular intentions in the foreseeable future to deliver on growth, on competitiveness and on completion of the single market of the European Union? What practical measures do you intend to adopt in order to attain these goals?

2-317

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – In one minute it is difficult to do justice to the importance of the internal market. However, let me reassure Mr Zahradil that this month we will present the Single Market Act, a very ambitious set of proposals to implement the single market, to deepen it and to remove many obstacles to it with regard to services and the many administrative burdens that exist mainly for SMEs.

These are the concrete points I can announce today: concrete measures concerning access to finance for SMEs and the reduction of the administrative burden affecting our companies, especially SMEs.

Let me also say that the letter that was written to me by nine European prime ministers or heads of state was a very important document. It is important at this precise moment, when there are such heavy constraints on our budgets, to unleash the full potential of the single market. This is undoubtedly a source of growth for the European Union.

2-318

Jan Zahradil, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr Barroso, I do not want to jump into some kind of controversial debate and I believe in your good intentions. However, you know the institution you are running. The European Commission is sometimes a bit of a difficult animal to run. So could you please tell us also how you would guarantee that the European Commission, under your Presidency, would avoid the

tendency – that sometimes is all too visible – of over-regulating rather than deregulating or better regulating?

2-319

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – Please, let us not take a prejudiced view of the Commission. The Commission has a good record on this matter. We have already made some improvements: a 31% reduction of the administrative burden by the Commission, with 22% already being agreed by the Council and Parliament. In fact, the Council is resisting some of the measures to reduce the burden.

I believe you will agree, Mr Zahradil, that 27 different bureaucracies are worse than one bureaucracy. So the Commission is doing a lot to make life easier for businesses across the continent, implementing the internal market. In fact the resistance sometimes comes from the national administrations with, for instance, gold-plating of directives and so on. We are going to be serious about the implementation of this agenda for better regulation, on which I believe we can agree.

2-320

Lothar Bisky, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Meine Frage geht in eine ähnliche Richtung wie die von Herrn Schulz. Ich will mich deshalb auf einen besonderen Aspekt konzentrieren. Sie verstehen sicher, dass unsere Sensibilität für Stresstests nach den Erfahrungen mit den Bankenstresstests größer geworden ist, auch was Atomkraft anbelangt. Meine Frage geht jetzt speziell in Richtung Euratom.

Euratom verschlingt ja größere Summen von Forschungsgeldern, darüber will ich jetzt nicht richten. Ich persönlich bin der Meinung, dass das Forschungsgeld für eine äußerst riskante Technologie ausgegeben wird. Meiner Ansicht nach werden die Risiken nicht ausreichend gemeinsam kontrolliert, und es wird nach meinem Dafürhalten auch nicht genug gemeinsam darüber entschieden. Denn Atomkraft macht ja nicht an der Grenze halt. Und das ist unser Problem. Müsste man nicht eigentlich bei Atomkraft nur noch gemeinschaftlich entscheiden, weil die Grenzen sowieso überschritten werden durch die Strahlung?

2-321

José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission. – As the Lisbon Treaty clearly recognises, Mr Bisky, the energy mix is the national competence of the Member States. It is not up to the European institutions to decide which energy sources each country should have.

However, the conclusions of the last European Council were a step forward because there was an agreement to test all nuclear plants in the European Union. This exercise will be carried out under the responsibility of the European Nuclear Safety Regulatory Group and the Commission. The Commission will also present a report which will be made public.

We are now in a position where those in favour of nuclear energy and those against – because there are Member States in Europe with different positions – at least agree that we have to upgrade all the conditions for nuclear safety. That is more likely to happen with a European approach than on a national basis.

2-322

Lothar Bisky, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Barroso, was halten Sie von dem Vorschlag, eine Europäische Gemeinschaft zur Förderung erneuerbarer Energien für eine umweltverträgliche Energieversorgung und für Energieeinsparung innerhalb des EU-Vertragswerks zu errichten? Halten Sie das für einen unterstützenswerten Vorschlag, der uns eventuell rascher von den Gefahren der Atomkraft befreit?

2-323

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – We have already made some proposals on that matter, namely the so-called 20-20-20 agenda where, for instance, the Member States agreed unanimously – because unanimity is required in that matter – the 20% targets for renewables by 2020. Let me say that we are on target to achieve that goal. So European Union legislation that makes this binding on Member States already exists.

Are Member States ready to go forward? This is something we can discuss, but I can tell you that from my point of view, from my consultations, they now believe that they should commit to reaching that goal first. So we probably do not need to create a new Community – a new institutional – framework, but we do need to commit decisively to the goals that we have agreed and even, if agreed, to set more ambitious goals.

2-324

Nigel Farage, on behalf of the EFD Group. – Mr Barroso, I am confused. Help me. What is the EU's policy on Libya? I got a letter on 1 April from the noble Baroness Ashton telling me that the EU had provided more than EUR 75 million in humanitarian assistance and that, although the situation remains uncertain, the EU has offered to assist in fostering dialogue. Yet she wrote this many days after the bombing had begun. That is what she has been saying.

On the other hand, we have got hard man Herman Van Rompuy, who has made it clear that regime change is the aim of this Libyan adventure. He also said that the action in Libya could not have happened without the European Union, and that France and Germany could not have taken military action without first getting the support of the European Council. So we have two big chiefs within the European Union directly contradicting each other. Could you please shed some light on the matter, and tell us what is the European Union's policy on Gaddafi and Libya?

2-325

José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission. – The Member States unanimously agreed that Gaddafi should go. There is no contradiction in engaging in dialogue with the people we think we should

talk to. That was probably what Lady Ashton was referring to. For instance, we have received here representatives of the opposition to Colonel Gaddafi.

Having said that, the military action was not a decision of the European Union as such. Some Member States on the United Nations Security Council decided, based on a consensus reached in the European Council, to implement a no-fly zone. But it was not a decision of the European Union as such because there were some differences in the approach to the situation. We have to recognise this. The reality is that there were differences over the way in which we should handle the Libyan issue.

However, I also agree with what President Van Rompuy said: without this position taken by the European Council, the decisions of the Security Council could not have been made. These were historic decisions in the sense that they implement the responsibility to protect.

2-326

Nigel Farage, *on behalf of the EFD Group*. – Well there is certainly a broad range of opinions here. I wonder whether Mr Barroso would agree with me that appointing as Head of your new Foreign Office and in charge of external security a woman who has been an extreme left-wing, life-long passivist, the former treasurer of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, somebody who has proved to be incompetent in the job, was not in fact one of the better decisions of the European Union. I can only say thank God for Baroness Ashton, without her I suspect all of us would be very much deeper into Libya.

2-327

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission*. – The Member States' decision, with my support, to nominate Catherine Ashton as Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy was, I think, a good one.

She is a very committed European. She certainly does not share your views, but I do not think that is really a problem. I think she is making a very honest and determined contribution to our goals, but let us be honest about this. She has a very difficult and challenging job. She is now doing something that before was done by at least three or four people. In addition she has had to introduce the new European External Action Service.

I believe that those of you who do not seem to sympathise with her ideas should give her the benefit of the doubt. I believe the fact that we now have a High Representative who is Vice-President of the Commission at the same time is an improvement. I can testify to her enthusiasm, to her determination and to the very European approach that she takes in all these issues.

2-328

Andrew Henry William Brons (NI). – Can the President of the Commission foresee any circumstances

in which all Member States, including the United Kingdom, are forced to adopt the euro against the wishes of their peoples – possibly expressed in a referendum – and even against the professed wishes of their governments? The preamble to the Lisbon Treaty commits Member States to establishing economic and monetary union: a single, stable currency. The word 'single' implies that it will not coexist with other currencies.

There is, of course, the protocol to the Treaty that states that unless the United Kingdom notifies the Council that it intends to adopt the euro, it shall be under no obligation to do so. But the question is whether the protocol will protect the United Kingdom against the provisions of the Treaty. Other countries outside the eurozone appear to be in a less-favoured position. Article 140 of the Treaty states that Member States with a derogation will be examined every two years on the progress being made in achieving economic and monetary union.

2-329

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the European Commission*. – I did not understand the question, but if the question is whether the United Kingdom will be forced to join the euro, the answer is no.

2-330

Andrew Henry William Brons (NI). – We know that the United Kingdom is protected by the Protocol, but the validity of protocols is a question that goes beyond the subject of a single currency.

There is a protocol providing the UK and two other countries with opt-outs from the Charter of Fundamental Rights, but the Commission's own Legal Service has suggested that the opt-out is, at best, of limited application. Might the protocol providing the UK with an opt-out from the single currency also be of limited value?

2-331

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission*. – If you want a full legal analysis, I will be happy to send the analysis by the Commission's Legal Service. But I can tell you – I am sorry if this disappoints you – that the UK is not going to be forced to enter the euro.

2-332

President. – The next topic is the European response to the tragedy in Japan. We have many colleagues on the list. I would ask you not to raise a blue card if you want to be on the catch-the-eye list, because that is a quite different thing. Please raise a white card – or any other. The blue card is for quite a different procedure.

2-333

Alejo Vidal-Quadras (PPE). – Señor Presidente, tras el grave accidente en la central de Fukushima, la reacción de la Comisión Europea ha estado caracterizada hasta el momento, salvo algún desliz poco afortunado, por las necesarias seriedad, prudencia y rigor.

Sin embargo, este doloroso acontecimiento ha generado en nuestras poblaciones un clima emocional agudo, adverso a esta fuente de energía. Con el fin de paliar posibles efectos negativos en las urnas, ciertos gobiernos han cambiado de manera precipitada su posición y han decidido revocar sus planes de nuevas construcciones o sus planes de prolongar la vida útil de sus centrales.

Señor Barroso: teniendo en cuenta que la energía nuclear representa un catorce por ciento de nuestro consumo energético, el constante y previsible aumento de la demanda eléctrica y nuestro objetivo de llegar a un 85 % de reducciones de dióxido de carbono para 2050, muchos de nosotros, y yo, le preguntamos a usted, señor Barroso, en este contexto, que puede ser efímero, si la Comisión Europea tiene prevista alguna acción legislativa o política para evitar que este clima ponga en riesgo nuestra estrategia energética a largo plazo.

2-334

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – As I have already said in answer to another colleague, deciding on the energy mix is a matter that lies within the national sphere of responsibility. As you know, there are Member States in the European Union that have nuclear energy, for instance your country, Spain, and others that do not have nuclear energy, for instance my country, Portugal. So it is not up to the Commission to say whether or not Member States should have nuclear energy. We have to act within our spheres of responsibility.

We have in fact now received new mandates as regards issues of nuclear safety. I believe we can and should fulfil the goals already agreed for a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. I believe the 20% target that was unanimously agreed is reachable if the Member States act with real determination in implementing all the measures that they can take to achieve what is a very important goal for the European Union and indeed for the world.

2-335

Sandra Kalniete (PPE). – Priekšsēdētāja kungs! Jau vairākas nedēļas pasaule ar līdzjūtību un satraukumu seko līdzīgai notiekošajam Japānā. Es vēlos atkārtoti izteikt cieņu Japānas tautai. Domās mēs esam kopā ar cilvēkiem, kuri dienu un nakti strādā Fukušimas atomreaktoros, lai novērstu kodolkatastrofu. Viņi ir varoņi, kas savu veselību un dzīvību upurē Japānai un cilvēcei. Japānai stāv priekšā intensīvs nopostīto teritoriju atjaunošanas darbs, kas prasīs ievērojamus līdzekļus, tai skaitā starptautiskās investīcijas. Tādēļ Eiropas Savienībai ir jāsāk sarunas par brīvās tirdzniecības līgumu ar Japānu. Pazīstot japāņu principu sākt sarunas tikai tad, ja ir stingra apņēmība tās beigt un sasniegt rezultātu, esmu pārliecināta, ka sarunu laikā līdz šim esošās neskaidrības tiks atrisinātas un tiks sasniegt abām pusēm pieņemams brīvās tirdzniecības līgums. Es vēlētos dzirdēt *Barroso* kunga viedokli, vai Komisija atbalsta sarunu sākšanu par brīvās tirdzniecības līgumu gaidāmajā Japānas un ES samītā 25. maijā un, ja nē, tad kāpēc, un kad sarunas varētu sākt.

2-336

José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission. – Let me also start by conveying, on behalf of the Commission, our fullest admiration, respect and solidarity with the Japanese people. I sent a personal message to Prime Minister Kan immediately after this catastrophic event. I spoke with him again yesterday over the phone to have the latest information on the situation and he told me how grateful he was for the European Union's solidarity.

Regarding the trade issue, last year's European Union-Japan Summit agreed to examine the options for how to best to improve our relations. One of the options on the economic side is the possibility of a European Union-Japan FTA. This option will require a considerable degree of ambition on both sides and a willingness to tackle, *inter alia*, non-tariff measures and the removal of obstacles that hamper European Union companies' access to Japan's market for public procurement. There have been consistent demands from the European Union side in discussions with Japan. I am happy that the European Council has now clarified its position. Yesterday I reaffirmed to the Prime Minister of Japan that we are ready to work with Japan, provided it addresses these matters constructively. He promised me that it would do so in a constructive way, addressing matters of concern also to the European side.

2-337

Edit Herczog (S&D). – When we look at the news on the Fukushima accident and the debates on the consequences, we do not see the shareholders there. We see neither the financial investors nor the members of the political class, but we see the employees: the workers are fighting this accident. I fully support strengthening nuclear safety standards, but are you ready to invite the employee representatives, namely the trade unions, to the multi-stakeholder dialogue in order to strengthen and achieve standards and are you ready globally to promote the nuclear safety standards achieved? If so, how do you propose doing this?

2-338

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – In fact the European Council made the decision to try to promote the highest possible standards, not only in Europe but with our partners. For instance, Commissioner Oettinger has already been in contact with Russian partners. Russia and the Ukraine said they were interested in working with us on that matter. We are also trying to see if we can achieve the same level of cooperation with Switzerland and also, although it is not so advanced, with Turkey and Armenia.

Yesterday, in my phone call with the Prime Minister of Japan, he told me that he also wants to cooperate with us, and also in the international efforts to be made in the G8 and the G20, to achieve higher levels of nuclear safety in the world. We now have the conditions to make a real effort, not only at European level – that is now guaranteed – but also globally, working with the International Atomic Energy Agency and other relevant international bodies.

2-339

Sarah Ludford (ALDE). – A year ago in Haiti there was a feeling that the EU was slow off the mark in disaster and humanitarian relief. Are you satisfied by the degree of operational coordination between the EU and Member States in the recent emergencies, especially in Japan?

What has happened since the Commission communication of three years ago on reinforcing the Union's disaster response capacity, which said that we needed greater coherence and effectiveness for a more integrated EU disaster response capacity?

In particular, has recent experience in Japan and a rather different one in North Africa helped to advance Commission thinking on whether we need an EU rapid reaction mechanism for humanitarian disaster and reconstruction aid?

2-340

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – In the response to this crisis, I am proud that the Commission, represented by Kristalina Georgieva, who is here with us, was the first to send a high-level delegation to Japan after the terrible events there.

I can assure you that Japan very much appreciated that gesture. We have provided both political and moral support to Japan: our system has been working in an efficient manner. In fact, the Japanese authorities were the first to ask us to coordinate the action of Member States because they preferred coordinated, rather than bilateral, support from the different Member States.

Even if Japan is a very rich country which is very able to face these kinds of crises, as a matter of solidarity we are providing humanitarian aid of EUR 15 million. Of this, EUR 10 million comes from the European Union budget, arranged by the Commission, the remaining EUR 5 million or so comes from the Member States.

We are basically satisfied with the coordination efforts in humanitarian terms, but it is certain that we can always improve if the Member States are ready to accept a coordinated and coherent approach with regard to civil protection and crisis response.

2-341

Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE). – Mr President, the March European Council confirmed the EU's role as a promoter of the highest nuclear safety standards worldwide and in the EU neighbourhood.

At least two new nuclear projects at the EU's external border raise serious concern, owing to a lack of transparency and of consultation with the countries affected. New NPPs containing experimental reactors will be located in the Kaliningrad enclave in between two Member States and only 23 kilometres away from the eastern EU border in Belarus. The EU, in cooperation with the relevant international bodies, should ensure that the developers comply with the highest nuclear safety and environmental standards right

from the beginning of the development stage and should allow international nuclear experts to assess both projects, especially the site selection criteria.

The EU could effectively prevent unsafe nuclear development by refusing to contract energy that will be produced in unclean nuclear power plant stations. What role does the Commission see in preventing unsafe nuclear development at the EU's external borders? What measures could it take?

2-342

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – A good example I can give you is that of our working relations with Ukraine. I will attend the Nuclear Safety Summit in Kiev on 19 April 2011, organised by the Ukrainian Government, and I will be there together with the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon. In fact, we have been one of the most important donors – if not the most important – to Chernobyl so that it can be fully repaired.

As the European Council stated in its conclusions, the priority of ensuring the safety of nuclear plants obviously cannot cease to apply at our borders. The European Union will request that similar stress tests be carried out in the neighbouring countries and worldwide, at both existing and planned nuclear plants and, in this regard, full use should be made of the relevant international organisations.

So, certainly, we are going to accord very high priority to nuclear safety in our relations with third countries, including some that you have mentioned.

2-343

Elisa Ferreira (S&D). – Senhor Presidente, a crise no Japão dá mais sentido ao nosso compromisso colectivo de criar uma Estratégia 2020. No entanto, continuamos a aguardar que, quer sobre ela quer sobre a Estratégia 2020, haja instrumentos sérios, fortes e que tirem a Europa da situação que estamos a atravessar, de medidas recessivas, desemprego, insuficiente crescimento e um problema incontroado de dívida soberana. Não seria altura, neste momento, de a Europa avançar com fontes novas europeias de financiamento e lançar efectivamente medidas de crescimento e coesão baseadas numa outra abordagem do problema energético e do problema da sustentabilidade do crescimento? É essa a minha pergunta.

2-344

José Manuel Barroso, Pt Commission. – Senhora Deputada Elisa Ferreira, eu respondo com todo o prazer, embora não seja exactamente sobre o tema "catástrofe no Japão". Em relação à questão de encontrar fundos de financiamento, ainda hoje no debate, de manhã, eu disse que nós, Comissão Europeia, vamos apresentar nas próximas Perspectivas Financeiras propostas para aquilo a que chamamos "EU project bonds", ou seja, obrigações para investimento em determinados projectos, projectos estruturantes, por exemplo projectos para redes europeias, incluindo com certeza a energia. Atrevo-me a pensar que a Sra. Deputada vai apoiar estas

propostas e gostaria de ter também o apoio dos diferentes governos. Por isso, esta questão é algo em que nos devemos unir. Precisamente porque há falta de recursos em muitos dos nossos Estados devido às contracções orçamentais para investimento, é necessário que a União Europeia não desista também de dar esta dimensão ao investimento para o crescimento na Europa. Há bastantes domínios onde penso que um euro investido a nível europeu dá mais do que um euro investido a nível nacional, como por exemplo, no domínio da energia.

2-345

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, d'abord un point positif, Monsieur Barroso. Je me réjouis du fait que vous allez adapter les valeurs limites européennes avec les valeurs japonaises, parce qu'on avait constaté lors du règlement 297/2011 que les valeurs proposées par la Commission étaient beaucoup trop importantes. Et donc je me réjouis et je voudrais que cela soit intégré dans ce règlement.

Deuxième point au sujet de l'importation des denrées du Japon. Il y a une question de fond. Est-ce que pour soutenir l'économie du Japon, on est obligés d'avoir des aliments contaminés, même si ceux-ci sont en-dessous des normes? Vous avez certainement des enfants. Moi, je me dis, est-ce que je vais leur donner du lait à 500 becquerels d'iode, alors que je peux avoir une alternative avec du lait à zéro becquerel d'iode? Et je me dis que, peut-être, la Commission devrait se dire "On bloque les aliments provenant du Japon, parce qu'ils sont susceptibles d'être contaminés, et on va aider et soutenir, peut-être financièrement ou par des aliments propres, les Japonais eux-mêmes".

Enfin, j'ai un appel à vous faire, Monsieur Barroso, parce que j'ai été interpellée par Areva, qui est allé au Japon, où son matériel a été interdit et stocké à l'aéroport. Donc, ce serait très important que vous demandiez au gouvernement japonais de débloquent l'appareil, tout le système de masques, de robots, etc. qui sont bloqués à l'aéroport.

2-346

President. – Colleague, you are talking in the place of other Members. There is a long list of colleagues who are waiting to speak.

2-347

José Manuel Barroso, Président de la Commission. – Concernant ce dernier point, je n'étais pas au courant. Si j'ai des informations, je serai sans doute satisfait de pouvoir intervenir.

En ce qui concerne la question du lait, vous avez raison, Madame la députée. J'ai non seulement trois enfants, mais aussi un petit-enfant qui, pour l'instant, ne boit que du lait. C'est la seule chose qu'il peut consommer, et je suis donc aussi préoccupé que vous en ce qui concerne la garantie de la nourriture et également du lait que nous importons en Europe.

Notre information, sur la base de toutes les expertises que nous avons, c'est que les mesures que nous avons prises sont suffisantes pour faire face aux risques existants. Jusqu'à présent, nous n'avons identifié aucun cas de nourriture contaminée à des niveaux qui puissent représenter des menaces pour la santé de nos consommateurs, et nous continuerons à appliquer les normes les plus élevées concernant cette question.

2-348

Νίκη Τζαβέλα (EFD). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να παρακαλέσω τον Πρόεδρο της Επιτροπής καθώς και τον Πρόεδρο του Κοινοβουλίου, να απονείμουμε, κατά κάποιο τρόπο, τιμή σ' αυτούς τους 50 - που δεν είναι 50, είναι παραπάνω - ανώνυμους Γιαπωνέζους εργάτες, οι οποίοι εργάζονται ξέροντας ότι θα πεθάνουν! Και σ' αυτό το Κοινοβούλιο απονέμουμε τιμές σε ακτιβιστές οι οποίοι μάχονται για τη διάσωση της καφέ αρκούδας - π.χ. στα Ιμαλάια. Με όλον τον σεβασμό, αλλά κανείς δεν σκέφτηκε εδώ, ότι κάτι πρέπει να πούμε και γι' αυτά τα άτομα, που παρά το γεγονός ότι γνωρίζουν ότι θα πεθάνουν, είναι εκεί και εργάζονται μέρες ατέλειωτες;

Θέλω να σας διαβάσω ακριβώς τι είπε ένας γιαπωνέζος εργάτης ο οποίος μπόρεσε και έδωσε μια μικρή συνέντευξη. Είπε: "Αισθάνομαι πολύ έντονα ότι δεν υπάρχει κανένας άλλος από εμάς για να κάνει αυτή τη δουλειά και ότι δεν μπορούμε να πάμε στο σπίτι μας μέχρι να τελειώσουμε αυτή τη δουλειά". Οι στολές κατά της ραδιενέργειας που διέθετε η ΤΕΠΚΟ εξαντλήθηκαν πολύ γρήγορα. Ο ίδιος και οι συνάδελφοί του αναγκάστηκαν να επινοήσουν εξαρτήματα.
(Ο Πρόεδρος διακόπτει την ομιλήτρια)

2-349

President. – Madam Tzavela, you have spoken for almost two minutes now, but you had only one minute, even if everything you have spoken about is very important for us.

2-350

José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission. – I would like to support the comments made by you, Madam. I think that what you have said is extremely important. I think that those men are heroes; they have our greatest respect and admiration for their courage and their generosity. And let me tell you about the Japanese people too. Commissioner Georgieva was there recently, not far from the area of the accident, and one of the things that impressed Kristalina very much in fact was the resilience, the dignified attitude and the spirit of the Japanese people. So I think it is more than appropriate that we here send, from Strasbourg, from the European Parliament, a message of respect and admiration to the Japanese people and specifically to those heroes who are sacrificing their lives for the good of all Japanese people.

2-351

President. – Madam, I also agree with the President of the European Commission.

2-352

Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η περιοχή της Βορειο-ανατολικής Ιαπωνίας θα παραμείνει

μολυσμένη για τα επόμενα 300 με 400 χρόνια και η ζωή δεν θα επανέλθει σε φυσιολογικούς ρυθμούς ποτέ. Αυτό λένε οι επιστήμονες.

Στο μεταξύ τα σχέδια για την κατασκευή πυρηνικού εργοστασίου σε μια ιδιαίτερα σεισμογενή περιοχή προχωράνε κανονικά. Αυτό μας απαντάει η Τουρκία, κύριε Πρόεδρε, και μια ανάλογη καταστροφή στην Τουρκία - αν κάτι τέτοιο προχωρήσει - θέτει θέμα επιβίωσης ολόκληρης της Ευρώπης. Αυτό λέει η κοινή, απλή λογική.

Η Επιτροπή τι απαντάει σε όλα αυτά; Στην Ατζέντα συνεννόησης με τα υποψήφια προς ένταξη κράτη (αναφερθήκατε πριν στις τρίτες χώρες, αναφέρομαι στα υποψήφια προς ένταξη κράτη), πόσο ψηλά τίθεται η περιβαλλοντική ηθική για την χρήση της πυρηνικής ενέργειας;

2-353

José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission. – Mr President, my answer is yes, but this also applies to candidate countries. Some of the countries which are now members of the European Union and which were candidate countries some time ago were – according to the negotiations – obliged to revise their safety standards and, in some cases, shut down certain nuclear energy installations. We are serious about this.

We will certainly put the question to our Turkish partners – I already mentioned that in the previous statement – and not only to Turkey, but to all the partners that are close to our borders. I believe that special attention should be paid to this. At the same time, we will share with them the information which we have about our own nuclear installations. That is the right approach to trying to solve this issue constructively.

2-354

Franz Obermayr (NI). – Demokratie heißt Volksherrschaft, wie wir alle hier wissen, und in Österreich haben wir das im Jahre 1978 sehr ernst genommen. Wir haben die Bürger zur Atomenergie befragt, und das Ergebnis war eindeutig ein kernenergiefreies Österreich. Aufgrund dessen kam es bei uns zum Atomsperrgesetz, welches heute im Verfassungsrang ist.

Doch wie sieht es in der EU aus? Geplant sind AKW-Stresstests und deren Veröffentlichung. Die Tests sind aber nicht zwingend und enthalten auch keine konkrete Verpflichtung, Mängel zu beheben. Ich unterstütze daher sehr klar eine österreichische Aktion: „Abschalten! Jetzt!“ Und das möchte ich auch europaweit sehen. Das ist jedoch nicht so einfach, wie wir alle wissen, denn Kernkraft ist grundsätzlich eine Kompetenz der Mitgliedstaaten.

Daher frage ich Sie, Herr Präsident Barroso: Werden Sie sich für einheitliche, zwingende europäische Standards einsetzen, und werden Sie endlich die korrekte Durchführung der EU-Umweltnormen, speziell der

Umweltverträglichkeitsprüfung, veranlassen und auch Nichtbeachtung entsprechend sanktionieren?

2-355

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – We will do whatever we can under the current Treaties. As you know, the Treaties give the Member States some national competence in terms of energy, but we are also using the competence we have. The conclusions agreed by the European Council that give the European Commission – together with national independent regulators – a very strong role in terms of nuclear safety efforts, represent progress. We will do that publicly with full transparency. But, of course, I am sure you know that from other matters where we sometimes have difficulties in implementing binding legislation and binding rules at European level. Having said that, I think that the exercise agreed on by our Member States and European partners will be a serious one.

2-356

Linda McAvan (S&D). – Mr Barroso, you have already partly answered this question, which concerns the food safety issues in relation to Japanese imports. I wonder if you could just tell us how much food we import from Japan, so that we can allay some public fears in that regard.

Also, one of the issues about which I am starting to get letters is the fact that your services have based the recommended limits for radiation on two different regulations: one concerning Chernobyl and the other a general provision. This is what is causing confusion. I have read the relevant question and answer on the Commission's website but I have to say that it is very complicated. I wonder if you could throw some light on this. Why are there two different regulations?

If you cannot throw light on it today, could you at least clarify it on the Commission's website so that my constituents understand exactly what the levels are, why they have been drawn up, and why there is a difference between Chernobyl levels and non-Chernobyl levels?

2-357

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – I will try, but these matters are extremely technical; I myself had to do a crash course to understand some of the language. But first, as regards the amount of food and feed imported, it is really marginal. The European Union imports feed and food with a total value of EUR 216 million from Japan, which represents around 0.4% in value and less than 0.1% in volume of total feed and food imports into the European Union. For the Japanese economy it also represents very little. I could give you a list of the products imported, but I have only one minute so I cannot do so on this occasion.

On the second issue, concerning why there are different values, those values were established after Chernobyl. They were based on that scientific evidence, and that is why we believe they are sound. Nevertheless, we have now had another tragedy, far away in Japan. As I mentioned, Japan has very high food safety standards.

To avoid a contradiction between their standards and our standards, we have decided – as I announced today – on some kind of harmonisation, at least with Japan, while we are reviewing scientifically the global standards we can implement for any kind of imports to the European Union. This explains why there are differences; but they are, I believe, transitional differences.

2-358

President. – President Barroso, thank you for your presence here in plenary with us, for all your answers, for the very lively discussion, and chiefly for your words on the very important EU response to the tragedy in Japan.

That concludes the item.

2-359

10 - EU framework for coordinating national Roma integration strategies (debate)

2-360

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ROBERTA ANGELILLI
Vicepresidente

2-361

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la dichiarazione della Commissione sul quadro europeo di coordinamento delle strategie nazionali per l'integrazione dei Rom.

2-362

Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission. – Madam President, I am presenting, together with my colleague, László Andor, the decision which the Commission has taken to present a new framework for national Roma integration strategies.

The EU framework comes at a moment when the situation of Roma has become a real focus of attention in Europe. The EU has made available to the Member States a range of legal, policy and financial instruments to address the situation of the Roma. We also have a whole legal framework based on non-discrimination, free movement of people and the enlargement strategy. However it is very clear that the economic and social marginalisation of the Roma persists, and this is neither acceptable nor sustainable in the European Union of the 21st century.

Parliament, with support from across the whole political spectrum – and I would like to underline this – has drawn attention to the urgency of promoting the integration of Roma, through its recently adopted resolution on the EU Roma strategy. I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mrs Járóka, for her excellent work.

Determined action is needed, both at national and at European level. We need to join forces and step up our efforts to end discrimination against Roma and make sure they enjoy the same rights as any other European citizens, because that is what they are. When I say that, I of course have in mind a two-way process which

requires a change in the mindset of the majority of our European citizens and of members of the Roma communities.

We all agree that there is a need for effective policy planning and implementation as well as for a strategic common approach. We all know that the primary responsibility for the integration of Roma lies with the Member States. We also acknowledge that the situation of the Roma varies greatly from one Member State to another. That is why the Commission decided to present an EU framework to enable the Member States to take action commensurate with the challenge they have to overcome.

The Roma task force which was set up in September last year, and reported in December, showed clearly that, very often, not enough is being done. The EUR 26.5 billion which are available under the Structural Funds are not being utilised as they should be. Only EUR 100 million of this money was earmarked for specific Roma activities, while 70% of the means for technical assistance, which would have been necessary in most Member States, was simply not used. So the measures in place so far are not adequate. It is now time to ensure that national, regional and local policies focus on Roma needs in a clear and specific way.

In our framework we concentrate on four main issues: education, employment, health and housing. We want the EU and the 27 Member States to commit themselves to closing the gaps and to concentrate on the common goals in those four areas with targeted actions and sufficient funds to deliver them. We want all Member States to build these goals into their existing Roma strategy, if they have one, or to develop a Roma strategy if they do not have one, for the period up to 2020.

In order to check whether these efforts achieve their objectives, we need regular monitoring. Therefore the EU framework lays the foundations for a robust monitoring mechanism to ensure concrete results for the Roma. This monitoring mechanism will ensure that the national Roma strategies are implemented, that money intended for Roma integration reaches its final beneficiaries, and that there is progress towards achieving the Roma integration goals.

The Commission will report annually on progress made towards integrating the Roma population in the Member States. The EU framework provides an opportunity for all stakeholders, at all levels, to join forces with the EU population in general and the Roma population in particular in order to put an end to the exclusion of more than 10 million European citizens, which we can no longer afford for the future.

2-363

László Andor, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, Honourable Members, the socio-economic situation of Roma is at the top of the EU agenda. Last month this House adopted the Járóka Report on an EU strategy on Roma inclusion. And today, the Commission

adopted a Communication on an EU Framework for national Roma integration strategies.

Both documents make significant contributions to the wider debate on Roma, and will feed into the conclusions to be adopted at the next Council meeting of Employment and Social Affairs Ministers on 19 May, which will be exclusively devoted to the integration of Roma.

Those documents articulate the EU's political determination to address the situation of millions of Roma who are suffering from economic and social exclusion. I would like to make three key points here.

Firstly, the Commission has set out an EU framework for national Roma integration strategies. It acknowledges the Member States' prime responsibility for designing and implementing Roma integration strategies. It also reaffirms the Commission's deep conviction that the European Union cannot tolerate any form of racism, xenophobia, discrimination or social exclusion of Roma. The Union has a moral and political obligation to support the Member States in their efforts with all the policies and instruments at its disposal.

Secondly, as you know, the Union has agreed on a comprehensive strategy for developing the European economic and social model in a balanced way. The Europe 2020 Strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth is the right policy context for addressing the multifaceted problems facing Roma. We must harness Europe 2020's objectives, targets, flagship initiatives and reporting structures for the cause of the Roma.

The key message is that excluding millions of EU citizens from economic and social life is not smart, is not sustainable and is certainly not inclusive. In short, there is no excuse for Roma exclusion to continue in the Europe we want to live in.

In particular, the Europe 2020 headline targets for employment, poverty reduction and education are key benchmarks for measuring progress in Roma integration policies. The Commission's Communication on Roma identifies four areas that are of strategic importance to overcome Roma exclusion. These are as follows.

Access to employment: the big gap between Roma and non-Roma employment rates has to be addressed. We will not achieve our Europe 2020 targets if we do not do it.

Access to education: all Roma children should have access to quality education and not face discrimination or segregation. As a minimum, all Roma children should complete primary school.

Access to healthcare: reducing the gap in health between Roma and non-Roma. Member States should provide access to quality healthcare under the same conditions as for the rest of the population.

Access to housing and essential services: where the situation of the Roma people is indeed much worse than that of the rest of the population, for example where access to water, electricity and other services are concerned.

The lack of an integrated approach has a negative impact on the overall integration of Roma people in society and leaves them in poverty.

Thirdly, the Union must put its money where its mouth is. The Commission is currently drawing up a proposal for the multi-annual financial framework, which will be followed by specific proposals on the Structural Funds. To my mind, the Structural Funds need to be brought into line with the Europe 2020 strategy. This applies to the policy areas for which I am responsible in general – employment and social inclusion – and it certainly applies to the socio-economic integration of Roma. Making our financial instruments more effective is a key objective for me.

Let me stop at this point, so I can listen to your views and answer any questions.

2-364

Enikő Győri, President-in-Office of the Council. – The Hungarian Presidency welcomes the Commission communication on the EU framework for national Roma integration strategies. I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation not only for the work done, but also for the personal dedication of Commissioner Reding, Commissioner Andor and all those who have cooperated on this truly significant achievement.

With the presentation of this strategic document, we have moved a giant step closer to the realisation of one of the chief priorities of the Hungarian Presidency. I am convinced that it will prove to be an important contribution to the improvement of the economic and social situation of the Roma in Europe, together with the recently adopted resolution of the European Parliament on an EU strategy for Roma inclusion based on the report by Livia Járóka.

Extreme poverty, discrimination and marginalisation continue to affect large numbers of Roma throughout Europe, so it is high time for improvement. We cannot afford to say that it is their problem, and not ours. Moreover, people must never be considered as a problem, but rather as a chance, an opportunity. Given the current economic and demographic situation in Europe, the improvement of the economic and social status of the Roma can open up new human resources, thus contributing to economic growth in the long run.

The Hungarian Presidency has always believed that, besides the necessary fight against discrimination, a new policy mix is necessary, with three key elements: employment, education and housing. If followed up properly by the Member States, integrated policy action in these three fields, complemented by adequate monitoring as proposed by the Commission, will make a

difference. The Member States will also have to make an effort to reach the goals of the EU 2020 strategy. Measures for the social inclusion of the Roma can be mainstreamed in various policy fields. It is now widely recognised that measures inspired and coordinated at EU level can create synergy and added value.

What is next? The Hungarian Presidency intends to present and discuss the communication with the two Commissioners during the next Roma platform on 7 April in Budapest, to which I invite all who are interested. The Council will deal with it in a horizontal manner. Firstly, the April Justice and Home Affairs Council will discuss it on 12 April. Then it will be the turn of the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council on 9 May, with the adoption of Council conclusions. The Education Council will also receive the document, on 20 May, before the Hungarian Presidency presents its report on the results of the discussions to the General Affairs Council on 23 May.

The final moment of this itinerary will, hopefully, be an endorsement in the June European Council. It will, of course, just be a new beginning for coordinated action at EU and national level for helping this truly European minority.

2-365

László Tőkés, a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében. – Tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Tisztelt Biztosok és Államtitkár! Járóka Lívia jelentése alapján, azzal együtt, örömmel haladunk tovább a romastratégia megvalósítása útján. Ennek apropója az április 8-i nemzetközi roma nap. Éppen erre a napra esik egyébként az Európai Roma Platform ötödik ülése, melyet Magyarországon tartanak. Mindezekkel újabb jelentős lépést tehetünk egy uniós koordinálású, de a helyi sajátosságokat figyelembe venni képes közös cselekvési terv irányába. Az Európai Néppárt évek óta szorgalmazza a közösségi fellépést a romák társadalmi befogadása ügyében. És az állam- és kormányfők június 24-i csúcstalálkozásán reményeink szerint valóban útnak indulhat az európai roma stratégia.

Az Unió legsúlyosabb emberi jogi problémájára adandó európai szintű választ adhatnak ezáltal. Elsősorban a tagállamok felelősége, hogy állampolgárai számára biztosítsa az alapvető emberi jogok érvényesülését. Az Unió csak kereteket adhat ehhez, de az egyes országok tölthetik meg tartalommal ezeket a kereteket. Az európai roma stratégia egyfajta szakmai minimum lehet. De meggyőződésem, hogy egy pártokon és ciklusokon átívelő, hosszú távú cselekvési terv készül ezáltal, amely hatékonyan orvosolhatja a romákat érintő szegénységet és társadalmi kirekesztést. Néhány fontos pont a stratégia tartalmáról: gazdasági és nem etnikai alapon határozza meg célcsoportját, előmozdítja az emberi jogok teljes spektrumának érvényesülését, és megerősíti az esélyegyenlőség elvét, tekintetbe veszi a kirekesztés területi jellegét és enyhíti a fejletlen mikrorégiókban koncentrálódó hátrányokat.

A stratégia sikeréhez az érintett, azaz az Unió intézmények, a tagállamok, a civil szervezetek és a roma közösségek hosszú távú, erőteljes, közös erőfeszítésére van szükség. Éppen ezért ezt az ügyet nem szabad ellentétek szítására, pártpolitikai támadásokra használni. A csoportos megbélyegzésnek sincs helye. Sem a romák kollektív bűnösségét, sem a többség, az elnyomók kollektív felelősségét nem szabad egymással szembeállítani. A roma ügy megoldása a magyar EU elnökség prioritását jelenti. Kívánom, hogy az Európai Tanács júniusban fogadja el a tervbe vett stratégiát. Ebben kérem támogatását az Európai Parlamentnek.

2-366

Monika Flašíková Beňová, za skupinu S&D – Pani komisárka, pán komisár, v prvom rade by som vám chcela zablahoželať k prezentovanému rámcu. Som rada, že, po opakovaných a mnohonásobných výzvach zo strany Parlamentu, Komisia dnes konečne predstavuje túto európsku rámcovú stratégiu. Myslím si, že je aj najvyšší čas, pretože situácia začína byť čoraz vážnejšia. Mnohí Rómovia v Únii čelia nielen nedôstojným životným podmienkam, ale aj rastúcemu teroru. Sobotňajší fakľový pochod proti Rómom v Maďarsku je toho najnovším dôkazom a chcela by som týmto vyzvať maďarskú vládu k vyvodeniu dôsledkov.

Čo sa týka predstaveného rámca, dovoľte mi začať kriticky. Situácia je urgentná, ale aj tak nemôžeme akceptovať rozhodnutie Komisie pripraviť rámec bez verejných konzultácií so zúčastnenými stranami. Je zvláštne, že na jednej strane v samotnom rámci zdôrazňujete dôležitosť spolupráce s občianskou spoločnosťou, ale pri samotnej príprave tohto kľúčového dokumentu ste obišli ako Rómom, tak mimovládne organizácie, medzinárodné organizácie a podobne. Takýto uzavretý postup rámca na jeho legitimitu nepridá, skôr naopak.

Samotný obsah prezentovaného rámca považujem však vcelku za úspešný. Komisia správne definovala kompetencie pri riešení tohto celoeurópskeho problému. Kľúčové kompetencie ostávajú však naďalej na úrovni členských štátov. Považujem však za mimoriadne dôležité, že Európska únia preberá úlohu koordinátora národných stratégií a dohľadu nad nimi s cieľom zabezpečiť čo najrýchlejšiu a ozajstnú integráciu Rómom.

V tejto súvislosti je absolútne kľúčové spomenúť aj dôležitosť monitorovania súladu národných stratégií s predkladaným rámcem a dôležitosť monitorovania efektívnosti ich implementácie. V tomto smere sa mi však zdá byť postoj Komisie trošku málo ambicióznym. Komisia by mala pritvrdiť najmä v očakávaníach od členských štátov. Rámec správne definuje štyri kľúčové oblasti pre integráciu Rómom: prístup ku vzdelávaniu, dostupnosť zamestnania, prístup k zdravotnej starostlivosti a dostupnosť dôstojného bývania a základných služieb. Spolu s členmi našej frakcie sme sa počas svojich početných návštev rómskych komunít po celej Európe mali možnosť presvedčiť, že práve toto sú kľúčové oblasti, kde Rómovia často čelia zhoršeným

podmienkam. Treba však zdôrazniť, že podobne formulované ciele sa objavili už aj v programe *Dekáda rómskeho začleňovania*. Teraz je podstatné, aby sa zabezpečilo ich naplnenie.

K týmto štyrom oblastiam by som ešte chcela doplniť ďalšiu, ktorá v rámci chýba, a to konkrétne boj nielen proti diskriminácii, ale aj boj proti verbálnym či fyzickým prejavom rasizmu.

V neposlednom rade by som chcela upozorniť na otázku financovania integračných opatrení. Pracovná skupina Komisie ešte koncom minulého roka odhalila, že členské štáty majú značné medzery vo využívaní fondov EÚ. Komisia by si mala dať preto záležať na troch veciach: aby čerpanie fondov nebolo administratívne príliš náročné, aby Komisia spravila účinné opatrenia s cieľom zabezpečiť, aby vyčlenené zdroje skutočne plnili svoj účel, a aby sa zamedzilo použitiu zdrojov na segregáčnej praktiky.

Záverom mi dovoľte ešte raz poďakovať a zablahoželať vám, pani komisárka a pán komisár, a teraz bude rad na členských štátoch, aby na jeho základe na národnej úrovni efektívne postupovali pri integrácii rómskeho etnika.

(Rečník súhlasil, že odpovie na otázku položenú zdvihnutím modrej karty (článok 149 ods. 8 rokovacieho poriadku).

2-367

Franz Obermayr (NI). – Danke, Frau Kollegin Flašíková, dass ich diese Frage an Sie richten darf. Sie haben sich ja sehr gut mit dem vorliegenden Bericht befasst und wissen sicherlich auch, dass in dem Bericht vorgesehen ist, dass die Mitgliedstaaten Bußgelder zu zahlen haben, wenn Abweichungen von dem Bericht festgestellt werden oder wenn die Strategie nicht eingehalten wird. Wie stehen Sie dazu, dass ein Staat auch dann bußgeldpflichtig wird, wenn die Pflicht zum Besuch der Grundschule nicht eingehalten wird? In allen Ländern ist der Besuch der Grundschule verbindlich vorgeschrieben. Wenn also der Besuch der Grundschule von Roma-Kindern nicht erfolgt, ist das betreffende Land dann als solches bußgeldpflichtig? Glauben Sie nicht auch, dass sich auch die Eltern in gewisser Weise darum zu kümmern haben, dass ihre Kinder in die Schule gehen müssen?

2-368

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D) – V tomto smere by som chcela povedať jednu vec: som absolútne zástankyňou toho, že tam, kde vytvárame práva, tam musia byť dodržiavané aj povinnosti. A samozrejme je aj úlohou rodičov, aby dbali o to, aby boli dodržiavané všetky práva dieťaťa. Myslím si však, že členské štáty Európskej únie majú dostatočné nástroje na to, aby takýto priestor vytvorili, a že nebudú trestané za to, ak sa nebude dodržiavať povinnosť zo strany rodičov.

2-369

Станимир Илчев, от името на групата ALDE. – г-жо председател, аз също искам да благодаря на

докладчика, г-жа Jároka, както и на представителите на Комисията, на Съвета и на Унгарското председателство, тъй като те направиха пред нас много сериозни обещания и поеха много важни ангажименти.

Когато говорим за интеграцията на ромите, не бива да забравяме, че става дума за най-специфичния и може би най-сложния проблем на Европа и на Европейския съюз. Проблем, който е неразрешим само чрез финансиране, само чрез анти-дискриминационно законодателство или само чрез лансиране на образователни програми. Този проблем може да намери решение единствено чрез комбинацията на всички тези подходи и наистина в рамките на единна политическа воля.

Днес Съюзът повече от всякога е насаме със своите 12 милиона роми. Някои още не разбират, че тези хора не са просто само български, румънски, словашки роми, а те са граждани на Съюза с еднакви права и задължения и същевременно с ограничени възможности.

Ситуацията, както виждаме, е доста сложна. Стратегията на Европейския съюз за интегриране на ромите ще бъде толкова успешна, колкото поинтегрирани бъдат действията, инициативите и политиките на държавите-членки и на всички европейски институции.

Импровизациите и едностранните действия може дори да нанесат по-скоро щети вместо да произведат ползи, и тук е мястото да се каже, че в някои от държавите-членки знанието за ромите е недостатъчно, в някои случаи дори и превратно. От това следва, че ромският въпрос в Европа трябва да се изучава активно и професионално да се следи неговата динамика. Иначе има опасност вместо да неутрализираме цъкащата бомба, само да я преместваме от едно място на друго върху картата на стария континент.

Ядрото на нашата амбициозна стратегия не може да бъде друго, освен гигантско усилие за образование на ромите - максимално включване на децата им в образователната система, елементарна квалификация на младежите, ограмотяване на възрастните.

Голямата цел трябва да бъде един нарастващ през следващите години процент от роми, подготвени за трудовия пазар и с култивирано отношение към институциите и законността. Това е единствената гаранция, че животът на ромите няма да се развива в бъдеще, както досега като мизерно съществуване върху пясък, в който безсмислено потъваха парите на европейските данъкоплатци.

2-370

Hélène Flautre, au nom du groupe Verts/ALE. – Madame la Présidente, c'est une bonne nouvelle, évidemment, aujourd'hui, d'avoir entre nos mains un cadre européen qui va faire obligation à chacun des États

membres de faire connaître sa stratégie en matière d'inclusion des Roms. D'ici la fin de l'année, ces stratégies seront évaluées par la Commission européenne, et nous aurons donc à en débattre à nouveau à peu près dans un an. Donc, on lance aujourd'hui en fait une feuille de route qui doit permettre aux parlementaires, aux institutions, à la société civile, d'être en capacité d'extrême vigilance permanente sur des domaines très importants, ceux que vous avez cités.

J'observe que la communication de la Commission prend en compte un certain nombre de remarques que nous avons formulées dans le rapport parlementaire. Je veux parler, par exemple de l'implication de l'Agence des droits fondamentaux dans l'évaluation des stratégies. Je pense que cette Agence n'a plus à démontrer ses compétences en la matière. Je pense également au développement de la coopération avec le Conseil de l'Europe sur la formation des médiateurs issus de la communauté rom. C'est un élément stratégique déterminant pour la réussite des projets à tous les niveaux, au même titre que l'attention qui est donnée aux Roms qui sont ressortissants de pays tiers, ainsi que la dimension élargissement, qui est prise en compte dans ce rapport. Je pense, enfin, que la définition d'indicateurs communs pour renforcer le mécanisme d'évaluation est tout à fait la bienvenue.

Néanmoins, dans cette communication, je voudrais souligner des manquements. Je crois qu'il n'y est pas fait référence de manière suffisamment forte et appuyée à la nécessaire participation des Roms à tous les niveaux, c'est-à-dire le niveau de l'élaboration des projets, de la mise en œuvre des projets et de l'évaluation de ces projets. On y parle d'information, on y parle de consultation, mais l'implication de la communauté rom elle-même est déterminante. Les expériences, parce qu'il y a aussi de bonnes expériences qui réussissent en Europe, le démontrent à souhait. C'est, je trouve, un point faible de la communication.

Un deuxième point faible de la communication, c'est qu'elle aborde la question de la non-discrimination de manière horizontale dans chacun des quatre secteurs. Mais je crois que c'est très important, qu'il aurait été très important qu'il y ait un paragraphe spécifiquement dévolu à la lutte contre les discriminations, contre les violences, pour l'accès à la justice des populations roms. Ce volet anti-discrimination, droits fondamentaux, accès à la justice n'est pas assumé de manière spécifique en tant que tel. Je crois que c'est une faiblesse du texte de la Commission.

Je pense également que nous avons parlé des médiateurs, programme lancé par le Conseil de l'Europe. C'est bien qu'il soit mentionné dans cette communication. Nous aurions pu, vous auriez pu également mentionner les lignes directrices qui ont déjà été formulées par le Conseil de l'Europe, de manière à ce qu'on n'ait pas, en quelque sorte, deux stratégies ou deux types de référence pour évaluer les stratégies nationales. Cela aurait été, me semble-t-il, un plus dans cette communication.

Enfin, je crois que le travail de la Commission n'est pas terminé, que la *task force* doit continuer son travail pour que les États membres sentent au jour le jour la pression qui est mise sur elle, au niveau de la Commission, de la société civile et des institutions locales, pour la mise en œuvre effective de ces orientations.

2-371

Timothy Kirkhope, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, this proposal is an opportunity to better integrate the Roma people within Member States and to find ways to provide the Roma people with the full, equal opportunities and rights afforded to all EU citizens. The main aim of the programme should be to achieve basic universal rights for all those people.

I fear, however, that once again this heavily burdened and complicated agenda, like previous programmes, may have to be cut back. The competences of Member States in the areas of education, health and housing must be respected and, from what I have read so far, I fear the Commission may be acting *ultra vires* in a manner that is detrimental to the rights of Member States to determine their own policies in these areas. However, I hope that this new strategy marks a new era in the way the EU addresses the issue by firstly listening to the Roma people.

For too long programmes have been too complicated and have simply not reached the people who need help most. In nearly ten years little of substance has been achieved on the ground. I hope the Commission will now focus on how best to simplify the procedures for accessing EU funds and how to better monitor, assess and implement its programmes. If the EU is spending money in this area then it needs to be spent now in a better way.

2-372

Cornelia Ernst, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Auf der einen Seite ist es gut, dass es nun eine Rahmenstrategie für die Roma geben soll, aber auf der anderen Seite muss ich Wasser in den Wein gießen. Denn was die Kommission insgesamt auf den Tisch gelegt hat, bleibt hinter den jahrelangen Diskussionen mit Roma-Vertretern, auch in diesem Haus, zurück.

Roma-Vertreter haben seit Jahren mit und ohne Rahmenstrategie immer wieder darauf hingewiesen, dass wir zielgenaue Maßnahmen und klare, konkrete Vorgaben brauchen. Es gibt noch nicht einmal klare Sanktionen bei einer Nichteinhaltung dieser Strategie. Es gibt zwar Ansätze, die hier genannt wurden, aber keine tatsächlichen Sanktionen, und so werden Verbindlichkeiten ausgehöhlt wie ein Schweizer Käse.

Die Roma-Strategie soll alle wesentlichen Bereiche bedenken. So hatten wir es vereinbart. Aber was bietet die Kommission neben den vier Schwerpunkten noch an? Es fehlt eine strukturell verankerte Partizipation und Einbindung der Roma-Gemeinschaften an allen und in alle sie betreffenden Entscheidungen. Es fehlen Strukturen zur konkreten Umsetzung von Zielen. Es fehlt die Geschlechterperspektive. Und was mich

wirklich ärgert und was ich für einen Skandal halte, ist, dass Sie explizit nichts, aber auch gar nichts zur Bekämpfung der Roma-Feindlichkeit unternehmen wollen.

Sie beklagen, dass EU-Strukturmittel für Roma nicht genutzt werden. Aber ich frage Sie ganz offen: Ist nicht die Roma-Feindlichkeit auch eine Ursache dafür, dass man auf solche EU-Mittel bislang verzichtet hat? Ich glaube schon.

Wir als GUE/NGL-Fraktion kritisieren diese Mitteilung. Wir halten sie für nicht ausreichend, und ich erwarte ganz einfach entsprechende Veränderungen.

2-373

Mario Borghesio, *a nome del gruppo EFD*. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, pur essendo euroscettico, potrei essere favorevole a un'impostazione in vista del 2020 per eliminare discriminazioni, difficoltà ed emarginazione, ove ci fosse veramente un'azione incisiva della Commissione europea per controllare il comportamento degli Stati.

Quando però questi discorsi di grande avvenire, di grande controllo, mi vengono fatti da un Commissario europeo che continua a non spiegarmi come mai nel suo paese, nel Granducato di Lussemburgo, sono proibiti gli accampamenti di quei nomadi che possono invece installarsi vicino a casa mia, in Italia e in Francia. Quindi parliamo di dare la casa ai nomadi, mentre in qualche paese europeo, precisamente nel paese europeo del Commissario Reding, essi non possono nemmeno farsi il loro accampamento.

Sul numero odierno del principale quotidiano del mio paese, "Il Corriere della Sera", si legge la notizia di un genitore – che non merita la definizione di genitore – nomade, che è stato arrestato in Italia perché ha venduto la propria bambina ai trafficanti che la volevano mandare a prostituirsi. Ha venduto la propria bambina. Altri li mandano a fare altre cose. Sono loro che spesso non li mandano a scuola, nonostante le pressioni e le attenzioni delle autorità, dei mediatori e delle associazioni.

Vogliamo parlare anche di questi problemi? Vogliamo toglierci le fette di salame del buonismo idiota e capire che molti problemi dei Rom dipendono esclusivamente e principalmente da loro?

2-374

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 149)

2-375

Iosif Matula (PPE), *în scris*. – Romii constituie o importantă minoritate etnică în Europa, localizată pe întregul teritoriul continentului. Cu toate acestea, Uniunea nu dispune de o strategie unitară, integrată, care să se adreseze acestei comunități. Astfel, Cadrul pentru coordonarea strategiilor naționale privind romii este esențial, prin obiectivul de a coordona statele membre în

elaborarea propriilor strategii naționale. În felul acesta, anticipăm eficientizarea utilizării fondurilor pentru romi.

Valorificarea patrimoniului cultural și a meșteșugurilor comunităților de romi poate îmbunătăți semnificativ percepția pe care o are majoritatea populației despre această comunitate, dar și auto-percepția romilor. Un aspect important este și acela al asigurării unor servicii de bază pentru comunitățile nomade - o problemă transfrontalieră, chiar dacă procentul acestora se estimează a fi foarte redus în Europa.

Integrarea deplină a comunităților de romi se poate realiza cu condiția să asigurăm acces egal la educație, locuri de muncă, servicii medicale și locuințe, dar și încurajând inițiativele antreprenoriale ale membrilor acestei populații și simplificând procedurile de accesare a fondurilor structurale specifice. Cadrul pentru coordonarea strategiilor naționale pentru integrarea romilor va avea succes dacă membrii comunității rome vor fi încurajați să preia inițiativa în domeniu, nefiind doar beneficiari pasivi ai măsurilor elaborate la nivel european sau național.

2-376

Rovana Plumb (S&D), *in writing*. – The EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies provides an opportunity to join forces at all levels and with all stakeholders to put an end to the exclusion of the Roma. The goals set up at EU level, covering four important areas for Roma integration – access to education, employment, healthcare and housing – will only be reached if there is a clear commitment from Member States. It is now crucial to step up a gear and ensure that national, regional and local integration policies target Roma in a clear and specific way and that explicit measures address the needs of the Roma to prevent and compensate for the disadvantages they face. The Member States should ensure that all Roma children have access to quality education and establish a concrete target for raising Roma employment rates within the context of Europe 2020, increasing the proportion of Roma households with access to water, sanitation and electricity, and promoting non-discriminatory access to housing, including social housing. The Member States should establish concrete targets with concrete timelines for raising the life expectancy of Roma, raising child vaccination rates to the level of the non-Roma population, and lowering infant and maternal mortality rates to the level of the non-Roma population.

2-377

11 - Stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese per l'esercizio 2012 - Sezione I - Parlamento (discussione)

2-378

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di José Manuel Fernandes, a nome della commissione per i bilanci, sullo stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese del Parlamento europeo per l'esercizio 2012 – Sezione I – Parlamento (2011/2018(BUD)) (A7-0087/2011).

2-379

José Manuel Fernandes, relator. – Senhora Presidente, caros Colegas, em primeiro lugar, um agradecimento a todos aqueles que participaram na elaboração deste relatório e, em particular, um agradecimento especial aos relatores-sombra de todos os grupos políticos.

Este é um relatório que permite que o orçamento para 2012 do Parlamento Europeu seja um orçamento de austeridade, um orçamento de contenção, um orçamento rigoroso. Na verdade, em relação à proposta inicial cortámos efectivamente cerca de 49 milhões de euros. Em relação à posição que assumimos, e que foi votada e sufragada aqui em plenário por larga maioria, fomos mais longe do que aquilo que nos tínhamos comprometido. Tínhamos dito que a actualização seria à volta da inflação. Pois bem, ficámos muito longe da inflação, o que significa que o orçamento para 2012 se traduz num decréscimo real, num orçamento também que fica abaixo dos 20 % da rubrica 5 que é aquela que tem as verbas para as instituições da União Europeia. Já há alguns anos que não atingíamos esse objectivo e que passávamos dos 20 %.

Recordo ainda que a Comissão dos Presidentes fixou em 20 a 22 % o objectivo para o orçamento do parlamento, ficando este ano aquém desse valor. Mas também na execução do orçamento, em 2012, vamos querer poupanças utilizando os princípios da boa gestão, o princípio da economia, o princípio da eficiência e também o princípio da eficácia. Queremos que todas as despesas sejam justificadas, queremos que as despesas variáveis sejam objecto de uma análise de custo-benefício. Dessa forma, conseguiremos poupanças adicionais também na execução.

O esforço deve ser de todas as instituições no que diz respeito à poupança e prevê-se que a margem da rubrica 5, que engloba as despesas administrativas de todas as instituições, tenha, em 2012, uma sobra de cerca de 380 milhões de euros. Pois bem, nós propomos que 100 milhões de euros destinados às despesas administrativas sejam transferidos para a área da juventude. E porquê a juventude? Porque é a geração que, em termos de acesso ao emprego, tem maiores dificuldades, é aquela cuja taxa de desemprego é o dobro em relação às outras gerações. Mas há objectivos e razões adicionais para elegermos a prioridade "juventude" também para 2012. Já o foi em 2011 e, para além disso, na Estratégia da União Europeia 2020 que guia as próximas Perspectivas Financeiras, mas que guia também o orçamento da colega Balzani para 2012, a juventude está presente em todos os cinco objectivos. E mais, no que diz respeito ao abandono escolar e à educação relativamente à geração entre os 30 e 34 anos, 40 % desta geração tem diplomas universitários, o que torna dois dos objectivos exclusivos. Espero que emendas que contrariam esta proposta sejam repensadas, pois consideramos que a prioridade "juventude" deve ser uma prioridade a manter por este Parlamento.

2-380

Monika Hohlmeier, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Berichterstatter, liebe

Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der Parlamentshaushalt 2012 steht natürlich vor wirtschaftlich und finanziell schwierigen Zeiten. Deshalb halte ich es für positiv, dass wir uns in den grundlegenden Leitlinien darauf verständigt haben, auch unseren Haushalt im Parlament sorgfältig vor dem Hintergrund nicht zu starker Steigerungen zu erstellen und auch letztendlich nur einen Ausgleich maximal in Höhe der Inflationsrate vorzunehmen. Ich halte auch das Ziel, das von meinem Kollegen Fernandes in Bezug auf die Jugend genannt wurde, für ein sehr wichtiges Ziel, denn uns war im letzten Haushaltsentwurf besonders wichtig, dass der Jugend mehr Geld zur Verfügung gestellt werden sollte als dies bisher der Fall war, weil letztendlich gerade junge Menschen, die ohne Arbeit sind oder besonderer Unterstützung bedürfen, auch von europäischer Seite Unterstützung erfahren sollten. Deshalb halte ich die zusätzlichen 100 Millionen für einen sehr positiven Ansatz.

Ich möchte als Berichterstatterin für Gebäude im Besonderen auch darauf hinweisen, dass ich es für besonders wichtig halte, dass wir bei den Gebäuden eine besonders große Effizienz in Bezug auf die Finanzierung behalten und auch die Finanzlage sorgfältig überwachen. In diesem Zusammenhang halte ich es für richtig, dass Mittel, die im Laufe des Jahres im Parlamentshaushalt nicht verwendet werden können, im Besonderen dafür verwendet werden sollen, möglichst kostengünstig Zinsen zu vermeiden. In diesem Zusammenhang ist auch dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass die Gelder nicht in einem so genannten „Dezember-Fieber“ noch ausgegeben werden, sondern dann dafür verwendet werden, Gebäude schneller und kostengünstiger abzufinanzieren. Beim Haus der Europäischen Geschichte werden wir gemeinschaftlich darauf achten, dass das Betriebskonzept noch einmal sorgfältig überprüft wird und dass im Besonderen auch im Bereich des Baus eine sorgfältige Kostenüberwachung stattfindet und dass vor allem eine ordnungsgemäße Haushaltsvorlage auch nach der Gebäudevorlage nach einer Notifizierung gemäß Artikel 179 Absatz 3 stattfinden wird.

2-381

Derek Vaughan, on behalf of the S&D Group. – Madam President, I would first of all like to pay tribute to the rapporteur for the way in which he has approached this budget and for his recognition that Parliament should avoid large increases in its spending for 2012. This is particularly appropriate as we know that the Council intends to cut its budget by 4%, the Commission intends to increase its budget by only 1%, the Committee of the Regions by around 2.9% and the Economic and Social Committee by an even smaller amount.

I believe that the initial suggestion of 5.2% made by the Bureau was far too high. Reducing the increase to 2.3% is therefore progress. It is in fact a cut of about 0.5% in real terms. Personally, I would have liked to have seen an even smaller increase. In the future, I believe we should produce a plan to identify savings in Parliament's budget.

However, we should recognise that savings have been made. I welcome the savings made on the Added-Value Assessment Unit – which will save us around EUR 1.3 million – the savings on information campaigns, buildings policy and stationery and on the proposal to reduce the contingency reserve by around EUR 3 million. These all equate to real savings of around EUR 13.7 billion, in addition to the deferred spending on Lisbon and enlargement. As I said, I believe that further savings could have been made, but we have at least found some savings.

Finally, could I also raise two important outstanding issues? Firstly, on the suggestion that the EUR 100 million from unallocated margins in Heading 5 should go to youth policy, as outlined by the rapporteur: along with other groups, we have said in Amendment 7 that this transfer could be considered but only in line with the priorities in the general 2012 budget. This will therefore need discussion before a decision can be made on whether it should be done and where the money should go – in other words, where the money would be spent if that transfer takes place. It is far too soon for us to commit ourselves to that.

Secondly, there is the issue of the House of European History. It would be a good idea if we had plenty of money, but I believe that now is not the time. We need a proper business plan and we need it to go through the proper parliamentary procedure, perhaps through the normal budget process later this year, so that Members can have their say and give their views on this project. On this issue, I believe it is important that Parliament, as on other issues, should be seen to be taking the right decisions on our own budget. Our own budget is important and we have to be seen to be making sure that we take the right decisions for the public.

2-382

Alexander Alvaro, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin! Man kann sich durchaus der Ansicht anschließen, dass die Arbeit des Berichterstatters und auch der Kollegen Früchte gezeigt hat. Es zeigt sich, dass Geld nicht alles ist, aber ohne Geld anscheinend alles nichts ist. Genauso zeigt es sich auch, dass, wenn es um Einsparmöglichkeiten geht, jeder an dem festhält, was er hat, und nicht bereit ist, etwas abzugeben, was gegebenenfalls eine Entwicklung hin zu mehr Einsparpotenzial bringen könnte. Vor diesem Hintergrund ist auch die Diskussion, ob man sich bei einer Inflationsrate von 2,3 %, 2,5 % oder 2,7 % bewegt, letzten Endes nichts anderes als Spiegelfechterei. Unsere Aufgabe ist, zu schauen, wo wir konkret Gelder einsparen können.

Entscheidende Voraussetzung dafür ist – und es wäre wichtig, wenn sich das Generalsekretariat dieses Hauses das vielleicht zu Herzen nehmen würde –, dass der Haushaltsausschuss auch mit allen wesentlichen Unterlagen versorgt wird, um anhand des Haushaltsplans des Europäischen Parlaments zu schauen, wo entsprechende Einsparmöglichkeiten bestehen, und nicht nur die Änderungsvorschläge des Generalsekretärs

vorgelegt bekommt. Der Haushaltsplan des Europäischen Parlaments besteht aus mehr als diesen Änderungsvorschlägen.

Wir haben Einsparmöglichkeiten – das hat Kollege Fernandes schon gesagt – im Umfang von 49 Millionen Euro genutzt. Was er verschwiegen hat, ist, dass zwei Drittel davon lediglich in das Haushaltsjahr 2013 bzw. 2012 transferiert werden, wir also im nächsten Jahr darüber entscheiden müssen, was wir mit diesen Geldern machen. Was die originären Einsparungen betrifft, so bin ich froh, dass die so genannten kleineren Fraktionen einschließlich der Liberalen es geschafft haben, sich zusammenzuschließen und die beiden größeren Fraktionen zu überzeugen, dass es notwendig ist, diese Einsparmaßnahmen im Bereich Informationstechnologie, in simplen Dingen wie Reinigungsfragen oder Zuschüssen zu politischen Parteien und Stiftungen usw. vorzunehmen, dass wir uns also wenigstens ansatzweise verständigt haben, wo man Gelder einsparen kann.

Die eben begonnene Diskussion über die 100 Millionen Euro, die der Jugend zugute kommen sollen, betrifft natürlich ein Thema, bei dem man eigentlich nicht dagegen sein kann. Andererseits muss man aufpassen, wo man Nebelkerzen wirft, denn diese Frage hat nichts mit diesem Bericht zu tun. Sie muss in anderen Berichten behandelt werden. Es kann nicht sein, dass man dadurch von anderen wichtigen Themen ablenkt. Nichtsdestotrotz, es ist ein Anfang gemacht worden, und es hat sich gezeigt, dass wir nicht zwingend mehr Geld, sondern eine deutlich verbesserte Ausgabendisziplin brauchen. Da sind wir auf einer guten Reise in Zusammenarbeit mit allen Fraktionen.

2-383

Helga Trüpel, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion.* – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Es ist richtig, dass in diesen ökonomisch schwierigen Zeiten auch das Europäische Parlament einen Beitrag leisten und bereit sein muss zu Selbstbegrenzung und Selbstdisziplin, auch wenn wir immer noch mit Aufbauarbeit für unsere eigene Institution beschäftigt sind und mit dem Lissabon-Vertrag neue Kompetenzen bekommen haben. Ich teile die Einschätzung meiner Vorredner, dass es gut war, dass wir die Haushaltsvoranschläge des Präsidiums, die mit 5,2 % wirklich überzogen waren, auf einen Zuwachs von 2,3 % heruntergehandelt haben. Aber es handelt sich ja immer noch um Zuwächse, wenn auch wahrscheinlich unter der Inflationsmarke, es sind also nicht wirklich Einsparungen, sondern es ist nur eine Reduktion von Zuwächsen, und man sollte so ehrlich sein, die Dinge auch so zu benennen, wie sie sind.

Zum Haus der Europäischen Geschichte möchte ich sagen: Konzeptionell teilt meine Fraktion mehrheitlich diesen Ansatz eines Service für die Bürger Europas, dass sie sich über unsere Geschichte nach 1945 informieren können. Aber das bedeutet natürlich auch, dass man einen Business-Plan braucht und dass alle Bedingungen, die wir jetzt mehrheitlich für die Abstimmung morgen formulieren, auch eingehalten werden. Nur dann kann

man eine Haushaltspolitik der Verantwortung, der Wahrheit und der Klarheit betreiben. Das heißt aber auch: Wenn man diese neue Priorität will – es handelt sich immerhin um ein Investitionsvolumen von 60 Millionen Euro in den nächsten Jahren –, muss man aus der Sicht der Grünen auch bereit sein, an anderen Punkten zu sparen und nicht nur Zuwächse zu begrenzen. Zum Beispiel kann man bei Flügen innerhalb der Europäischen Union, die weniger als vier Stunden dauern, unserer Meinung nach auf Business-Flüge verzichten. Damit würden einige Euro eingespart. Stattdessen könnten hier in Straßburg mehr Fahrräder für die Mitarbeiter und uns Abgeordnete zur Verfügung gestellt werden.

Eine letzte Bemerkung zu dem politischen Trick mit der Umwidmung der Mittel für Jugendarbeit. Natürlich möchten wir Grünen auch mehr Geld für Jugendarbeit ausgeben. Das ist aber ein Teil des Kommissionshaushalts. Wenn man nämlich jetzt diese Summe für Jugend aus dem EP-Haushalt entnimmt, dann nimmt man sie zum Beispiel der neuen Agentur für Finanzaufsicht und auch der Agentur für Lebensmittelsicherheit weg. Wollen wir das wirklich? Ist es das, was dieses Haus als Signal an unsere Bürger geben möchte? Nein, das ist eine falsche Entscheidung. Wir müssen diese Agenturen, die für eine richtige Regulierung eintreten, arbeitsfähig und stark machen und im Kommissionshaushalt die Gelder für die Jugendarbeit zur Verfügung stellen. Das wäre ein richtiger politischer Ansatz.

2-384

Lajos Bokros, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Madam President, EU leaders are living in a bubble of illusion and self-delusion. The best example of that happened this morning. Leaders of EU institutions were saying that the financial crisis is largely behind us. Nothing could be further from the truth. As Wolfgang Münchau wrote yesterday in the Financial Times, Europe is facing a stark choice between default and bailout. Both imply the absorption of a huge loss. The only difference between the two is how the loss gets distributed. In the case of a default, German, French, British, Italian and Spanish banks will suffer and the taxpayers of those countries will share the cost with Greek, Irish and Portuguese taxpayers. In the case of a bailout, the total burden will be put on the back of Greek, Irish and – soon – Portuguese citizens.

It is in this context that I say that the proposal to increase the budget of the Parliament by 2.3% is still too high and unacceptable. Let us go back to the drawing board and reduce it to 1%, as suggested by Commissioner Janusz Lewandowski. To show an increase well below inflation would earn some badly needed legitimacy for Parliament in the eyes of European citizens. Not only the increase, but also the structure can be modified.

There are many ways to save money for the European taxpayer. As Helga Trüpel has already said, we do not need to travel business class within the European Union. An amendment jointly tabled by the Greens, the United

Left and the ECR proposes to reduce travel costs significantly by using flexible economy class tickets for flights under four hours in length. We do not need a shiny, glitzy fleet of black Mercedes-Benz cars here in Strasbourg. Use the tram. We do not need the House of European History, as Europe is losing competitiveness and geopolitical weight. It will be a museum anyway.

There is huge scope for savings on energy costs. Our offices have no temperature control or individually adjustable heating and air conditioning. We waste a tremendous amount of energy every year. There is large scope for savings on security and IT services. In both cases, we need far better service for much less money. We should review and revise our health insurance costs as well. There is no need to have access to such an extraordinarily generous range of health care services. Budgeting is about setting priorities, both positive and negative. There is no shortage of positive ones, but responsible and prudent budgeting requires both, especially in times of crisis.

2-385

Miguel Portas, em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL. – Nós deputados europeus temos o poder de decidir sobre o nosso próprio salário. Decidimos também do dinheiro para contratar pessoas. Entre 2010 e 2011 atribuímos mais 3.000 euros a cada um de nós por mês. Somos ainda nós que votamos o tecto das despesas para os nossos gabinetes, as ajudas de custo, os subsídios e até o modo como viajamos. Nestas matérias o nosso poder é absoluto e é por isso que me interrogo e que vos interrogo: temos usado ou temos abusado deste nosso poder, temos sido sábios e ponderados ou, pelo contrário, não temos sabido resistir ao poder que este poder tem sobre nós? Infelizmente não temos sabido e é por isso que este debate não é sobre números, este debate é sobre ética e sobre política, é um debate que nos qualifica ou nos desqualifica aos olhos de quem nos pede contas.

Eu não sou, nem longe nem perto disso, um populista anti-partidos ou que ache que os deputados devem trabalhar à luz de velas. Mas é exactamente porque esta demagogia existe nos nossos países, que nós temos que ser extremamente exigentes quando falamos em decidir sobre os dinheiros e as regalias que nos afectam. Desculpem lá, mas não é normal que deputados que viajaram sempre em económica tenham passado a fazê-lo em executiva mal os voos começaram a ser reembolsados ao bilhete e não ao quilómetro. E o mesmo tipo de critério se aplica aos nossos salários e despesas. A minha opinião é que eles são excessivos, nalguns casos até são extravagantes, mas não é isso que está agora em causa, o que está em causa é saber se temos a coragem de votar pelo menos o congelamento destas despesas.

Eu não compreendo como é que pode haver aqui deputados que não hesitam em defender nos seus países políticas de austeridade e de redução do salário e da pensão, mas que quando chega ao momento de decidir sobre o seu próprio dinheiro, aí a austeridade ficou a

porta de casa. Isto não é sério meus amigos, isto é indecente e muito triste.

2-386

Marta Andreasen, on behalf of the EFD Group. – Madam President, the 2.3% increase in the budget requested by this Parliament calls into question its sense of responsibility. Going through the different expenditure lines, you can find many growing 50% to 100% without any reasonable justification.

At the beginning of this plenary session I asked this Parliament to postpone the vote on the Fernandes report owing to lack of accurate information on costs for the House of European History and a conflict of interest, but my request was voted down. A sum of EUR 2.5 million has already been paid out without enough information. It appears that MEPs are willing to operate in the dark and just hand over taxpayers' money without asking the right questions. I can only ask the British Prime Minister to accept nothing but a significant reduction of the whole EU budget for 2012 and hope that Parliament will be the one to bear the biggest cut.

2-387

Lucas Hartong (NI). – Wat valt er binnen één minuut te zeggen over de begroting 2012 van het Europees Parlement? Niet veel, maar wel genoeg.

Dit verslag heeft geen visie, maar is slechts een aaneenschakeling van holle frasen, die opnieuw aantonen dat de Europese Unie geen enkele toegevoegde waarde heeft. De begroting 2012 laat verspilling zien, met name aan een onzinnig project als het Huis van de Europese geschiedenis. De kostenramingen lopen gierend uit de hand en de voorzitter van de Begrotingscommissie, die het besluit moet nemen over de financiering, is tevens beoogd lid van de raad van toezicht. Geen enkel ander parlement zou zo'n belangenverstrengeling accepteren, maar dit Europees Parlement wel. Te gek voor woorden!

De heer Lamassoure gaf gisteren aan zijn mandaat ter beschikking te willen stellen. De PVV verzoekt dan nu ook nadrukkelijk om dat daadwerkelijk te doen. Ik hoop dat de geldverspilling voor het komend jaar beperkt blijft en eigenlijk stopt. Ondertussen zal ik blijven controleren en waarschuwen namens de burger.

2-388

Barbara Matera (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ringrazio innanzitutto il relatore per il bilancio di previsione del Parlamento, l'onorevole Fernandes, per essere riuscito a bilanciare le richieste del Segretariato generale e i suggerimenti del Commissario Lewandowski relativi al contenimento delle spese amministrative delle Istituzioni europee.

Il messaggio che questo Parlamento vuole dare è di responsabilità, mantenendo le richieste di incremento degli stanziamenti al di sotto del tasso di inflazione, in un momento di difficoltà per le finanze pubbliche degli Stati membri.

Auspicio che il Consiglio, che dovrà valutare la proposta del relatore di ridurre il massimale della rubrica 5 al fine di finanziare politiche a favore dei giovani, si esprima in senso positivo.

Ritengo basilare trovare fondi addizionali in supporto dell'occupazione giovanile, attualmente ai minimi storici in gran parte dell'Europa, in modo tale da spingere l'acceleratore verso il raggiungimento dei principi cardine della strategia Europa 2020 e da rilanciare la crescita economica, la quale fa perno sui nostri giovani e sulla loro possibilità di ottenere formazione di alto livello.

2-389

Göran Färm (S&D). – Fru talman! Att de av våra kolleger som är emot hela Europeiska unionen vill skära Europaparlamentets budget är kanske inte så konstigt, men det är helt uppenbart att det är populistiska motiv bakom. Det som är viktigare är att vi som är för Europeiska unionen också tycker att det är dags att börja tänka om när det gäller administrativa utgifter.

För första gången bestämmer vi oss i det här betänkandet för att vi inte accepterar en utveckling som innebär att parlamentets budget växer i en situation där vi har ett svårt läge för medlemsstaternas budgetar och när många vanliga medborgare drabbas av åtstrammingsåtgärder. Nu måste vi också börja ta saken på allvar. För första gången under den tid som jag har varit ledamot av parlamentet skär vi nu i parlamentets budget. Jag tycker att vi borde göra mer. Jag håller med föredraganden och flera av föregående talare om att vi borde ta mera strategiskt på detta. Därför har vi lagt ett ändringsförslag från den socialdemokratiska gruppen om en långsiktig, strategisk översyn av parlamentets administrativa utgifter. Nu måste vi visa att vi kan ta den uppgiften på allvar. Det är inte bara snack. Vi måste börja arbeta med en sådan översyn.

Det andra jag ville nämna är *House of European History*, den europeiska historiens hus. Det finns många som ifrågasatt om det är en uppgift för ett parlament att driva ett europeiskt historiemuseum. Det kan ifrågasättas, men jag tror att det finns en poäng i projektet, nämligen att ingen annan har startat ett sådant museum. Det kanske är dags att någon gör det. Men det måste ske i enlighet med transparenta principer, totalt ansvar för kostnaderna och ett rejält ansvarstagande för verksamheten. Därför är jag väldigt glad över att vi nu har kunnat komma överens mellan De gröna och socialdemokraterna och föredraganden om att rösta för de väsentligaste delarna av vårt ändringsförslag, som innebär att vi nu får en rejält transparent beslutsprocess om detta *House of European History*. Det är jag glad för.

(*Talaren godtog att besvara en fråga ("blått kort") i enlighet med artikel 149.8 i arbetsordningen.*)

2-390

Lucas Hartong (NI). – Madam President, I have a question for my honourable colleague. What is wrong with populism, seeing that parliamentarians are the voice of the *populus*, the people?

2-391

Göran Färm (S&D). – Käre kollega Lucas Hartong! Populism brukar betyda att man inte tar saker och ting på ett gediget allvar, att man bara reagerar med ryggmärgen, att man inte tänker igenom en ordentlig strategisk reaktion. Det väsentliga med det här som vi gör nu är ju att vi som faktiskt tror på Europeiska unionen också vill se till att vi tar ansvar inför skattebetalarna och åstadkommer en rejäl översyn av administrationen i EU. Det är mycket, mycket lättare för dem som inte vill ha någon Europeisk union som Lucas Hartong eftersom han skulle vilja lägga ned alltihop. Men det är inget ansvarstagande, det är populism.

(Talaren besvarade frågan och godtog att besvara ytterligare en fråga ("blått kort") i enlighet med artikel 149.8 i arbetsordningen.)

2-392

Miguel Portas (GUE/NGL). – É uma pergunta, Colega Göran Färm, que é a seguinte: face ao que foi a proposta inicial da Mesa do Parlamento é evidente que nós estamos perante um relatório que realiza algumas poupanças mas, se compararmos com a execução orçamental de 2010, o que se propõe para 2012 é um aumento de 11%, de 175 milhões de euros, onde não é sequer difícil saber onde está o essencial: 43 milhões de euros em móveis, 33 milhões de euros em assistentes parlamentares, 18 milhões de euros em contratações de trabalho temporário, 7 milhões de euros em campanhas de informação. Eu creio que nem é preciso prosseguir.

2-393

Göran Färm (S&D). – Madam President, Mr Portas does not need to continue. Basically I agree with him. I also wanted to go further. I am not happy that we ended up with an increase of 2.3%. I think we could have gone further, but it was a compromise between the Committee on Budgets and the Bureau. This is also the reason why we have tabled an amendment seeking a long-term strategic overview of Parliament's costs. With more modern management and a real effort to make long-term savings, I think we can end up in a much better situation when it comes to administrative expenditure, and there we will certainly listen to some of the proposals made by Mr Portas.

2-394

Carl Haglund (ALDE). – Fru talman! Vissa av de saker som vi nu diskuterar i ganska hästk ton debatterade vi redan i fjol. Då fanns det ingen vilja att se över vissa saker. Jag gläder mig över det som bl.a. kollegan från socialdemokraterna just sa, att det finns en vilja att fundera på hur vi på lång sikt kan göra. Det är antagligen det klokaste sättet att närma sig det här.

Den här diskussionen visar också att man lätt kan få en administrativ diskussion att bli en tävling i vem som är mest populist. Det förefaller tyvärr vara ganska många här i kammaren som tävlar om förstapriset. Däremot är det nog så att vi måste över våra kostnader och det enda vettiga sättet är att göra det är med långsiktigt perspektiv. Från liberalernas sida har vi både i fjol och i år föreslagit en del besparingar. Vi hörde till dem som

var glada över att vi kunde skära i de ökningarna som presidiet ursprungligen föreslog. I det sammanhanget vill jag tacka Alexander Alvaro för ett bra arbete.

När det förslaget om att ett historiemuseum måste jag säga att personligen inte är särskilt tilltalad av tanken, men samtidigt tror jag att det är bra att minnas att den här processen är lång och den inleddes redan under förra valperioden. Nu gäller det att se på hur vi kan fatta beslut om saken. Jag tror att det vore bra att frågan tas upp i en omröstning där de som känner att de inte vill ha ett museum har en reell möjlighet att säga nej. Det kan mycket väl hända att jag då tillhör dem.

Jag tror emellertid inte att vi vinner någonting på att tävla i vem som är mest populist i detta sammanhang, utan det är bättre att riktigt fundera på var vi kan skära ned.

2-395

Peter van Dalen (ECR). – In de huidige economische tijden vind ik het vanzelfsprekend dat het Europees Parlement een sobere begroting maakt. En terecht kiest de rapporteur voor zelfbeheersing. Helaas, hij gaat niet ver genoeg.

De voorstellen zijn nu dat wij een begroting krijgen die 2,3% hoger wordt. Dat is niet in lijn met wat de Commissie wil, die denkt aan 1% hoger, en zeker niet in lijn met wat de Raad wil, die denkt zelfs aan een bezuiniging met een paar procent. Dat moeten wij ook doen. Wij moeten meer bezuinigen. En dat kan ook. Wij kunnen meer bezuinigen. Het is misschien eerder besloten om dat Huis van de Europese geschiedenis te gaan bouwen, maar wij kunnen een besluit ook terugdraaien. Dus laten wij dat vooral doen. Stoppen met dat miljoenen verslindende project van het Huis van de Europese geschiedenis.

En dan denk ik ook aan onszelf. Wij krijgen nog elke maand vele duizenden euro's aan algemene onkostenvergoeding zonder dat er verantwoording over dat bedrag wordt afgelegd. Als wij dat nu eens gaan controleren en goed gaan onderzoeken, valt daar ook veel geld te besparen. Laten wij daar nu eens op inzetten: meer besparen.

2-396

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). – Senhora Presidente, muito se tem discutido a respeito deste relatório sobre os salários e os subsídios dos deputados. Quero aqui lembrar que estivemos e votámos contra, ao contrário da maioria, do actual estatuto financeiro dos deputados do Parlamento Europeu, entre outras razões porque implicou, no caso de alguns países, praticamente a duplicação do vencimento dos deputados, mas sobretudo porque quebrou um princípio para nós essencial, o da existência de um vínculo entre o nível salarial médio dos cidadãos de um país e o nível salarial dos seus representantes. A quebra deste vínculo é mais um sintoma da degradação da democracia, do afastamento entre representantes e representados, da degenerescência ética, de um sistema que ao mesmo tempo que impõe políticas anti-sociais com cortes generalizados a

população põe os seus executantes a coberto dos seus efeitos. Não seria tempo de rever este estatuto financeiro?

Queria terminar dizendo, Senhora Presidente, que é importante que fique claro também que não nos revemos nas propostas de alteração a este relatório que, defendendo poupanças no Parlamento, procuram criar um regime de exceção mais favorável para o financiamento dos partidos europeus e das fundações políticas europeias.

2-397

Claudio Morganti (EFD). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione sulle previsioni di bilancio del Parlamento europeo per l'anno 2012 sottolinea giustamente l'assoluta necessità di contenimento delle spese. Il compromesso raggiunto pare accettabile, con un aumento delle spese al 2,30%, ovvero inferiore all'inflazione prevista e quindi con un teorico risparmio.

Siamo tuttavia ancora lontani dalle richieste del Commissario al bilancio, che aveva auspicato che le Istituzioni contenessero il loro fabbisogno a un aumento di un solo punto percentuale, che alcune Istituzioni, come il Consiglio, sono riuscite a realizzare. Lascio momentaneamente da parte le questioni riguardanti questo aumento, probabilmente giustificato dalle maggiori attribuzioni post Lisbona, e vorrei invece spendere qualche parola sulla Casa della storia europea.

In commissione per i bilanci sono girate cifre folli in merito a questa Casa della storia europea, sia per la sua realizzazione che per la sua gestione. Mi sembra davvero assurdo che in questo momento si possa anche solo pensare di investire decine e decine di milioni di euro per un progetto di assai dubbia utilità, totalmente fuori luogo e fuori tempo.

2-398

Angelika Werthmann (NI). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Dass das EP angesichts der derzeitigen, nach wie vor anhaltenden Strukturkrise in unseren Mitgliedstaaten seinen Haushalt für das Jahr 2012 mit Bedacht budgetiert, ist hervorzuheben. Aufgaben und Ausgaben aller Institutionen nehmen durch die EU-Erweiterung, den Vertrag von Lissabon und neue Aktivitäten kontinuierlich zu. Dennoch, Sparsamkeit ist oberstes Gebot.

Es ist somit folgerichtig, dass das Parlament im Personalbereich einen Konsolidierungskurs verfolgt und die Ausgaben bei Parlamentsbetrieb, Missionen und Dienstreisen reduziert. Ich unterstütze insbesondere den Vorschlag des Generalsekretärs, die Umweltpolitik unseres Hauses weiter fortzusetzen. Ich hebe hervor, dass sich das EP in diesem Haushaltsentwurf zu einer konstanten und gleichmäßigen Unterrichtung der europäischen Bürgerinnen und Bürger bekennt.

Das Haus der Europäischen Geschichte findet inhaltlich viel Zustimmung. Daher ist es zu begrüßen, dass nunmehr auch die Haushaltsbehörde über das Projekt

informiert wurde. Auch hier mahne ich eine massive Reduzierung der Kosten an und erwarte volle Transparenz in allen Punkten.

2-399

Paul Rübiger (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Ich glaube, der Haushalt stellt uns jedes Jahr wieder vor die Herausforderung, auf der einen Seite sparsam mit den Mitteln umzugehen, und auf der anderen Seite die Mittel effizient einzusetzen. Ich glaube, im Bereich Effizienz können wir durchaus in diesem Hause noch einiges bewirken. Es wäre ganz gut, wenn wir eigene Stellen einrichten, bei denen die Abgeordneten und die Mitarbeiter Verbesserungsvorschläge einbringen können, wodurch dann auch die Effizienz im Haus entsprechend gefördert wird.

Auf der anderen Seite haben wir seit dem Vertrag von Lissabon Fachminister, die in ihren Mitgliedstaaten über ausreichende Ressourcen verfügen, über eigenes Fachpersonal, über Kabinette und entsprechende finanzielle Mittel, die sie einsetzen könnten, um den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern die Europapolitik besser verständlich zu machen. Wir im Europäischen Parlament sind unsererseits dafür verantwortlich, das der Bevölkerung nahe zu bringen, was hier tagtäglich zum Nutzen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger entschieden wird.

Auch für die neuen Kompetenzen in den Bereichen Energie, Welthandel und Außenpolitik, aber auch in den Bereichen Wettbewerb, Umwelt und Soziales, die uns alle so bewegen, muss das Parlament die ausreichenden Mittel zur Verfügung haben.

Ich trete auch sehr intensiv für die Pauschalierungen ein, weil dann natürlich die Möglichkeit besteht, entsprechende Einsparungen vorzunehmen. Jeder, der glaubt, dass er in der *Economy-Class* auf der Kurzstrecke ausreichend versorgt ist, soll *Economy* fliegen. Das ist keine Frage. Oder wenn jemand bei der Sekretariatszulage nicht die Obergrenze ausnützt, dann ist das auch in Ordnung. Hier sind wir alle aufgerufen, selbst zu entscheiden, wie viel Arbeit wir haben und inwieweit wir mit den Bürgern kommunizieren wollen. Das sollte in der Entscheidungsfreiheit der Abgeordneten bleiben, weil natürlich auch entscheidend ist, dass wir den Nutzen gut kommunizieren.

2-400

**ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ΡΟΔΗ ΚΡΑΤΣΑ-
ΤΣΑΓΚΑΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ**

Αντιπρόεδρος

2-401

Jens Geier (S&D). – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wenn ich der Debatte über das Haus der Europäischen Geschichte so folge, dann scheint es ja nur zwei Sorten von Abgeordneten zu geben: die Haushälter, die dieser Debatte beiwohnen, die dieses Projekt überwiegend kritisch sehen, und alle anderen, die das inhaltlich ganz in Ordnung finden. Das Schlimme daran ist, dass in der Frage des Hauses der Europäischen Geschichte so verschiedene Süsschen gekocht werden, die eigentlich mit dem Haus selber gar

nichts mehr zu tun haben. So meldet der „Daily Telegraph“ heute, ihm lägen Dokumente vor, dass die Kosten dieses Hauses mittlerweile auf die sicherlich astronomische Summe von 137 Millionen Pfund angewachsen wären. Ich kann den „Daily Telegraph“ nur einladen, dem Haushaltsausschuss diese Dokumente zuzuleiten und die Transparenz, die die Presse sonst von den Abgeordneten verlangt, selber walten zu lassen. Ich würde diese Dokumente sehr gerne prüfen!

Macht dieses Projekt Sinn? Ja, inhaltlich macht es natürlich Sinn, darauf hinzuweisen, was die Europäische Union und die europäische Integration für das Leben der Menschen bedeutet haben. Muss ein Parlament ein Museum betreiben? Nein, sicherlich nicht. Deshalb gibt es auch für die Sozialdemokraten im Europäischen Parlament für dieses Projekt zwei klare Leitplanken. Das eine ist: Wir wollen einen Businessplan für dieses Projekt haben. Das zweite ist: Wir wollen die Folgekosten, d. h. auch die künftige Trägerschaft dieses Hauses geklärt haben. Ein Drittes kann man hinzufügen: Wir sollten Doppelungen inhaltlicher Art zwischen dem Infocenter und dem Haus der Europäischen Geschichte vermeiden.

2-402

Anne E. Jensen (ALDE). – Fru formand! Jeg vil også gerne sige noget om Huset for Europæisk Historie. Det er selvfølgelig ikke meningen, at Parlamentet skal drive et museum, men jeg synes, det er en god idé, at vi får bedre faciliteter for besøgende til Parlamentet i Bruxelles, og jeg synes, et europæisk historiehuse er et vigtigt element i denne sammenhæng.

Jeg vil også sige, at et flertal i min gruppe er positivt stemt over for Huset for Europæisk Historie. Men vi er meget, meget enige i de synspunkter, der er kommet fra S&D om, at vi skal have mere åbenhed, mere gennemsigtighed med hensyn til, hvorledes økonomien er i forbindelse med dette hus, og hvordan driften vil være i fremtiden. Det er meget vigtigt. Men jeg synes, at idéen er god. Den støtter jeg bestemt op om. Men vi skal vide, hvilke økonomiske forpligtelser vi påtager os på længere sigt.

2-403

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Mr President, at this particular time budgets are bound to be controversial, and especially here in the European Parliament. At the same time it has to be said that everybody has an opportunity to express views here and it is good to hear all the views expressed. That is one of the great strengths of the European Parliament: everybody can come, have a view, make a point and be listened to.

Regarding the budget itself, obviously we are in a difficult situation economically and any increase is going to be perhaps misconstrued, perhaps understandably so to a certain degree. However, the bottom line here is that there is a 2.3% increase when inflation is expected to be 2.8%.

The other point that must be made is that the European Union has to deal with something in line with the overall

context of the 27 countries, whereas some countries, particularly my own country, are suffering very badly at present. We have just come from a meeting, thankfully, with Commissioner Rehn, who was very obliging with us. Obviously in that situation people cannot understand any increase whatsoever, even if it is less than inflation. Be that as it may, I think we have to make overall decisions, we have to give commitments to various things we have to do, we are going to see growth in terms of extra MEPs as a result of the Lisbon Treaty and, hopefully, also when Croatia joins.

One point I would make before I conclude is that all this brings to mind the point which President Barroso has been making quite frequently: we do need to have a full and frank discussion on own resources and, perhaps, particularly project bonds, because the more finance the European Union can get independently, the less controversial budgets are going to be and the less we will be asking from the Member States. Ultimately, I think we should be following the line of President Barroso.

2-404

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE). – Ik vertegenwoordig hier de meest pro-Europese partij van mijn land, Nederland. Juist omdat ik zo sterk in Europa geloof, ben ik heel kritisch op Europa en ook over de begroting van onze eigen instelling, het Europees Parlement.

Ik vind dus ook dat wij in deze moeilijke financiële tijden heel zuinig moeten begroten en ik ben het dan ook niet eens met de verhoging. Ik ben vooral verbaasd over de oorspronkelijke begroting waar de secretaris-generaal mee kwam, meer dan 5% hoger, zoals ik ook verbaasd ben over het feit dat hij hier niet aanwezig is. Ik had hem hier graag willen hebben, omdat ik hem wil herinneren aan paragraaf 6 van de resolutie waarin wij aan de diensten vragen om met een stofkam door de begroting te gaan om te kijken naar mogelijke bezuinigingen. Ik wil hem vragen dat vóór 1 juli van dit jaar te doen, zodat wij in staat zijn om met concrete bezuinigingen te komen.

Tot slot, Voorzitter, wil ik mijn pro-Europese collega's oproepen: geef diegenen die Europa willen afbreken nu geen munitie in handen om daarmee door te gaan. Want het *populus* waar zij de mond van vol hebben, is het meest gediend met een welvarend en krachtig Europa.

2-405

Salvador Garriga Polledo (PPE). – Señora Presidenta, felicito al señor Fernandes, ponente, y agradezco estas últimas palabras del colega Gerbrandy; creo que son muy afortunadas.

Éste es un presupuesto más austero, en línea con lo solicitado por la Comisión y el Consejo. Se mantiene en el límite del 20 %, con lo que cumplimos el *gentlemen's agreement*, aunque no existe: todos hablamos de ahorros, algunos con intenciones partidistas, pero todos tenemos algunas prioridades comunes: por ejemplo, los diputados queremos que se mejore la producción

legislativa, se pide que respondamos a las nuevas prioridades del Tratado de Lisboa, se nos pide un trabajo más profesional en las codecisiones, se nos piden más salas de reuniones, más seguridad interna, mayor esfuerzo en la política de comunicación, mejores redes informáticas... Todo esto hay que financiarlo, ¿o no?

Hay que cumplir los acuerdos firmados en materia inmobiliaria. Se dice que podríamos dejar de financiarlos, pero sabemos que esto no funciona así y, si somos responsables, tendremos que aceptarlo, ¿o no?

La juventud nunca es una polémica: la juventud es una necesidad. Mi país tiene, por ejemplo, un 50 % de paro juvenil. Cien millones de euros a la política de juventud no solucionan los problemas, pero responden a las prioridades del Parlamento. Sé que transferir este dinero desde la categoría 5 hasta la categoría 1a es polémico, e incluso se podría argumentar, como se ha argumentado, que contradice el procedimiento presupuestario, pero somos una institución viva y debemos adaptarnos a las necesidades del momento.

No creo que haya una urgencia mayor que solucionar el tema del desempleo juvenil. Estoy seguro de que es la prioridad de todos ustedes.

Y, por último: yo voy a votar a favor de la Casa común de la Historia Europea.

2-406

Riikka Manner (ALDE). – Arvoisa puhemies, ensinnäkin haluan onnitella mietinnön esittelijää Fernandesta erinomaisesta työstä. Varmasti tämä 2,3 prosentin kasvu on huomattavasti helpompi hyväksyä ja perustella kuin puhemiehistön esittämä 5,2 prosenttia. Parlamentin on oltava tässä budjettimenettelyssä hyvin itsekriittinen. Tässä mietinnössä sitä on toteutettu, mutta tätä työtä pitää jatkaa edelleenkin hyvin tiiviisti.

Pidän tärkeänä sitä, että säästöjä on etsitty myös pienistä puroista, eri kohteista. Varmasti esimerkiksi siivous- ja kunnossapitotoimista säästäminen on yksi keino, mutta ehkä kaipaisimme myös suurempia linjanvetoja kuin saippuan säästäminen. Tämän vuoden puolella parlamentti äänesti syksyn tuplaistunnon muuttamisesta yhdeksi viikon istunnoksi Strasbourgissa. Tämän parlamentin kuukausittaisen täysistuntorallin saattaminen päätökseen toisi mm. huomattavia säästöjä myös parlamentin budjettiin.

2-407

Janusz Władysław Zemke (S&D). – Patrząc na budżet Parlamentu można zauważyć, że znaczącą pozycję zajmują w nim wydatki na transport i tak będzie również w przyszłości. Musimy bowiem jeździć z 27 państw na posiedzenia w Brukseli i Strasburgu. Dokonałem wyliczenia, z którego wynika, że łączne koszty podróży posłów i pracowników Parlamentu przekraczają 100 mln euro rocznie. Myślę, że można tutaj poszukiwać dalszych oszczędności. Podróżujemy bardzo często. Nie mogę zrozumieć, dlaczego za bilety lotnicze płacimy tyle samo co osoby sporadycznie korzystające z linii lotniczych. Namawiałbym zatem, żeby kierownictwo

Parlamentu podjęło dyskusję z liniami lotniczymi. Uważam, że mamy szanse na uzyskanie znacznych zniżek. Normalnie w każdym państwie tak się dzieje; rząd i ministerstwa uzyskują zniżki sięgające 20 - 30 %. Dziękuję bardzo.

2-408

Jaroslav Paška (EFD) – Správa o odhade príjmov a výdavkov Európskeho parlamentu na rozpočtový rok 2012 hovorí v bode 17 a 18 o pokračovaní realizácie Domu európskych dejín a navrhuje vytvoriť rozpočtové rezervy, na krytie ďalších nákladov v súvislosti s realizáciou tohto projektu, zaradené do položky kapitoly 10.1 – *Rezerva na nepredvídané výdavky*. No neviem, či možno pokračovanie projektu Domu európskych dejín považovať za nepredvídaný výdavok, ale pozorne som počúval pani poslankyňu Martu Andreasen, ktorá nás pri schvaľovaní programu upozornila na skutočnosť, že v správe uvádzané náklady na Dom európskych dejín sú výrazne podhodnotené.

Nepoznám motiváciu osôb, ktoré realizáciu Domu európskych dejín v období pretrvávajúcich finančných a hospodárskych problémov Európskej únie tak tvrdohlavo pretláčajú. Ale viem, že široká európska verejnosť to vníma ako nehorázne plytvanie peniazmi daňových poplatníkov. Preto vám, vážení kolegovia, s plnou vážnosťou navrhujem zvážiť pokračovanie financovania tohto rozporuplného projektu za 60 miliónov EUR.

2-409

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D) – Z predkladanej správy by som chcela vypichnúť jeden veľmi dôležitý aspekt. Je ním ambícia dôslednejšie dbať na efektivitu a šetrnosť európskych inštitúcií. V čase hospodárskej krízy, keď mnoho obyvateľiek a obyvateľov Únie stratilo prácu, je hospodárenie inštitúcií financované z ich daní mimoriadne citlivá záležitosť, a treba povedať, že celkom oprávnené. Je preto dôležité, že rozpočet zakotvuje povinnosť prísneho hospodárenia.

Aby sme zbytočnému plytvaniu verejnými zdrojmi predišli, treba sa sústrediť na niekoľko bodov. Dôležité je vytvorenie a aplikácia stratégie elektronickej správy. Malo by sa podporiť využívanie videokonferencií pre schôdze a rovnako aj využívanie nových ekologických technológií. Na to, aby sme šetрили prírodné zdroje, najmä papier, treba plne sfunkčnit' bezdrôtovú sieť na všetkých našich pracoviskách. Šetrenie prostriedkov musí mať ale na druhej strane aj svoje hranice, aby nešlo na úkor kvality práce, ktorú v európskych inštitúciách vykonávame. Napríklad považujem za dôležité, aby na stretnutiach výborov nechýbalo tlmočenie, a týmto by som sa chcela všetkým tlmočníkom, dámam a pánom, poďakovať za ich prácu.

2-410

Giovanni La Via (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei in primo luogo plaudire all'ottimo lavoro svolto dal collega Fernandes e al clima di positiva cooperazione tra l'Ufficio di presidenza e la commissione per i bilanci che ha permesso di

raggiungere un accordo sullo stato di previsione delle entrate e delle spese del Parlamento per l'esercizio 2012.

Come è emerso dal dibattito, da una proposta che si attestava su un tasso suggerito di aumento del 5,2% rispetto al 2011, si è giunti a un livello complessivo del progetto di stato di previsione che rappresenta un tasso di aumento del 2,3%.

Credo inoltre importante la previsione di un *transfer* di 100 milioni di euro a favore dei progetti relativi alla gioventù, politica che il Parlamento ha individuato come priorità per il 2011, utili al finanziamento di progetti a favore della mobilità, dell'educazione e del lavoro per tutti i giovani europei.

Auspicio infine che nella procedura per il bilancio 2012 possa promuoversi, attraverso l'impegno di tutte le Istituzioni, l'ottimizzazione della gestione delle risorse.

2-411

Vladimír Maňka (S&D). – Chceme sa poďakovať pánovi spravodajcovi za skutočne veľmi dobrú správu. Aj on, aj vy všetci, ktorí ste dnes vystupovali, ste poukazovali na to, aké sú tu nedostatky a objavili ste skutočne možno aj riešenia. Ale jediné správne riešenie je to, že nebudeme hľadať každý individuálne, čo nájde alebo nenájde, ale že sa na celý problém pozrieme naozaj objektívnym pohľadom. A jediný objektívny pohľad je, že si zrôntgenujem Parlament externým spôsobom. To isté urobil kedysi Dvor audítorov a všimnime si, po tomto externom audite zrazu šetri administratívne výdavky.

To znamená, som veľmi rád, že aj poslanci nášho výboru podporili môj pozmeňujúci návrh, že Parlament sa naozaj na určité svoje oblasti pozrie z hľadiska vonkajšieho pohľadu a tu objavíme všetko to, čo ste vy povedali, a možno aj niečo viac. A potom je ďalší krok, ktorý povedal Göran Färm, kontrola týchto výdavkov do budúcnosti. Toto sú jediné riešenia.

2-412

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Atsižvelgiant į sunkią dabartinę finansų, ekonomikos ir socialinę Europos Sąjungos padėtį, ir Parlamento biudžeto išteklių turėtų būti naudojami apdairiai ir efektyviai. Siūloma, kad bendros 2012 m. Europos Parlamento išlaidos padidėtų 2,3 %, tai yra mažiau negu dabartinis infliacijos lygis. Ir tai yra iš tikrųjų teigiama, tačiau ateityje Parlamentas turi dar veiksmingiau taupyti bei griežtinti valdymo ir kontrolės procedūras. Pritariu pranešėjo siūlymui, kad reikia atlikti ilgalaikę Europos Parlamento biudžeto peržiūrą ir tuo būdu sumažinti išlaidas. Parlamento tarnybos turi dėti daugiau pastangų modernizuojant bei racionalizuojant administravimą, mažinant priklausomybę nuo išorės paslaugų, taikant griežtą žmogiškųjų išteklių valdymą. Tikiu, kad šios priemonės leistų padidinti Europos Sąjungos lėšų panaudojimo efektyvumą, tokiu būdu taupyti Europos mokesčių mokėtojų pinigus ir sumažinti dabartinį Parlamento išlaidų lygį.

2-413

José Manuel Fernandes, relator. – Em primeiro lugar é importante referir um número: as despesas administrativas de todas as Instituições Europeias são cerca de 6%. Não há orçamento de nenhuma Instituição, em nenhum Estado-Membro, que tenha uma parte tão ínfima de um orçamento global, de um orçamento da União Europeia.

O Parlamento Europeu tem novas competências. São 27 Estados-Membros, o Tratado de Lisboa ao entrar em vigor vai trazer também mais 18 Deputados, há um alargamento à Croácia e é evidente que tudo isto trás despesas. No entanto, a verdade é que há um decréscimo real neste orçamento ao ficar bem longe da inflação.

Uma palavra ainda para a questão da juventude. Bem sabemos que a iniciativa é da Comissão, que o Conselho tem de aprovar por unanimidade, no entanto, também sabemos que era importante dar um sinal e a verba a que nos estamos a referir é da rubrica 5 de todas as despesas administrativas, onde vai haver cerca de 380 milhões de euros e nós propomos 100.

Sobre a questão dos salários dos Deputados, o Parlamento Europeu não tem competência para actualizar os salários. Quem actualiza os salários é, por proposta da Comissão, o Conselho que fixa esses salários. Mais, a proposta da Comissão é de 0,9% neste momento para a actualização dos salários. Os salários também estão numa coisa que se chama *Estatuto dos Deputados* e estão indexados ao salário do Juiz do Tribunal de Justiça.

Para alterar o Estatuto dos Deputados não basta o Parlamento. É necessária a Comissão e é necessária a aprovação do Conselho. Há deputados que deveriam ler os regulamentos e que deveriam ler o Tratado de Lisboa e, nomeadamente, o artigo 223.º.

2-414

Miguel Portas (GUE/NGL). – José Manuel Fernandes, sobre isto dos salários parece-me evidente que o Parlamento pode perfeitamente tomar a iniciativa de propor a revisão do Estatuto dos seus próprios eurodeputados. Esse regulamento foi aprovado nesta casa, pode ser mexido nesta casa, por muito que haja passos institucionais a dar. E, de facto, apenas o salário está indexado aos aumentos que sejam decididos pelo Conselho Europeu, pelos governos. Só o salário, todas as outras despesas, que são relevantes, não estão e dependem rigorosamente desta casa e de mais ninguém.

2-415

José Manuel Fernandes, relator. – A actualização dos salários, conforme o próprio colega Portas confirma, não é da competência do Parlamento. Por isso não faz sentido estar, num orçamento deste tipo, a falar em congelamento dos salários. Faria, isso sim, sentido apresentar uma proposta, por exemplo, para alterar o Estatuto dos Deputados. Pode fazer também sentido alterar o Regulamento n.º 31 da Comunidade Europeia e, nomeadamente, o artigo 64.º. O que não faz sentido é procurar, nesta casa, fazer-se de conta que os deputados

se auto-aumentam quando tal não pode acontecer por fruto da lei e, essa sim, é uma forma de procurar enganar aqueles que nos ouvem e de fazer demagogia.

2-416

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία επί της εκθέσεως του κ. José Manuel Fernandes (A7-0087/2011) θα διεξαχθεί αύριο στις 12:00.

2-417

12 - Προστασία των οικονομικών συμφερόντων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης - Καταπολέμηση της απάτης (συζήτηση)

2-418

Πρόεδρος. – Το επόμενο σημείο είναι η έκθεση του κ. Cătălin Sorin Ivan (A7-0050/2011), εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Ελέγχου του Προϋπολογισμού, σχετικά με την προστασία των οικονομικών συμφερόντων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης - Καταπολέμηση της απάτης - Ετήσια έκθεση 2009 [COM(2010)0382 - 2010/2247(INI)].

2-419

Cătălin Sorin Ivan, Raportor. – Acest raport privind protecția intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene se bazează pe raportul Comisiei făcut în temeiul articolului 325 din Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene. În acest articol se vorbește foarte clar despre lupta împotriva fraudei, în timp ce în raportul Comisiei nu este foarte clar ce proporție dintre neregularități sunt fraude și ce proporție sunt simple erori.

Este foarte important să definim foarte clar ceea ce este fraudă pentru că acolo vorbim de un comportament contravențional voluntar, vorbim de corupție în adevăratul sens al cuvântului, în timp ce erorile sunt greșeli neintenționate. Dacă putem accepta o toleranță față de erori, nu putem accepta în niciun caz toleranță în ceea ce privește fraudă. Pentru fraudă, toleranța trebuie să fie zero atunci când vorbim de fondurile europene și de bugetul Uniunii Europene.

O altă problemă foarte importantă este aceea legată de colectarea datelor și a informațiilor. Trebuie să discutăm foarte serios despre modul în care statele membre comunică Uniunii Europene, mai precis Comisiei Europene, informații legate de modul în care sunt utilizate fondurile europene. Sunt de părere că declarațiile naționale de management vor avea un conținut calitativ superior atunci când vor veni la pachet cu o responsabilitate politică la nivel național mult mai mare. Cer încă o dată Comisiei ca aceste declarații naționale de management să fie semnate de ministrul de resort sau de un ministru din guvernul național.

În altă ordine de idei, 16,7 miliarde de euro din bugetul Uniunii Europene reprezintă resursele proprii și, în principal, venituri din taxele vamale. 70% din importuri trec prin așa-numita procedură simplificată. Am să citez aici din Raportul special nr. 1/2010 al Curții de Conturi, care evidențiază următoarele: „controlul efectuat asupra

acestor proceduri simplificate este foarte scăzut, iar numărul de erori identificate de Curte este alarmant.” Este foarte important ca, în acest caz, Comisia să evalueze impactul financiar al acestor nereguli.

Vreau să felicit OLAF-ul pentru operațiunea Diablo II, care vizează nu numai protejarea intereselor financiare ale Uniunii Europene dar, în același timp, vizează și lupta împotriva produselor contrafăcute. Dincolo de prejudiciul pe care aceste produse contrafăcute îl aduc cadrului fiscal și bugetului Uniunii Europene, vorbim de siguranța cetățenilor europeni, vorbim de efecte negative în economia Uniunii Europene.

Am să mă refer în continuare la cheltuieli și am să vorbesc, pe de o parte, despre utilizarea fondurilor europene și, pe de altă parte, despre recuperarea fondurilor alocate nejustificat. Dacă vorbim de utilizarea fondurilor europene, aici vorbim obligatoriu despre Sistemul integrat de administrare și control al fondurilor europene, un sistem foarte bun dar care, odată pus în aplicare, întâmpină dificultăți foarte mari, pentru că se bazează pe baze de date incorecte și suferă, de asemenea, din cauza identificării parcelelor de utilizare.

De asemenea, dacă vorbim despre recuperarea fondurilor europene, pot să spun doar atât, că este îngrijorător faptul că 42% din fondurile pe agricultură sunt recuperate și doar 50% din fondurile de coeziune. Sunt cifre foarte îngrijorătoare și trebuie să fim foarte atenți în ceea ce privește recuperarea fondurilor.

2-420

Algirdas Šemeta, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Ivan, for his constructive report. I will concentrate my remarks on six very important elements of it.

Firstly, the question of the information provided in the report on the protection of financial interests. The 2009 report already includes new detailed information on levels of fraud and irregularities, and indicates the suspected fraud rate per Member State for the 2000-2006 Cohesion programmes. Further improvements are always possible, and I will take due account of your suggestions.

Secondly, on the issue of the Convention on the protection of financial interests, I am preparing a communication for next May, together with Vice-President Reding. It will present a strategy for the protection of EU public money against all forms of illegal conduct, including fraud, and will look at procedures, substantive criminal law and the institutional framework.

Thirdly, turning to own resources, in 2010 the Commission started to visit all Member States to examine simplified customs import procedures. It will report to the Parliament as soon as enough information has been gathered for a meaningful analysis of their implementation and performance.

Fourthly, on cigarette smuggling, agreements have now been concluded with four tobacco manufacturers. We will continue to push for a Protocol on the elimination of the illicit trade in tobacco products under the WHO Convention on Tobacco Control.

On the fifth point, I fully agree that failures in applying public procurement rules are an important source of errors and fraud. The Commission vigorously implements financial corrections with rates of up to 100% of the allocated funding, depending on the gravity of the irregularities. We propose simplification and clarification of EU procurements directives by 2012, in line with the Green Paper published earlier this year.

Finally, I share the view that the recovery of unduly paid funds is a key element in protecting the EU's financial interests. For multiannual Cohesion programmes, the Commission is making extensive use of the interruption and suspension of payments, avoiding payments to Member States where management and control systems are found not to be effective. In 2010, more than EUR 2.4 billion of payments under the Regional and Social Funds were preventively interrupted. The Commission will continue to push Member States towards more efficient management of recovery from final beneficiaries.

The situation is improving. In the agricultural sector, for example, the recovery rate at the end of 2010 went up to 53% for new 2007 cases, compared to 10% for cases dating from before 2006. Let me stress, however, that for multiannual programmes the full picture is only seen when the programmes are closed, after any irregularities have been satisfactorily dealt with by the Member States.

To conclude, the Commission will endeavour to actively follow up the actions which Parliament has proposed. Thank you for your attention.

2-421

Monica Luisa Macovei, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Madam President, I believe we have to talk about what we need to correct, so I will refer to the critical issues. The first of them is the fact that the Commission's report did not provide information on the estimated level of irregularities and fraud in individual Member States. Therefore, we lack a clear picture of the problem at Member State level. In addition, the Commission dealt broadly with irregularities but failed to look at fraud in detail. We expect that to change in the report for the following year.

The second issue concerns public procurement, which, as we all know, is the area with the highest risk of fraud and corruption. What we call for in this report is for the Commission to focus on regulating public procurement: to apply uniform systems of procurement; to define and implement clear conditions for participation in public procurement; to implement criteria for decision-making on public procurement and bring transparency to these decisions; and also to review public procurement decisions and ensure transparency and accountability in

public finances. We expect the Commission and the Council to finalise the adoption of the public procurement reform and to consult with us on this.

The third issue concerns the transparency of beneficiaries' funding. There is a page on the Commission's website where we can see some of the beneficiaries of European funds in the Member States. However, we need to improve this greatly. We need one-stop transparency. We need a single website that publishes all the beneficiaries of EU funds on the basis of standard categories of information to be supplied by all the Member States in at least one working language of the Union. Otherwise we will be lost in a lot of diverse information that fails to provide any overall picture and cannot offer transparency.

As the Commissioner said, there is always room for improvement, and I hope to see improvement in the areas I have mentioned.

2-422

Jens Geier, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar Šemeta! Wir wissen, 80 % des EU-Haushalts werden im geteilten Management verwaltet, was bedeutet, das Geld wird in den Mitgliedstaaten verwaltet und ausgegeben, und dort entstehen die Fehler und die Unregelmäßigkeiten, dort werden die Betrügereien begangen.

Insofern ist der jährliche Bericht zum Schutz der finanziellen Interessen der Europäischen Union so etwas wie das Sündenregister der Mitgliedstaaten, und für die Arbeit daran danke ich Ivan Cătălin Sorin und den Schattenberichterstattem der anderen Fraktionen. Ich habe im Bericht der Kommission über den Schutz der finanziellen Interessen – in der deutschen Fassung ist das auf Seite 11 – einen bemerkenswerten Satz gefunden. Da steht: „Bei den Ziel-2-Programmen dürften sich vor allem die sehr hohen Unregelmäßigkeitsquoten in den Ländern, die am meisten von diesen Programmen profitieren (das Vereinigte Königreich und die Niederlande), auf die Gesamtquote ausgewirkt haben.“

Das Vereinigte Königreich und die Niederlande, das sind zwei der Staaten, die uns vorgeschlagen haben, den europäischen Haushalt zu kürzen. Ich kann sie von dieser Stelle aus nur auffordern: Bitte kümmert euch darum, dass das europäische Steuergeld ordentlich ausgegeben wird, und senkt die Unregelmäßigkeitsquoten in euren Ländern! Und wenn Sie, Herr Kommissar, in diesem Zusammenhang hier noch ein paar Ausführungen machen würden, würde mich das sehr interessieren.

2-423

Bart Staes, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Rapportering over fraude en onregelmatigheden is een zeer belangrijk iets voor de wetgever, want dit geeft ons inzicht in de besteding van de middelen. Het geeft ons inzicht in wat er mogelijk fout loopt. Het geeft ons

inzicht in wat er verbeterd kan worden. In die context is het voorliggende verslag van zeer groot belang.

Ik denk dat wij na het debat in de anti-fraudecommissie van ons Parlement de volgende conclusies kunnen handhaven:

Ten eerste, de rapporten moeten preciezer worden. Er moet een daadwerkelijk inzicht worden geboden in de werkelijke omvang van onregelmatigheden en van fraude;

Ten tweede, de lidstaten moeten beter rapporteren. Dat gebeurt nu niet optimaal en dan gebruik ik een mooi woord: niet optimaal. Wij moeten dus op de lidstaten druk uitoefenen, desnoods met sancties.

Ten derde, de onterecht bestede middelen moeten inderdaad teruggevorderd worden en de Commissie moet daartoe de nodige maatregelen nemen. Wij zullen dat ook bespreken tijdens de kwijting volgende maand in Straatsburg. Italië is in dit opzicht een probleemkind.

Ten vierde, wij moeten beter toezien op de verplichte melding door de lidstaten van onregelmatigheden. Het is bijzonder raar dat Spanje en Frankrijk hier in gebreke blijven.

Ik ben permanent rapporteur voor de eigen middelen en ik wil ook een woord van dank en felicitatie richten tot de Commissie en vooral tot OLAF, tot de eenheid anti-sigaretten en anti-tabaksfraude. De resultaten daar zijn verbluffend en zeer goed. De Diabolo II-actie - het is gezegd - was een pracht van een samenwerkingsactie en ook de afspraken die gemaakt zijn met British American Tobacco en met Imperial Tobacco. Het levert ons 500 miljoen euro op.

Alleen, dit geld mag niet zomaar verdwijnen in de schatkisten van de lidstaten. Dit geld moet echt gebruikt worden, zowel door de Commissie, maar vooral door de lidstaten om de anti-fraudemaatregelen in de lidstaten te versterken. Dat is echt een heel belangrijk iets. Het geld dat door deze overeenkomst wordt opgebracht, moet gebruikt worden in de strijd tegen de fraude.

2-424

Andrea Češková, za skupinu ECR. – Paní předsedající, vítám tuto zprávu, která usiluje o větší transparentnost v boji proti korupci a která si zaslouží podporu. Již na podzim minulého roku jsme při prezentaci Evropského účetního dvora diskutovali o tom, jaká je odpovědnost členských států za celkovou kontrolu vydávání finančních prostředků Evropské unie.

Považuji za správné, aby každý členský stát chránil finanční zájmy Evropské unie tím, že na národní úrovni zajistí spolehlivé kontroly při zjišťování nesrovnalostí a podvodů. V souvislosti s tím je také nutná spolupráce členských států a Komise v poskytování úplných a spolehlivých informací. Povinná prohlášení o zprávě na národní úrovni musí být řádně zkontrolována národním kontrolním úřadem. Úmluva o ochraně finančních zájmů

Evropských společenství je jistě vhodný a doprovodný instrument.

Česká republika, která je zmíněna v této zprávě, však ještě tuto úmluvu neratifikovala, jelikož je nutné zavedení trestněprávní odpovědnosti právnických osob. Právní řád České republiky je tradičně založen na trestněprávní odpovědnosti pouze fyzických osob. Tato záležitost je ale nyní projednávána na půdě Parlamentu České republiky.

2-425

Marta Andreassen, on behalf of the EFD Group. – Madam President, the EU tends to term what in many cases is fraud and corruption as errors. Worse, the Commission has decided to move from zero tolerance to tolerable risk. To add insult to injury, the recent revelations about members of this House who agreed to amend or write legislation in exchange for payment further erode the credibility of this Parliament, particularly in its efforts to fight fraud and corruption.

Only two of the four whose names were revealed have effectively resigned. Will this Parliament review the legislation these four MEPs have worked on? One MEP has even gone so far as to question OLAF's power to investigate these cases, declaring – incredibly – that in some countries such action would not be considered illegal and would not even be investigated.

This report should spur the British Government to withhold all payments to the EU until fraud – to use its proper name – is meaningfully tackled by this Parliament.

2-426

Csanád Szegedi (NI). – Köszönöm a szót, tisztelt Elnök Asszony! Tisztelt Képviselőtársaim! Én elsősorban a rendelkezésemre álló időben a politikai csalással, a politikai korrupcióval szeretnék foglalkozni. Nagyon sajnálom, hogy ezzel a jelentéssel már csak akkor foglalkozunk, amikor az Európai Parlament három képviselője lebukott korrupció alapos gyanújával. Belegondolni is rossz, hogy itt az Európai Parlamentben a lebukott képviselők csak a jéghegy csúcsát képviselik. Ugyanis bizonyos számítások szerint az európai uniós pályázatok, a közbeszerzések, amiről itt most nagyon sokat beszéltek, annak mintegy 50%-át ellopják, elsikkasztják, korrupcióban elveszik, és bizonyos politikusok zsebébe vándorol. Szóval ez tűrhetetlen!

És ennek csak az anyagi vonatkozása másodlagos, hiszen a társadalom meg elfordul a politikától. Ha az emberek elfordulnak a politikától, akkor pedig olyan rezignált hangulat lesz úrrá, amely képtelen megakadályozni az iskolabezárásokat, az élelmiszeráraknak a növekedését, a munkahelyek bezárását. Ezért kell az Európai Parlamentnek példát mutatnia, és le kell mondanunk a mentelmi jognak a kedvezményességéről, valamint a Jobbik azt javasolja, hogy a büntetési tételek a politikusokra duplán vonatkozzanak. Köszönöm szépen a figyelmüket.

2-427

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Der PIF-Bericht 2009 bringt mehrere wichtige Neuerungen. Erstmals unternimmt die Kommission den Versuch, die Höhe von Unregelmäßigkeiten und Betrug zu klassifizieren. Damit einher geht leider der im Bericht an allen Ecken und Enden spürbare Versuch, das Problem Unregelmäßigkeiten und Betrug mit statistischen Mitteln zu verharmlosen. Herr Kommissar, das hat mir überhaupt nicht gefallen!

Der Bericht bietet noch eine weitere wichtige Neuerung, nämlich die Implementierung des Meldesystems zum Umgang mit Unregelmäßigkeiten, IMS. Jetzt können 800 Stellen in Europa Daten eingeben, und nicht nur 50 wie bislang. Also stieg der Anteil der Unregelmäßigkeiten im Agrarbereich um 43 %, im Strukturfondsbereich um 23 %, bei der Summe im Strukturfondsbereich sogar um 109 %.

Dieses System muss weiter verbessert werden. Wir sehen mit Schmerzen, dass die Kommission immer noch recht viel Geduld mit der Umsetzung in den Mitgliedstaaten hat, denn die Umsetzung ist nach wie vor nur schleppend. Das lässt sich in dem Bericht auch sehr gut nachlesen. Deswegen unsere Forderung nach einer vollen Implementierung des IMS. Erst wenn es richtig läuft, stehen glaubwürdige Daten bereit, sodass wir erst dann an Quotenunregelmäßigkeiten und Betrug arbeiten können.

Mit Sorge erfüllt uns die Situation in Italien. Dieses Land liegt bei Betrug mit weitem Abstand an der Spitze. Die Konten der EU bis 2004 wurden geschlossen, und 60 % der vermuteten Betrugsfälle entfielen auf Italien. Deswegen wäre es sinnvoll und wichtig, diesem Land mit einem Aktionsplan und mit besonderen Maßnahmen unter die Arme zu greifen.

Ich möchte OLAF und seinen Beschäftigten für ihre wichtige Aufgabe ganz herzlich danken. Wir stärken ihnen den Rücken, und deswegen müssen wir hier wieder einen stärkeren Rückhalt in der Kommission für das Amt für Betrugsbekämpfung einfordern. Warum gibt es Probleme beim Zugang zu Datenbanken, wenn die Kommission die Arbeit von OLAF doch angeblich will und für genauso wichtig hält wie wir? Herr Kommissar, wir wären für Antworten und für eine entsprechende Abhilfe in den Gesetzgebungen der Kommission dankbar.

2-428

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D) – Chcela by som vysloviť podporu kolegovi spravodajcovi v jeho absolútne oprávnenej kritike voči výročnej správe Európskej komisie. Komisia sa len formálne sústreďuje na to, čo jej členské štáty oznámia.

Pán Komisár, mali by ste sa však za pomoci špecializovaných orgánov snažiť pátrať hlbšie. Musíte jednoducho vyvinúť viac úsilia a musíte sa snažiť aplikovať najnovšie metódy merania miery nezrovnalostí a podvodov. Keby sme pokračovali spôsobom,

ktorý reprezentuje výročná správa Komisie za rok 2009, ostanú nám iba dohady o mnohých podozrivých veciach. Napríklad niektoré veľké a finančne vysoko podporované štáty vykazujú veľmi nízku mieru nezrovnalostí a podvodov. Je situácia v nich naozaj taká pozitívna alebo je národná metodika zisťovania týchto prehreškov iba akási zhovievavá?

Absolútne súhlasím so spravodajcom v tom, že Komisia vynakladá neprimerane veľa úsilia na to, aby nás v Parlamente presvedčila o potrebe zaviesť akési prípustné riziko chýb, namiesto toho, aby sa pokúsila presvedčiť členské štáty o potrebe povinných národných vyhlásení o hospodárení.

2-429

Janusz Wojciechowski (ECR). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Zgadzam się ze sprawozdawcą, że nie powinno się mieszać poważnych oszustw z przypadkowymi błędami, bo wtedy te przypadkowe błędy odwracają uwagę od spraw najważniejszych. Podzielam również zarzuty dotyczące sprawozdania Komisji, które jest zbyt ogólnikowe, za mało jest w nim informacji o konkretnych oszustwach i nadużyciach. Nasza dyskusja na ten temat byłaby o wiele bardziej rzeczowa, gdybyśmy mieli więcej konkretnych informacji.

Walczymy z korupcją. Walkę tę powinniśmy zacząć od siebie i, uchwalając w tej izbie różne prawa, powinniśmy dbać o to, żeby były zawsze przejrzyste, żeby istniały jasne kryteria podejmowania decyzji, żeby wykluczone były sytuacje konfliktu interesów, żeby zapewnić maksymalną jawność w wydatkowaniu środków unijnych, a także by zapewnić systematyczną i bieżącą kontrolę. To są podstawowe instrumenty antykorupcyjne, które powinniśmy stosować.

2-430

Lucas Hartong (NI). – Voorzitter, ik ben blij met het verslag. De reden is echter heel triest, namelijk de constatering dat binnen de Europese Unie veel gefraudeerd wordt.

Ik citeer: De Commissie gaat niet nader in op fraude en onregelmatigheden worden zeer algemeen behandeld. Een groot bedrag aan EU-middelen wordt ten onrechte besteed. De onregelmatigheden in Polen, Roemenië en Bulgarije nemen onevenredig toe. Spanje en Italië zijn verantwoordelijk voor het grootste aantal gevallen van onregelmatigheden. En over de afgelopen jaren is slechts 10% van rechtmatige terugvorderingen daadwerkelijk teruggehaald. En tot slot: Bulgarije fraudeert het meest met speciale toetredingssteun op het gebied van landbouw en plattelandsontwikkeling.

Zomaar wat feiten uit het verslag. Goed dat het genoteerd staat, maar wat gaat de Europese Unie er eigenlijk aan doen? Hoelang nog wordt fraude getolereerd en hoelang nog moet de burger de rekening betalen?

(De spreker stemt ermee in een "blauwe kaart"-vraag te beantwoorden (artikel 149, lid 8, van het Reglement)

2-431

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE). – Mijnheer Hartong, ik heb uw speech goed aangehoord, maar ik heb ook naar mijnheer Geier geluisterd en die heeft op een bepaald moment gezegd dat twee nettobetalers, het Verenigd Koninkrijk en Nederland, ook zwaar in gebreke blijven. Wat gaat u, nadat u de hele groep andere lidstaten heeft veroordeeld, in uw eigen land doen om ervoor te zorgen dat ook Nederland niet in gebreke blijft?

2-432

Lucas Hartong (NI). – Ik dank mijn collega voor de vraag. Als u het verslag goed gelezen heeft, heeft u ook de feiten kunnen constateren, namelijk dat Nederland - over het Verenigd Koninkrijk kan ik even niet spreken, maar ik spreek nu namens Nederland - behoort tot de landen waar het laagste percentage fraude is, daarbij gelijk genoteerd dat, als er sprake is van fraude, het heel hard aangepakt zal worden. Daar ben ik groot voorstander van. Laat dat duidelijk zijn.

2-433

Erminia Mazzoni (PPE). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, esprimo apprezzamento per il lavoro svolto dal relatore. Devo dire che questa relazione mostra purtroppo una certa disattenzione della Commissione nei confronti di questo Parlamento che, già nel lavoro dell'anno scorso, aveva segnalato alla Commissione alcune specifiche azioni da intraprendere per riuscire a dare risposta a questo obiettivo che ci prefiggiamo di tutelare gli interessi finanziari dell'Unione europea e gli interessi del contribuente, di combattere le frodi e di lottare contro l'illegalità.

In effetti, come ha testimoniato il relatore, non diminuisce la preoccupazione sull'uso improprio dei fondi europei e le percentuali di irregolarità o di frodi sospette segnalate sono ancora molto elevate. Quindi, se l'obiettivo di questo nostro lavoro di controllo è quello di garantire il recupero delle risorse, dovremmo dire che abbiamo fallito considerando i dati che ci sono stati forniti.

La Commissione, come noi avevamo già detto nella relazione presentata l'anno scorso, dovrebbe farsi carico di intervenire su alcune criticità fondamentali che io raggrupparei in tre categorie, come hanno detto anche i colleghi che mi hanno preceduto. In primo luogo, la responsabilizzazione degli Stati membri, in particolare lavorando sui meccanismi di rilevazione e comunicazione da parte degli stessi Stati membri. In secondo luogo, la chiarezza delle norme. È fondamentale che si arrivi a una definizione uniforme e chiara dei concetti di frode, di irregolarità e di errore. Da ultimo la trasparenza, che vuol dire non solo avere dati certi di rilevazioni, sui quali poi elaborare le conclusioni che traiamo, ma anche procedere a un'implementazione di quella pubblicazione dei dati sul sito *web* che invece va un po' a rilento.

Sul primo punto, in particolare quello della responsabilizzazione degli Stati membri, io rilevo anche il fatto che la mancata armonizzazione dei sistemi nazio-

nali produce delle differenze significative sui tempi di accertamento delle frodi e delle irregolarità.

È stata più volte citata l'Italia. L'Italia è citata anche nel documento del relatore. Noi abbiamo sicuramente dei tempi di accertamento insopportabilmente lunghi e stiamo cercando di lavorare sui tempi della giustizia amministrativa e penale. Però io dico che se non c'è un criterio uniforme di definizione della frode e delle irregolarità, è chiaro che i tempi di recupero degli Stati come l'Italia sembreranno eccessivamente lunghi.

2-434

Edit Herczog (S&D). – A magam részéről is gratulálni szeretnék a jelentéstevőnek, és nagyon fontosnak ítélem azt a tevékenységet, amit mind a Parlament, mind a Számvevőszék, mind a nemzeti országok, tagállamok állami számvevőszékei végeznek. Nagyon-nagyon fontos, hogy átlátható módon és lehetőleg hibátlanul végezzük a munkánkat. Persze a Parlament hitelességének legfontosabb velejárója, hogy mi magunk mindannyian felelősek legyünk. A Parlamentnek saját maga tekintetében is biztos, hogy olyan szabályokat kell bevezetnie a maga számára, amelyek a mostaninál jobbak és hatékonyabbak. Ezzel együtt hangsúlyozni szeretném, hogy nagyon fontos, hogy szétválasszuk a szabálytalanságot és a csalást, hiszen a szabálytalanság nem azonos a csalással. A csalókat meg kell büntetni. Szabálytalanság esetében más módszert kell gyakorolni. El kell érni, hogy minden tagállam minden pénzköltő szervezete olyan pontosan ismerje a szabályokat, hogy lehetőség szerint a legkevesebb hibát kövesse el. Nem véletlenül látjuk, hogy az új tagállamokban, ahol most kezdődött a vita, most kezdődött a pénzek felhasználása, a tapasztalatlanság az egyik ok, ami közrejátszik.

2-435

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). – Madam President, can I just congratulate the rapporteur and indeed her shadow, my colleague Monica Macovei, for their work on this report. It is an important one, because taxpayers want to know that their money is well spent.

I think it is important to emphasise, as did the last speaker, the difference between irregularities and fraud. For the public, fraud is carried out with criminal intent, but many people make mistakes which could be classified as errors, or commit major or minor breaches of European Union rules, and they should not all be lumped together. There is a very distinct difference.

In relation to agriculture, which was mentioned by some colleagues, it is important that we have full transparency on payments in the agricultural sector. Huge improvements have been made in this area. But it is important, as we move towards reforming the common agricultural policy, that we continue to make those improvements. I refer in particular to paragraph 24, which talks about the control systems. I know that, in the Member State that I represent, farmers are getting new maps out and have got to resubmit. A huge amount of patience and attention is being paid to this issue, and rightly so.

I will finish by saying that individuals are sometimes caught by the system, whereas major players and others who might be more guilty of an element of fraud are perhaps less likely to be caught. That is something that we need to be aware of. Let us not terrorise the individual.

2-436

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Norėčiau padėkoti kolegai Cătălin Ivan, atlikusiam puikų darbą rengiant šį svarbų pranešimą. Europos Sąjungos mokesčių mokėtojų pinigai turi būti tinkamai ir efektyviai panaudoti. Tam būtina užtikrinti, kad valstybės narės turėtų veiksmingus kontrolės mechanizmus bei tinkamus sukčiavimo atvejų nustatymo pajėgumus. Svarbu, kad Komisijai ir OLAF būtų teikiama kokybiška, tiksli, patikima ir palyginama informacija apie pažeidimus ir sukčiavimus. Dabartinis išieškotų sumų lygis yra labai žemas ir netoleruotinas. Todėl būtina imtis veiksmų, kad būtų susigražintos visos neteisėtai panaudotos Europos Sąjungos lėšos. Vienas iš esminių dalykų šioje kovoje – kad Parlamento pranešimuose ir Komisijos metinėse ataskaitose Europos Sąjungos interesų apsaugos klausimu pateikiami faktai sulauktų tinkamo dėmesio iš Tarybos ir valstybių narių ir kad OLAF galėtų imtis visų būtinų priemonių stiprinant kovos su sukčiavimu veiksmus šioje srityje.

2-437

Илиана Иванова (PPE). – г-жо председател, уважаеми колеги, в този доклад за съжаление все още има тревожни констатации по отношение на високия процент неправомерно изразходвани средства и недостатъчно бързото им възстановяване. Но все пак данните от Европейската комисия не са напълно достатъчни и за определяне на мерки за дисциплиниране на държавите-членки с най-висок процент на нередности и измами.

Повечето колеги вече говориха за разликата между измами и нередности, която не е подчертана ясно, тъй като в доклада не се разглеждат подробно измамите, които са умишлено закононарушение, а подходът към нередностите е много общ, което не ни даде възможност за ефективни препоръки по въпроса.

Радвам се на заключението на Комисията, че спазването на изискванията за докладване в областта на селското стопанство вече е 95%. В същото време обаче, ниски и нулеви нива на измами и нередности в някои държави-членки ми се струват подозрителни и това би могло да означава, че системите за контрол и разкриване на измами не действат ефективно.

Смятам, че контролът по изразходването на европейски средства би се подобрил значително, ако са налице конкретни данни и методи за оценка на системите на управление и контрол в държавите-членки, от които да е видна ефективността на националните органи. Защото е напълно възможно държави с нулев процент нередности да имат просто слаб контрол, който не идентифицира проблемите, а държави с ефективни национални органи да откри-

ват повече измами и нередности и съответно процентите за тях да са чувствително по-високи.

Според данните на Европейската сметна палата поне 30% от грешките са могли да бъдат открити и отстранени от националните органи преди сертифицирането им до Европейската комисия. Надявам се всички страни-членки да положат повече усилия, за да подобрят своите механизми за откриване и отстраняване на грешките.

Искам да призова Европейската комисия да предприеме необходимите действия за гарантиране на достатъчно информация относно системите за контрол и управление в страните-членки, както и адекватни мерки за бързото отстраняване на идентифицираните слабости там, където съществуват системите по контрол.

2-438

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). – Señora Presidenta, yo también felicito a mi colega, señor Ivan, precisamente por este ejercicio de rigor que ha llevado adelante en un tema tan conflictivo y tan difícil como es la detección del fraude y la protección de los intereses financieros.

Quiero agradecerle su interés, precisamente, por identificar las definiciones de fraude, porque las sospechas de fraude y las irregularidades o los errores, por lo general, se suelen mezclar, y de ahí que salgan cifras que escandalizan sin que sean verdaderamente rigurosas.

También quiero destacar su interés en plantear el tema de los plazos. Los retrasos que se generan precisamente entre la detección y la notificación por parte de los Estados miembros, que llevan también a situaciones difíciles.

Y recordar que en los ciclos y en el cierre de los ciclos figuran finalmente las cifras definitivas, y que, de momento, el último ciclo total que se ha cerrado ha sido el del año 1999, y que en la actualidad solamente estamos, en el nuevo ciclo –2000-2006–, en el cierre del año 2004. Por lo tanto, sólo se podrán tener en cuenta las cifras definitivas de dicho ejercicio.

Deseo apoyar, por supuesto, los medios de la OLAF dentro del código deontológico y felicitar también por la detección del fraude en relación con China y con los países asiáticos.

2-439

Andrea Cozzolino (S&D). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, vorrei anch'io ringraziare il relatore. La relazione fa i conti con le novità intervenute nei cambiamenti nei sistemi di controllo e di comunicazione. Anche per questo emerge un quadro di grande eterogeneità, in particolare da parte degli Stati nella comunicazione di irregolarità e frodi.

La relazione segnala più volte la stranezza di bassi livelli di frode e di irregolarità comunicati da diversi paesi rispetto alle spese agricole, ai fondi strutturali e ai fondi

di preadesione. Davvero qui occorre fare chiarezza sui dati statistici che sono stati consegnati. Il quadro è poi aggravato dal nodo irrisolto dell'inefficacia dei recuperi.

Tuttavia, un dato appare chiaro e conferma una tendenza di lungo periodo. La lotta per la legalità e la trasparenza nella spesa delle risorse europee, come il contrasto all'elusione e l'evasione alle entrate, non possono contare ancora sulla piena collaborazione degli Stati e dei governi insieme alle Istituzioni europee.

In questo senso, mi sembrano opportune le sollecitazioni avanzate nella revisione della normativa comunitaria in materia di appalti e la necessità di avere quella che io chiamo un'anagrafe pubblica europea dei beneficiari dei fondi comunitari.

2-440

Γεώργιος Σταυρακάκης (S&D). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ και εγώ τον εισηγητή για την εξαιρετική δουλειά του στην ετήσια έκθεση για την προστασία των οικονομικών συμφερόντων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, όπως και για την καταπολέμηση της απάτης. Η έκθεση καλύπτει διεξοδικά όλους τους τομείς όπου τα κράτη μέλη εκτελούν τον προϋπολογισμό, όπως γεωργία, συνοχή, προενταξιακά ταμεία και συλλογή των ιδίων πόρων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης μέσω των τελωνειακών δασμών.

Συμφωνώ απόλυτα ότι είναι απαραίτητη η βελτίωση της εποπτείας των προενταξιακών κονδυλίων, δεδομένης της εμπειρίας του 2009, όπως και ότι είναι απαραίτητη η συνεχής παρακολούθηση του έργου της OLAF, και όχι μόνο όταν συζητείται η ετήσια έκθεση.

Θα ήθελα τέλος να τονίσω κυρία Πρόεδρε ότι η έκθεση μας προσφέρει σημαντικά ευρήματα που μπορούμε να χρησιμοποιήσουμε στις συζητήσεις που έχουν ξεκινήσει, τόσο για την αναθεώρηση του Δημοσιονομικού Κανονισμού, όσο και για τον σχεδιασμό της πολιτικής συνοχής μετά το 2013.

2-441

Ивайло Калфин (S&D). – бих искал да поздравя докладчика за много задълбочената работа по този доклад. Ние не веднъж сме доказали, че Парламентът е институция, която проявява особено внимание по отношение на начина, по който се изразходват средствата на европейските данъкоплатци.

Много колеги повдигнаха въпроса и аз също искам да се присъединя към настояването Комисията да приеме много по-ясни методологични правила за методологията, по която се отчитат страните-членки, тъй като смесването на понятия „злоупотреби“, „грешки“, даже се появява категорията „съмнения за злоупотреби“ създава статистика, по която не могат да се взимат ясни решения в Парламента.

Подкрепям и онези части от доклада, в които насърчават Комисията да въведе много по-ясни правила за национална отчетност, които да включват национални декларации, надлежно одитирани, които

се изискват от страните-членки и те трябва да вземат автоматично мерки за отстраняване на недостатъците.

2-442

Elena Băsescu (PPE). – Criminalitatea economico-financiară trebuie redusă în fiecare stat membru. Sume mari din fondurile UE sunt cheltuite în alte scopuri, iar fraudele în domeniul recuperării TVA se înmulțesc. Am mai spus-o și o repet: o modalitate eficientă prin care poate fi eliminată corupția în sistemul achizițiilor publice este introducerea sistemului electronic de licitații.

În calitate de stat la granița UE, României îi revine o responsabilitate mărită în diminuarea impactului unor activități ilicite. În acest sens, autoritățile statului au întreprins în ultimele două luni ample acțiuni de eliminare a corupției din vămi.

Este necesară intensificarea cooperării și a schimburilor de experiență cu regiunea Balcanilor de Vest pentru a proteja mai eficient interesele financiare ale UE. Mă refer, de exemplu, la contrabanda cu țigări, ce îngreunează în mod direct și semnificativ bugetul european.

2-443

Franz Obermayr (NI). – Frau Präsidentin! Fehler werden aus Unachtsamkeit oder Unwissenheit begangen. Betrug jedoch passiert nicht einfach, sondern setzt ein hohes Maß an krimineller Energie voraus. Wer sich gegenüber dem Moloch Brüssel durch falsche Angaben finanzielle Vorteile verschafft, gilt manchmal als moderner Robin Hood und nicht als Krimineller. Aber hier wird nicht nur die EU geschädigt, sondern es werden die Steuergelder unserer Mitbürger missbräuchlich verwendet.

Mangelhafte Instrumente zur Betrugsbekämpfung müssen verschärft werden. Ich denke an hohe finanzielle Strafen, aber auch an Ausschluss von den Förderungen als Konsequenz. Was wir letztlich brauchen, ist mehr Transparenz, sind klare Zuständigkeiten bei Verdacht auf Betrug und Fahrlässigkeit. Es kann nicht sein, dass die Institutionen, speziell das Europäische Parlament, und OLAF sich bei Ermittlungen gegenseitig behindern.

Letztlich zu unseren Sorgenkindern: Kohäsionspolitik, Heranführungshilfen und Agenturen. Hier muss rasch klar umgedacht werden und ordentlich eingegriffen und Ordnung geschaffen werden.

2-444

Markus Pieper (PPE). – Frau Präsidentin! Vorweg: Subventionsbetrug und Fördermittelmissbrauch sind in den letzten Jahren deutlich zurückgegangen. Trotz dieser Fortschritte in Sachen Transparenz und Kontrolle bleibt die Wahrnehmung in der Öffentlichkeit kritisch. Zu Recht kritisch, wenn wir an den Umgang einiger Mitgliedstaaten mit den zu Unrecht ausgezahlten Fördergeldern denken. Dass diese nur zu einem Bruchteil wieder in den europäischen Haushalt zurückfließen, ist letztlich ein Schaden für alle Steuerzahler.

Die Kommission muss diese Gelder sofort wieder eintreiben. Besser noch, den Mitgliedstaaten im nächsten Haushaltsjahr entsprechend weniger an Fördermitteln überweisen, und zwar so lange, bis das in den Mitgliedstaaten zu Unrecht ausgezahlte Geld wieder in Brüssel angekommen ist. Besorgt sind wir aber auch immer dann, wenn kaum Unregelmäßigkeiten gemeldet werden, nach dem Motto: Wenn ich nichts melde, muss ich auch nicht für die Wiedereinzahlung sorgen, und das Geld bleibt in meinem Land.

Wie auch im Bericht gefordert wird, fordere ich ebenfalls Spanien, Frankreich und andere Länder auf, die Karten offen auf den Tisch zu legen, und ich fordere die Kommission auf, die Kontrollen weiter zu verstärken.

2-445

Algirdas Šemeta, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I would like once again to thank Mr Ivan for a very constructive and good report and also all Members for the contributions made during this debate, which will certainly be taken on board by the Commission when preparing the report for 2010.

The Commission will further improve the format and content of the Article 325 annual report on the protection of financial interests and will take into account the suggestions that were made during the debate. As I mentioned, we have already improved the statistics, but of course there is still room for more improvement.

We are asking Member States to present more information and also to distinguish better between fraud and irregularities in order to be able to present clear information on both fraud and irregularities.

I fully agree with Mrs Grässle that we can make improvements in the irregularities management system, and we are working on it very seriously. The issue was raised of transparency of beneficiaries as well. We are improving this and the ideas that were presented here will also be analysed by the Commission.

The Commission also shares the view that, although measures have been taken by the Member States to make control systems in the fight against fraud and corruption more efficient, there is still room for further improvement. Regarding the points made by Mr Geier: fraud has no specific national borders. It is not just a problem for several Member States or new Member States but also for the Member States that you mentioned in your intervention.

Of course, we have to address this issue seriously throughout the European Union and my intention is to really improve the content of the report for 2010. I and my services have been working seriously on it and I believe that the report for 2010 will be of the highest possible quality.

2-446

Cătălin Sorin Ivan, *Raportor*. – Doresc și eu să mulțumesc domnului comisar și tuturor colegilor care au

contribuit la acest raport, fie astăzi în dezbateri, fie prin amendamente. De asemenea, doresc să mulțumesc raportorilor alternativi, cu care am avut o relație foarte bună. Acest raport este rezultatul muncii împreună și colaborării foarte bune pe care am avut-o.

Aș vrea să spun încă o dată că trebuie foarte clar definită diferența între iregularități și fraudă. Dacă putem accepta o toleranță la erori și la iregularități, toleranța trebuie să fie zero în ceea ce privește fraudă. În al doilea rând, declarațiile naționale de management trebuie să fie semnate de responsabilul politic la nivel național, ministrul de resort.

În al treilea rând, așteptăm cu mare interes controlul Comisiei în ceea ce privește procedura simplificată, pentru că este foarte important ca resursele proprii ale Uniunii Europene să fie cât mai bine colectate și bugetul să fie cât mai eficient consolidat.

În al patrulea rând, privind legea achizițiilor publice și birocrăția în ceea ce privește utilizarea fondurilor europene la nivel național, avem de-a face în multe state membre cu o birocrăție excesivă menită, pe de o parte, să lupte împotriva fraudei dar care, pe de altă parte, creează oportunități pentru corupție și pentru fraudarea fondurilor europene. În altă ordine de idei, fiind foarte politizate, fondurile se duc către clientela politică.

Nu în ultimul rând, dar ultimul în intervenția mea, vreau să salut propunerea colegului Jens Geier privind introducerea unui sistem de suspendare sistematică a fondurilor europene atunci când apar suspiciuni în ceea ce privește fraudă. Cred că, în felul acesta, și statele membre vor reacționa mult mai rapid atunci când tragem semnale de alarmă.

2-447

Πρόεδρος. – Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία επί της εκθέσεως του κ. Cătălin Sorin Ivan (A7-0050/2011) θα διεξαχθεί αύριο στις 12:00.

Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 149)

2-448

Zuzana Brzobohatá (S&D), *přisemně*. – Předloženou zprávu jsem již podpořila ve Výboru pro rozpočtovou kontrolu, přesto bych ráda upozornila na několik důležitých zjištění, která zpráva přináší. Předně bych ráda podtrhla ve zprávě obsažený apel na státy, které doposud neratifikovaly Úmluvu o ochraně finančních zájmů Evropských společenství, kterou kromě Malty a Estonska neratifikovala také Česká republika. Bohužel současná česká vláda nedělá nic, čímž by zvýšila boj proti podvodům a korupci. Naopak bych ráda ocenila, že zpráva konstatuje, že při čerpání předvstupního fondu SAPARD měla Česká republika spolu s Estonskem, Lotyšskem a Slovinskem nulovou míru podvodů. Za alarmující považuji zjištění Účetního dvora, že více než 30 % chyb, které Účetní dvůr zjistil ze vzorku z roku 2009, mohlo být odhaleno a opraveno členskými státy ještě před potvrzením výdajů Komisi, a to na základě informací, které měly členské státy k dispozici. Ráda

bych se připojila k výzvě, aby OLAF v souladu s požadavkem vzneseným v loňské zprávě o ochraně finančních zájmů Společenství ve své další výroční zprávě uvedl detailní analýzu strategií a opatření zavedených každým členským státem, pokud jde o boj proti podvodům a prevenci a zjišťování nesrovnalostí při využívání evropských fondů včetně případů, kdy byly způsobeny korupcí.

2-449

IN THE CHAIR: DIANA WALLIS

Vice-President

2-450

13 - Question Time (Commission)

2-451

President. – The next item is Question Time (B7-0210/2011).

The following questions are addressed to the Commission.

2-452

Question 11 by Georgios Papastamkos (H-000152/11)

Subject: Provision of humanitarian aid to countries in North Africa

Recent events in North African countries (Egypt, Tunisia, Libya) have merely aggravated the already very difficult conditions for many sectors of the population.

Economic poverty has led to considerable migratory flows towards Member States on the Mediterranean. Has the Commission adopted economic, medico-pharmaceutical and humanitarian aid measures following the crisis in North Africa? If so, what measures?

What measures does it intend to adopt with regard to Member States on the Mediterranean which are receiving refugees from North Africa?

What problems do the ongoing military operations pose for the provision of humanitarian aid?

2-453

Kristalina Georgieva, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, on 25 February 2011, the Commission adopted an EUR 3 million emergency decision on humanitarian aid operations in connection with the Libyan crisis. Those funds were mobilised immediately, and were actually the first significant contribution to arrive. This initial amount was increased to EUR 30 million on 3 March in view of the rapidly increasing humanitarian needs. An additional amount of EUR 6 million has been mobilised under the civil protection budget line for the co-financing of assistance in kind provided by the Member States.

EU humanitarian assistance is implemented through our partners, funded by ECHO or through assistance in kind from the Member States, and mobilised and coordinated via the EU civil protection mechanism. It covers the provision of assistance to people fleeing Libya on the borders with Tunisia, Egypt and Algeria, support for the

repatriation of third-country nationals to their countries of origin, the provision of assistance and humanitarian protection to people with refugee status who cannot go back to their countries – they have no countries to go to – and to Libyans fleeing Libya, the financing and prepositioning of emergency stocks to provide relief aid inside Libya, and the financing of medical supplies, emergency surgery and food assistance inside Libya, to be implemented as and when specific areas become accessible. Currently, not the whole territory is accessible. For the time being, we can operate in the east but not in the west, which is controlled by Gaddafi.

The Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy jointly adopted, on 8 March 2011, a communication on the partnership for democracy and shared prosperity with the southern Mediterranean. It presents a strategy for Europe to support the momentous changes in the southern neighbourhood. The Commission has also mobilised its instruments to support, if needed, Italy and other Member States if a massive influx of migrants from North Africa were to materialise. This response includes operational measures and financial assistance. The Frontex joint operation – Hermes 2011 – was launched on 20 February with assets and experts from a number of Member States. We are closely monitoring developments and preparing for different scenarios. If required, Frontex operations could be strengthened to help deal with possible new inflows. The Commission is ready to mobilise additional financial assistance from funds such as the External Borders Fund and the European Refugee Fund, which amount to EUR 25 million in total. A large number of Member States are prepared to provide very welcome specialised personnel and technical assets.

Compared to the status quo, current military operations have not affected the level of humanitarian access, because it was restricted from the beginning of the crisis by forces loyal to Gaddafi. Ongoing negotiations between the authorities in Tripoli and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) have not yet resulted in an agreement on humanitarian access to western Libya.

2-454

Γεώργιος Παπαστάμκος (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, ευχαριστώ την κυρία Επίτροπο για την εμπεριστατωμένη απάντησή της. Θεωρώ ιδιαίτερα σημαντικό το ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση βρίσκεται στην παγκόσμια πρωτοπορία όσον αφορά την χορήγηση ανθρωπιστικής βοήθειας, ότι δείχνει το ανθρωπιστικό της πρόσωπο.

Υπάρχει ένα ερώτημα βεβαίως, - το οποίο είναι διαχρονικό - κατά πόσο η ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια φθάνει στα χέρια των πραγματικών αποδεκτών, και η διαφάνεια διαδραματίζει εν προκειμένω πολύ μεγάλο ρόλο. Συγκρατώ, κυρία Επίτροπε, την ευαισθησία βορειοευρωπαϊκών χωρών για να ανοίξει - πέρα από το συμβατικό πλαίσιο - η ευρωπαϊκή αγορά, τα σύνορά της στις εξαγωγές αγροτικών προϊόντων απ' αυτές τις χώρες, της βορείου Αφρικής, στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Όμως,

δεν μπορεί ο ευρωπαϊκός νότος, γιατί εκεί εντοπίζεται ο ανταγωνισμός, να πληρώσει για μία ακόμη φορά. Δέχεται τις μεταναστευτικές πιέσεις, δεν μπορεί να έχουμε πρόβλημα και στον ευρωπαϊκό αγροτικό νότο.

2-455

Kristalina Georgieva, Member of the Commission. – Firstly, on the effectiveness of humanitarian assistance from the beginning, from the outset of the crisis, the most dramatic humanitarian impact so far can be split into three parts. First, the outflow of migrant workers into Tunisia, Egypt, Algeria and Niger – there the Commission and the Member States have been very effective. We have mobilised both air and sea deployment of Member States assets so we can take people home, and a humanitarian injection into the International organisation for migration and the UN organisation for refugees so that they can help with a huge amount of people – 420 000 people – fleeing Libya.

Second, in the Eastern part of Libya to which we have access, we have provided support for medical treatment as well as for the repositioning of food supplies. This is not yet a food crisis, but this is a country that imports 90% of its food, so we must be ready. There we also are helping sub-Saharan Africans, in particular Chadians, who found themselves in a very difficult position because of the risk to their safety, being perceived to be mercenaries, being perceived to be fighters, when of course many of them are not. Helping them to get to safety, mostly in Egypt, has also been a priority.

Third, we know that in Gaddafi-controlled areas there are humanitarian needs but we are restricted in getting there. We have set aside EUR 9 million even when conditions allow for us to be mobilised. We actually gave instructions to the World Food Programme as well as to other humanitarian organisations, to be ready to help.

On the second part of your question, access to markets, this is at the heart of the southern Mediterranean initiative which I outlined. It is about making sure that we can offer a prospect of a better future for jobs and prosperity to these countries. There we are putting a very strong emphasis indeed on trade, trade with Europe, but also trade among the countries of the Mediterranean.

2-456

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Gerbiamasis Komijos nary, iš tikrųjų susiklosčiusi situacija Šiaurės Afrikoje privertė Europos Sąjungą susidurti su dideliais iššūkiais. „Financial Times“ buvo pacituoti Komisijos narės žodžiai, kad Europos Sąjunga sėkmingai evakavo savo piliečius iš Libijos. Tačiau tuo pat metu šalis liko be medicinos priežiūros specialistų, kurių dauguma buvo bulgarai. Kaip jūs paminėjote, Europos Sąjunga teikia įvairią humanitarinę pagalbą, bet tuo pačiu susiduriame su kitu nenumatytu atveju, nes iš tikrųjų palikome šitą valstybę be reikiamos medicininės pagalbos. Kaip jūs planuojate spręsti šitą klausimą?

2-457

Kristalina Georgieva, Member of the Commission. – Let me first say that the evacuation of European citizens has been very successful. We managed to achieve coordination between our Member States and deployed the monitoring and information centre to provide a platform for this coordination. As a result, we got the vast majority of our citizens out of Libya in the fastest and safest manner. By the time this massive evacuation was completed, there were only around 200 people left who wanted to be evacuated. Right now — as we speak — some of them have been safely evacuated by a Russian aircraft.

On the question of medical services, as we evacuated European citizens the law of unintended consequences kicked in, because some of these European citizens had been providing medical services as part of the Libyan health service. Many nurses were evacuated, though not so many doctors. We are now making every possible effort to enable humanitarian organisations that specialise in medical care to provide access to such care for Libyans and third-country nationals in Libya.

Once again, the critical importance of Gaddafi allowing humanitarian organisations to operate in the western part of Libya cannot be over-emphasised. Unfortunately this has not yet happened. We have a team of our own experts in the eastern part of the country. They have returned from an assessment mission and reported that, although there are increasing numbers of wounded people in need of medical care, the medical supplies and support — including personnel — that the intentional community is providing are broadly sufficient in the eastern part of Libya. That is not the case, however, in cities like Misrata and other areas controlled by Gaddafi. As you probably know, attempts are now being made to send in medical ships by sea as a means of increasing the availability of medical treatment.

2-458

President. – Question 12 by Zigmantas Balčytis (H-000136/11)

Subject: Discrepancies in healthcare in the Member States

There are still major discrepancies in the regions and Member States of the EU in healthcare services and unequal treatment of patients in terms of access to high-quality services and reimbursement of medication for complex illnesses such as Alzheimer's.

Does the Commission intend to take any action in this regard? If so, what action will it take to promote the formulation of integrated national or regional strategies aimed at reducing inequality in healthcare and ensuring that patients in the EU have access to high-quality healthcare services?

2-459

Maria Damanaki, Member of the Commission. – Dear members of the Parliament, according to the Treaty the competence for addressing these issues lies with the Member States. The European Union carries out actions to support, to coordinate or supplement Member States

actions, to protect and improve human health. Having said this, the Commission believes that all citizens across the Union should have universal access to high quality care.

The Commission has therefore launched a number of initiatives in this regard and I am happy to answer the question by the honourable Member of Parliament. In 2009, the Commission adopted a communication on 'Solidarity and health: reducing health inequalities in the European Union' and this communication stresses the need to bridge inequalities in health.

Last December, the Commission services further launched a joint action with 14 Member States on reducing health inequalities in the framework of the health programme. Universal access to high quality care is also a focus of the open method of coordination on health and long term care. In this context Member States have agreed specific objectives concerning health care systems, access to health care, quality of health and sustainability of health care policies. In addition with the new directive on patients' rights in cross-border health care, EU patients will have the opportunity to get information on treatments that are available abroad and will be able to seek possible reimbursement of costs.

Finally, the health sector is one of the funding areas under the current cohesion policy. Measures financed in this context, such as modernisation of hospital infrastructure, purchase of medical equipment or the training of medical staff can help improve citizens' access to healthcare, particularly in the poorest regions.

2-460

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Gerbiama Komisijos nare, tikrai labai dėkoju už labai išsamų atsakymą, tačiau mano rinkėjai, kai kalbama apie sudėtingomis ligomis sergančius žmones, dažnai kelia vieną klausimą. Iš tikrųjų pats pagrindinis klausimas yra slauga, tačiau dažniausiai tą slaugą atlieka jų artimieji. Slaugantys asmenys nebegali būti pilnaverčiai darbo rinkos dalyviai, o jų situacija labai neapibrėžta. Ar nemanote, kad greta sveikatos priežiūros paslaugų suvienodinimo būtina reglamentuoti ir šį klausimą, siekiant socialiai apsaugoti ir slaugą atliekančius žmones?

2-461

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, κυρία Επίτροπε, με δεδομένο ότι η οδηγία στην οποία αναφερθήκατε σχετικά με την εφαρμογή των δικαιωμάτων των ασθενών στο πλαίσιο της διασυνοριακής υγειονομικής περίθαλψης δεν έχει τεθεί ακόμη σε ισχύ, θα ήθελα να σας ρωτήσω: έχει το δικαίωμα από τώρα, ο ασθενής, στην περίπτωση που αναζητήσει υπηρεσίες υγείας σε άλλο κράτος, να αποζημιώνεται από τα Ταμεία του; Θυμίζω, απλώς, ότι σχετικές θετικές αποφάσεις έχει πάρει ήδη το Ευρωπαϊκό Δικαστήριο.

2-462

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D). – Aș dori să întreb: în ceea ce privește programele naționale de sănătate și faptul că, din păcate, multe state membre și-au redus bugetele de sănătate ca urmare a crizei economice și

financiare, ce măsuri are Comisia în vedere, astfel încât statele membre să nu reducă bugetele pentru sănătate? Orice persoană netratată la timp înseamnă un cost suplimentar pentru sistemul de sănătate.

2-463

Maria Damanaki, Member of the Commission. – What I can say in general is that we have to address all these problems bearing in mind that what we have here is a competence of the Member States. So we have to respect that.

I can understand your point that discrepancies persist but the Commission will nevertheless do everything it can to facilitate Member States in harmonising the situation between them. Our priority is to facilitate cooperation among Member States to reduce the inequalities. Another thing we can do is to pursue the issue as part of the Process on Corporate Responsibility in the field of Pharmaceuticals launched by the Commission.

On the question raised by Mr Chountis, what I can say is that when the directive is in place we will provide a clear legal framework regarding rights to reimbursement for cross-border health care. We then propose to reduce the inequalities inherent in divergent implementation of European court decisions. Citizens will then be sure about when and on what basis they will, or will not, be reimbursed for care received abroad. Until then we have to wait, I'm afraid.

2-464

President. – Question 13 by Marian Harkin (H-000110/11)

Subject: Enabling technologies

Given Europe's ongoing weakness in translating R&D into commercial products, can the Commission give an overview of where we currently stand in terms of strengthening Europe's position in key enabling technologies?

2-465

Antonio Tajani, Vicepresidente della Commissione. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli deputati, per quanto riguarda le tecnologie abilitanti, il 30 settembre 2009 la Commissione ha adottato una comunicazione che disegnava una strategia comune per questo settore. In quella comunicazione evidenziamo che, nonostante le ottime capacità di ricerca e di sviluppo in alcune tecnologie abilitanti fondamentali, non riusciamo ad avere i proporzionati successi quando si tratta di trasformare i risultati della ricerca in prodotti manifatturieri e in servizi.

Credo quindi che sia importante definire una strategia che punti ad assicurare la diffusione delle tecnologie abilitanti fondamentali nelle industrie europee. Questa impostazione è stata sottolineata anche nelle iniziative faro della Commissione, in particolare quella sulla politica industriale, quella sull'Unione per l'innovazione e quella sulla strategia digitale per l'Europa.

Dopo l'adozione della comunicazione, la Commissione, a luglio dello scorso anno, ha istituito un gruppo di esperti ad alto livello sulle tecnologie abilitanti fondamentali. I lavori sono stati inaugurati da tre Commissari, dal Vicepresidente competente per l'agenda digitale Nelly Kroes, dal Commissario competente per la ricerca e l'innovazione Máire Geoghegan-Quinn e dal sottoscritto come responsabile per l'industria e l'imprenditoria. Il gruppo ha avuto un mandato di un anno per formulare raccomandazioni sulle misure politiche da adottare per promuovere la realizzazione industriale delle tecnologie abilitanti fondamentali in Europa.

Il gruppo è composto da 27 rappresentanti provenienti dalle amministrazioni degli Stati membri, dalla comunità dei ricercatori, dal settore europeo delle tecnologie abilitanti, dalla Banca europea per gli investimenti e dalle associazioni delle piccole e medie imprese.

A febbraio di quest'anno, il gruppo ha presentato alla Commissione europea un progetto preliminare che illustra le principali sfide connesse alla commercializzazione delle tecnologie abilitanti fondamentali in Europa. Il primo documento interlocutorio, un *internal working document*, è consultabile sul sito della Direzione generale "Enterprise". La relazione definitiva del gruppo di esperti sarà presentata alla Commissione nel corso del prossimo mese di luglio. Questa relazione costituirà un contributo importante alle riflessioni della Commissione destinate ad elaborare un quadro strategico comune che raggruppi i programmi di sostegno alla ricerca e all'innovazione.

Le tecnologie abilitanti fondamentali sono di importanza fondamentale per le nostre economie, perché costituiscono dei veri e propri strumenti che consentono l'emergere di futuri prodotti e servizi e rappresentano quindi le fondamenta della nostra base industriale, di quella che potremmo chiamare la nostra terza rivoluzione industriale.

Chi saprà avvalersi di queste tecnologie in Europa sarà in grado anche di rendere le nostre industrie più competitive e sarà all'avanguardia nel passaggio ad un'economia a bassa emissione di carbonio, efficiente nel consumo delle risorse e basata sulla conoscenza. Non avvalersi delle KETs significa perdere la leadership europea nei settori in cui siamo forti e perdere capacità innovativa nelle applicazioni che sono strategiche per la nostra Unione.

Allo stesso tempo, queste tecnologie offrono enormi potenzialità di mercato per la crescita. Voglio citarvi alcune cifre che sono emblematiche. Secondo le nostre valutazioni, il loro volume di mercato globale si aggira sui 950 e i 1.100 miliardi di euro l'anno, con un tasso di crescita annuale previsto compreso tra il 5% e il 46%. Quindi, le tecnologie emergenti rappresentano una straordinaria possibilità su cui tutte le economie industrializzate fonderanno la loro competitività, strumento inevitabile per la crescita del futuro.

Perdere questa occasione sarebbe un errore e la Commissione intende svolgere il suo ruolo. Abbiamo bisogno del sostegno del Parlamento europeo, tanto più dopo il trattato di Lisbona con le accresciute competenze affidate al Parlamento europeo, e credo – e lo dico anche come vecchio parlamentare europeo – che questa collaborazione tra Parlamento europeo e Commissione ci farà ottenere buoni risultati anche in questo settore cruciale per la crescita e la competitività della nostra economia europea.

2-466

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Commissioner, thank you for your reply and, indeed, congratulations to the Commission on its work for trying to ensure that Europe remains at the forefront of what you called 'the third industrial revolution'.

The high level group dealt with a number of issues, but one of them was this 'valley of death', in other words this chasm that separates the creative idea from the market place, and it pointed out the fact that Europe often loses its first-mover advantage.

It also spoke about a number of roadblocks that are there, for example the absence of a European IP patent and the need to reduce the fragmentation of the regulatory framework already in place. So I suppose my question is, what steps, if any, has the Commission taken to address any of those issues?

2-467

Antonio Tajani, Vicepresidente della Commissione. – Ringrazio l'onorevole Harkin per aver sottolineato anche il lavoro che sta svolgendo la Commissione, ma anche per sollecitare un maggior impegno dell'esecutivo. In questa fase noi stiamo aspettando le raccomandazioni politiche del gruppo di esperti prima di indicare una compiuta strategia da parte della Commissione.

Nel documento di lavoro a medio termine il gruppo di esperti ha proposto un ponte a tre pilastri che intende colmare questo divario di innovazione. Ognuno dei pilastri rappresenta una condizione che deve essere necessariamente soddisfatta affinché si possano diffondere le KETs nell'Unione europea.

Il primo riguarda la ricerca tecnologica. L'Europa deve sviluppare tecnologie più competitive fino alla fase dei prototipi che sono protetti dai brevetti. Questo obiettivo richiede che i programmi di ricerca dell'Unione siano maggiormente mirati alla ricerca tecnologica.

Il secondo riguarda la dimostrazione dei prodotti. Noi dobbiamo riuscire a trasformare le conquiste della tecnologia in prodotti competitivi e questo obiettivo richiede di riequilibrare i programmi di ricerca dell'Unione mediante progetti dimostrativi.

Il terzo pilastro è una competitività industriale di livello globale. L'Europa deve mantenere le attuali capacità produttive avanzate o crearne di nuove in modo da riuscire a competere su scala mondiale con prodotti innovativi a livello di prezzi e di dimensioni. È

opportuno, a questo fine, migliorare le condizioni quadro per gli investitori per incoraggiarli a investire nell'Unione europea. Quindi attrarre investimenti, ma anche lavorare meglio in tutti i programmi comunitari che possono favorire questo settore così importante, e cercare di colmare la carenza tra la ricerca e l'applicazione che è caratteristica di molti settori dell'attività produttiva dell'Unione europea.

Questo passaggio dalla ricerca all'applicazione è un problema che riguarda tutto il settore industriale. Ecco perché io sono favorevole e abbiamo sostenuto la politica dei *cluster* – ne abbiamo circa 2.000 – che permette di collegare ricerca e industria, università, ricerca e industria, università, ricerca e industria e innovazione, per rendere più competitivo il nostro sistema industriale.

Onorevole Harkin, questo è lo stato dell'arte. Continueremo a lavorare e tutte le proposte, tutti i suggerimenti che verranno dal Parlamento europeo saranno esaminati con grande attenzione da parte mia e farò tesoro di tutte le indicazioni che questa Assemblea vorrà fornirmi.

2-468

Question 14 by Chris Davies (H-000112/11)

Subject: Future of EU fishing industry

The Commission has indicated that the majority of EU fisheries are being worked unsustainably. Will the Commission indicate what is its assessment of the future for the fishing industry, and for employment within it, if current policies and practices continue and no reforms are introduced to reduce overcapacity, curb the discard of fish, and introduce measures to promote sustainable practices?

2-469

Maria Damanaki, Member of the Commission. – When my services started to prepare the reform package for the common fisheries policy, they carried out a thorough impact assessment of a number of possible reform options. One of these options was to continue the current policy beyond 2013. This status quo has been used as a benchmark for comparing the impact of other possible options. This status quo scenario takes into account new long-term management plans, the Control Regulation and the Regulation on illegal, unreported fisheries.

The results of the status quo scenario option are clear: if we do not change our policy then, by 2020, sustainability of stocks will in general be out of the question.

Regarding environmental sustainability, only 6% of the stocks analysed would reach maximum sustainable yield by 2020. This should be compared with our obligation to achieve maximum sustainable yield by 2015. So if we continue under the status quo situation there is no way we will fulfil our obligation to achieve maximum sustainable yield by 2015

With reference to the economic performance of our fishing fleets, under the status quo scenario only some fleets will be economically viable. The catching sector as a whole will have profits close to zero or even worse.

Finally, the picture for social sustainability is the same. Employment in the catching sector would continue to decline at the same pace as is the case now; wages would remain low, which would make the profession of fisherman increasingly unattractive to the younger generation.

So the status quo is really not an option for the Commission. We need the reform and we are working for it.

2-470

Chris Davies (ALDE). – The Commissioner has spelt out a very depressing picture, saying that, if we carry on as we are, the prospects are bleak, with fishing fleets in many cases economically unviable and job opportunities for fishermen declining.

However, is it not the case that decline might be better than the alternative? The fact is that we do not know. We do not have the scientific knowledge for 50% of our fisheries. We know that fish stocks are low in many cases, after decades of over-fishing. The reality is that the situation is very fragile. We are very vulnerable. Commissioner, you could not rule out the possibility that, if we carry on as we are, a number of these fisheries will collapse altogether.

2-471

Barbara Matera (PPE). – Condivido con i colleghi la preoccupazione per il comparto ittico nel Mediterraneo e condivido anche l'attenzione verso la tutela degli ecosistemi marini. Ma, alla luce delle difficoltà socio-economiche delle attività relative al mare, e in particolare di alcune comunità marittime piegate dalla rigidità della normativa comunitaria, chiedo se la Commissione intende trovare soluzioni equilibrate e immediate, al fine di tutelare contemporaneamente sia gli ecosistemi che i tanti cittadini europei che lavorano nel settore.

2-472

Seán Kelly (PPE). – The Commissioner paints a rather depressing picture. One of the problems that was highlighted by Mr Davies in the question, is the whole question of discards. Now I met a fisherman recently who said that he had discovered or invented a net that would put an end to discards with regard to tuna fishing. Would the Commissioner consider looking at that? Does she believe the technology can be implemented that will end discards, or at least curtail them?

2-473

Maria Damanaki, Member of the Commission. – If we continue with the status quo, then yes, we have to face the possibility of the collapse of a lot of stocks, and that is out of the question.

I can only agree that our situation is very fragile. If we have to face an extreme situation then the consequences will be very bad. That is why we need the reform and that is why we are going to examine the best way forward in order to achieve a balance between the sustainability of stocks and the socio-economic impact that the reform will have.

However, let me be clear: it is not that we are prioritising environmental care over care for our fishermen. We care about our fishermen and about the generations to come. That is why we need the reform because, to be honest with you, if we do not have any fish stocks then fishermen in the Mediterranean and all other European waters will have no future. In order to be sure that our fisheries industry has a future, we need the reform. We intend to bring forward some sound proposals and we intend to secure the livelihoods of our fishermen. This is something we want to do.

Another Member referred to the selectivity of fishing gear. Our services will be very willing to examine any new gear and any innovation in relation to selectivity. I would also like to say that, within the framework of our new funding system, we intend to allocate money in a generous way, despite the crisis, in order to be sure that improvements in selectivity are implemented. I very much welcome all the initiatives by the industry – by our fishermen – to bring about improvements in the selectivity of fishing gear.

In general, I would like to repeat that the status quo is not an option. It is not an option for the sustainability of the stocks, for the livelihoods of our fishermen or for the future of our coastal communities. That is why we need this reform.

2-474

President. – Question 15 by Jim Higgins (H-000127/11)

Subject: Proposed ban on shark finning

In light of the recent support by the Members of the European Parliament for the banning of shark finning, and given the fact that Congress in the United States has introduced legislation banning the practice and that other jurisdictions feel very strongly that such legislation should be implemented, what does the Commission propose in terms of giving legislative effect to the concerns of MEPs?

2-475

Maria Damanaki, Member of the Commission. – I would like to thank the honourable Member for his question because it gives me the opportunity to inform the House about shark finning.

Finning has been banned since 2003, via a Council regulation, on EU vessels fishing anywhere in the world and on all vessels fishing in EU waters. In general there is a ban on shark finning. However, the current regulation allows – and this is the problem we face – under certain conditions, on-board processing involving the removal of fins on board vessels, while making obligatory the retention of all shark carcasses on board.

This is why we have faced the problem of shark finning in recent years.

We presented a plan of action in February 2009 and have since taken a number of measures. We are also actively working with regional organisations to put effective management regimes in place for the most vulnerable shark species and to ensure their sustainable exploitation. So the problem we are facing with a view to addressing this situation is the need for a public consultation, and we have now already had a public consultation for some months. The consultation document presented three of the main options that are currently being discussed by experts worldwide to improve controls and to ensure full compliance. Many stakeholders, such as the fishing industry, scientists, managers and NGOs, as well as the general public, have sent us their comments.

I would like to assure you that I take the issue of protecting sharks very seriously. I have therefore asked my services to thoroughly study all the contributions received. We will then prepare an impact assessment which, as you know, is required to modify the regulation. It is my intention to have a legislative proposal adopted as soon as practically possible. I would like to inform you that I have made this issue a priority in order not to lose any more time.

I would also like to say that the Commission has taken a lot of measures to ensure the sustainable management and protection of sharks in general, beyond shark finning. We presented a plan of action and have since taken a number of measures. We have prohibited fishing for porbeagle, basking shark and white shark in EU waters. We have banned gill nets below 200 metres to protect deepwater sharks. Last year – and I would like to underline this – we proposed a sustainable and science-based quota for various sharks. We had a very rough time negotiating this in the Council. It was not an easy task, but in the end we were successful and we have a sustainable proposal for this year and, I hope, for next year.

2-476

Jim Higgins (PPE). – Madam President, cutting the fins off sharks is barbaric. It is inhumane; it is barbaric. Dumped back into the sea, they die. It is a practice that should be banned. While the Commission has referred to the 2003 regulation, it is simply not working.

I appreciate that it is very difficult. How do you police it? We need to put in place a regulation banning this practice completely. What we are talking about is the wiping out – the total extinction – of a particular species. The figures speak for themselves. For example, it is currently estimated that, in 2009, the fins of 26 million to 73 million sharks entered the global trade. It is a very lucrative business indeed. We need to ban it completely. It is barbaric, it should not be countenanced and we need to ban it once and for all. We should take the lead in that regard.

2-477

Brian Crowley (ALDE). – In 2003, shark-fin fishing was banned. By analogy, we now have the whole situation with regard to the mackerel situation in the European Union, where there is an agreement at European level and at European Economic Area level on a reduction in mackerel fishing. Yet we see that both Iceland and the Faroe Islands have caught 150 000 tonnes each and this is impacting directly on the sustainability of European fishing fleets. So what actions can be taken on that? In particular, can trade sanctions be taken against those two areas?

2-478

Chris Davies (ALDE). – With the lions disappearing from Africa and the sharks disappearing from our seas, I commend the Commissioner for what she is trying to do, but this is very much market driven. There was a huge demand from Asia for shark fins, and there is a great deal of money to be made from them.

The only way of ensuring that we are properly able to police and quantify what is going on is to ensure that fins are landed attached to the shark's body. That way we can retain control. I hope the Commissioner will bear this in mind when she draws up her proposals.

2-479

Maria Damanaki, Member of the Commission. – I agree with the Members of Parliament that although there is a ban, we cannot be happy with this situation. I agree with you and we know the reality and how it works. We know that there is a very profitable industry behind all this discussion. But we have to take measures consistent with our legal framework, so let me explain.

The problem exists because the industry can now land the fins and the sharks at different ports. They can land the fins which, as we can imagine, are more precious because of the demand for them, especially in Asia, and they can land the bodies of the sharks somewhere else, making control very difficult. This is why all this happens. This is something we have in mind. That is why we came forward with this consultation procedure because we would like to deal with this very difficult situation.

So what I can tell you is that we are going to have an ambitious proposal and, by the end of the year, I hope we will have a new legal instrument on shark fins that will have some concrete results. We are going to regulate this situation once and for all.

As regards the analogy on the mackerel situation, what I can say here is that the European Union has done its best. I would like to say that the Member States around this area were very cooperative and our fishermen and our industry had to suffer a lot of sacrifices in order to secure the sustainability of the stocks.

That is why we were very upset when Iceland and the Faroe Islands came with unilateral approaches and increased their own quotas by themselves. This is something we simply cannot accept. So we are now

working on this – my services are working with the Cabinet and the services of the Trade Commissioner, Mr de Gucht – and we are going to launch a legislative proposal for a legal weapon to use in such cases. We have some weapons now, but the legal weapons at our disposal now refer only to fresh fish, including mackerel, and not to the products of mackerel and especially not to fish oil and fish meal which are the main export products from Iceland and the Faroe Islands. So we have to be productive on this. The Commission is going to do its best to ensure that during the next fishing season the sustainability of the stocks will be protected.

2-480

President. – Question 16 by Rodi Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou (H-000142/11)

Subject: New maritime strategy for the Mediterranean

In view of the new challenges arising from developments in the Mediterranean Arab countries, it is necessary to adopt a maritime strategy as part of the 25-point integrated plan of action for the Mediterranean. The EU has drawn up legislation and strategies to promote the sustainable use of the sea, the conservation of maritime eco-systems and the protection of the resources essential for maritime activities of a social and economic nature.

Will the Commission adopt new maritime policy objectives as part of the new Euro-Mediterranean strategy?

What progress is being made by EU initiatives in this area, for example with regard to pollution in the Mediterranean?

What instruments does it have at its disposal to facilitate the adaptation of the Mediterranean area to climate change and avert the serious risks arising from flooding, coastal erosion and further land deterioration?

How do Mediterranean energy transport policies fit into the maritime strategy?

What measures are being taken and what forms of cooperation with Mediterranean partners are being envisaged with a view to protecting shipping and curbing illegal immigration by sea?

2-481

Maria Damanaki, Member of the Commission. – I thank Ms Kratsa-Tsagaropoulou for her question because it gives us the opportunity to refer to this very difficult situation in the Mediterranean.

I would like to inform Parliament that the Commission recently adopted a communication on 'A partnership for democracy and shared prosperity with the Southern Mediterranean', which sets out a series of proposals to address the challenges that the region currently faces following recent developments. As you know, this is an extreme situation which is very fragile and very worrying.

The Commission is highly satisfied with the general approval for its initiative. This communication has been received in a very positive way by all the Member States and, I hope, by Parliament.

Let me explain a few actions that we have taken to date towards the objective of a new maritime strategy for the Mediterranean. Firstly, in relation to an integrated maritime policy, we have already established a working group on such a policy, involving all the Mediterranean coastal states and regional conventions. We plan to take this forward as a cross-cutting forum on all maritime-related activities, cooperation and funding in the region. As part of this initiative, we also have the first technical assistance project, which was launched under the European Neighbourhood Policy, dealing with the integrated maritime policy for the Mediterranean.

I would also like to inform Parliament about an initiative I took recently in launching a joint cooperation project in the Mediterranean together with the International Maritime Organisation and the European Investment Bank. I am counting on this initiative and I hope it will be fruitful. We will define targeted actions for maritime growth, jobs and maritime training, which is very important for the Mediterranean region. We will also include measures for integrated maritime surveillance, and we will have private-sector involvement because, with regard to maritime issues, I believe this to be absolutely necessary.

In parallel, the Commission intends to support the organisation of a forum for Mediterranean coastguards throughout the region. We will also step up our efforts in the area of fisheries control through training, workshops and joint control in cooperation with Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO).

Regarding protection of the environment and climate change, at EU level the Commission is now working with the Member States to achieve good environmental status in its marine waters by 2020. At regional level, the EU and its Member States cooperate, in the framework of the Barcelona Convention, with Mediterranean partner countries to promote the prevention of pollution, and improve the response to it, in all the regional seas bordering the Union.

With regard to migration-related problems and the recent developments in the region, the Commission is committed to assisting and supporting EU Member States that face sudden migratory pressures and is ready to mobilise financial assistance. We are now working on identifying financial emergency envelopes under the External Borders Fund, and possibly the Return Fund and the European Refugee Fund, in addition to funding already earmarked for 2011.

As regards the surveillance of external borders, the Commission is in constant contact with Frontex, which has launched the Hermes 2011 joint operation to control the EU external border in the region. Frontex, together with Europol, has also started preparing a targeted risk assessment of potential exploitation of the volatile political situation by criminal and terrorist networks, and monitoring irregular migration flows.

2-482

Ρόδη Κράτσα-Τσαγκαροπούλου (PPE). – Ευχαριστώ πολύ κυρία Επίτροπε και για την αναφορά σας στα σχέδια και τις νέες κατευθύνσεις της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, όπως και για την προσωπική δέσμευση που εκφράσατε όσον αφορά την προετοιμασία σας σχετικά με αυτή τη νέα πραγματικότητα στη Μεσόγειο.

Ήθελα να ρωτήσω πιο συγκεκριμένα: πως αποτιμάτε τα σχέδια που ήδη έχουν δρομολογηθεί για την απορρύπανση της Μεσογείου, για τη μεταφορά ενέργειας και πως αυτά τα εντάσσεται στην σχέση με τη θαλάσσια πολιτική, καθώς και τι προστιθεμένη αξία περιμένετε να έχουν τα σχέδια και προγράμματα της νέας πολιτικής στην οποία ήδη αναφερθήκατε.

2-483

Giovanni La Via (PPE). – Signor Commissario, nel quadro della nuova politica mediterranea per la pesca e nel quadro che lei ha appena disegnato relativo alla situazione dei paesi della sponda sud del Mediterraneo, che vivono una situazione di profonda crisi, ritiene che la cooperazione transfrontaliera possa validamente, nell'ambito della politica della coesione, affrontare congiuntamente il tema, per trovare tra politica transfrontaliera e politica della pesca soluzioni condivise che consentano di ripristinare gli stock nel Mediterraneo e di facilitare una ripresa di questa attività economica?

2-484

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE). – Jaz bi rad postavil vprašanje gospe komisarki, ki se nanaša na to, da poskušajo številne evropske države svoje probleme, ribiške, prelagati na neko državo, ki ne obstaja formalnopravno – govorim o Zahodni Sahari.

Komisija je podaljšala oziroma dobila mandat za pogajanje z Marokom o ribiškem sporazumu. Lepo vas prosim! Kakšna jamstva imamo, da bodo sredstva, ki jih dobivamo iz tega sporazuma, uporabljena v korist prebivalstva Zahodne Sahare, ne pa samo za zadovoljevanje potreb evropskih ribičev.

2-485

Maria Damanaki, Member of the Commission. – I would like to agree with Mrs Grässle that there is, indeed, a strong possibility of pollution because of the energy transfer in the Mediterranean. There is a risk here because the Mediterranean is a rather closed sea and it cannot stand the burden of possible pollution.

So what we are going to do now is to increase and enhance our cooperation, the Commission's cooperation, with Member States. I would like to say to Mrs Grässle that Commissioner Potočnik and myself will be visiting Greece next week and we are going to organise something about the pollution of the Mediterranean. I would also like to inform her that Mediterranean countries could also better prevent and detect pollution from ships by participating in EMSA's satellite-based monitoring system, such as safe sea nets or clean sea nets. We have these systems and we are going to encourage our Member States around the Mediterranean to participate in these systems, to detect possible pollution from ships.

I would like to say that we are going to incentivise not only our Member States, but also our neighbours through discussions and cooperation in order to fulfil this aim.

With regard to regional cooperation, yes, we are going to take some initiatives on it and we have a lot of initiatives in the framework of the General Committee for Fisheries in the Mediterranean Region (GFCM), and we are also now working to have a new strategy, a maritime strategy, in the Adriatic and Ionian region.

We are now working with the governments of the Member States around the Adriatic and Ionian seas: Italy, Slovenia and Greece but also other neighbours around there, Croatia, Montenegro and Albania. We are trying to have a maritime cooperative strategy for this region. I would like to underline that this will really be an opportunity for cohesion funds, as the honourable Member has already said.

Lastly, a brief remark about Western Sahara: yes, we had a lot of concerns about the right of the real beneficiaries to take advantage of the money we are giving to Morocco as part of this fisheries agreement. That is why we have asked the Moroccan Government to give us data with regard to not only the implementation of the agreement in general, but also to the regional approach of this agreement and to the distribution they have in different regions in Morocco. We are going to renew the protocol for a transitional period of one year just to find out if we can go with it or not. This is the way we are moving, very cautiously, towards this direction.

2-486

President. – Question 17 by Georgios Papanikolaou (H-000108/11)

Subject: Training of researchers and assessment of universities in the flagship initiative on innovation

The Europe 2020 flagship initiative 'Innovation Union' (chapter 2) published recently by the Commission refers, among other things, to the obligation of the Member States to announce strategies for training enough researchers to meet their national strategic programme targets and the Commission's intention, in the same year, to support an international multi-dimensional system to benchmark the performance of European higher educational foundations.

I ask the Commission: How will it ensure the target of 3% for research by 2020 will be met across the board without variations in investments being seen between the Member States? Does the Commission think that the fiscal crisis in the eurozone Member States could put the intended targets at risk?

What are the criteria for benchmarking higher educational foundations in Europe to identify those which show the best performance in the field of research?

2-487

Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, Member of the Commission.
– On the 3% R&D intensity target the state of innovation urgency in Europe calls for the support of

smart growth and a commitment to tackle societal challenges. The Innovation Union Scoreboard shows that the EU is losing ground to the United States and Japan, while Brazil and China are closing the gap with the EU. The 3% R&D intensity target has a crucial contribution to make in meeting this challenge. The European Council invited Member States to set ambitious and realistic national targets, taking into account the initial level of R&D investment and the key structural characteristics of their economies.

Last year Member States and the Commission engaged in bilateral dialogues. Nearly all of the Member States have now set national R&D intensity targets, to be finalised in their national reform programmes by the end of April 2011.

On 12 January this year, the Commission adopted the communication on the annual growth survey. It comprises the list of national R&D targets, which are generally both ambitious and realistic and marks the start of a new cycle of coordination in this field. An assessment of the national research and innovation policies and achievements will be performed, aiming at identifying the main bottlenecks impeding growth and recovery in a post-crisis scenario where the financial constraints are still effective.

An excellent research base is vital if the 3% R&D intensity target is to be achieved and if Europe is to become more innovative. Europe will need at least one million more research jobs if the R&D intensity target of 3% is to be reached by 2020. The number of new researchers required is significantly higher as many researchers will retire over the period. Research excellence by universities and also, of course, by industry will benefit the wider society. Progress is related to the high quality of higher education institutions.

The Innovation Union Scoreboard uses internationally recognised indicators to benchmark the performance of Europe against that of our competitors. Three of these indicators are: new doctoral graduates per 1 000 population aged 25 to 34, quantitative, international scientific co-publications per million population and scientific publications among the top 10% most cited publications worldwide as a percentage of total scientific publications of the country, both qualitative.

The United States has increased its lead in international co-publications and is now 37% above the EU level. Pending the results in June of a feasibility study, the Commission will support an independent multidimensional international ranking to benchmark the performance of higher education institutions. This study will cover performances, not only in the field of research, but also in other important fields such as innovation, education, regional engagement and internationalisation. The multidimensional character of this concept will allow students, policy makers and the universities themselves to select the dimensions and underlying indicators of interest to them and make their

own personalised ranking tailored to their needs. Stakeholders are actively involved in all stages of this feasibility project.

2-488

Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE). – Κυρία Επίτροπε σας ευχαριστώ πολύ για την απάντησή σας. Θυμίζω όμως ότι και οκτώ περίπου χρόνια πριν, το 2003, στο σχεδιασμό μας τότε, στη στρατηγική για τη Λισσαβόνα, λέγαμε περίπου τα ίδια δηλαδή ότι έπρεπε να βασιστούμε στην καινοτομία, στην έρευνα ώστε να μπορέσουμε έτσι να έχουμε πιο ανταγωνιστική οικονομία.

Είστε πέραν του χρόνου Επίτροπος και νομίζω ότι έχετε την εμπειρία να μας απαντήσετε: τι σας κάνει να πιστεύετε ότι αυτή τη φορά, στη νέα στρατηγική που έχουμε για το 2020, θα τα καταφέρουμε και δεν θα έχουμε παρόμοια αποτελέσματα με την προηγούμενη στρατηγική που τελικώς απέτυχε παταγωδώς.

2-489

Seán Kelly (PPE). – Regarding higher education institutions, I want to ask the Commissioner whether she is satisfied that the European institutions have both the will and the capacity to raise their game, improve their ranking on the world stage and develop their ability to cooperate with one another in order to avoid duplication in research.

2-490

Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, Member of the Commission. – What is different now from what was promised and committed to in Lisbon? I think the first thing is that innovation and research is at the heart of European policy now. We have a commitment, not just from the Commission and from the Member States and the Parliament, but also from the European Council. We have very strong monitoring in place, which will be done diligently. We have 34 ‘Innovation Union’ commitments — for which different colleagues of mine have responsibility — where we monitor on a regular basis what the improvement is, what the changes are, what the development is and what has been delivered or, if it has not been delivered, why not. Every year we hope to have an ‘Innovation Convention’ at which we bring the stakeholders together to sit down and look at progress over the previous year.

So we have very strict monitoring, which I think is probably where we failed — or did not achieve what we set out to achieve — in Lisbon. We also have the annual growth survey and will now have the national reform programmes, where Member States will set down very clearly what their targets are going to be and how they hope they hope to attain those targets. I think that is a step forward that was needed.

On the modernisation of universities, this is a big issue that, I think, faces all the Member States of the EU. It is not good enough to have one or two universities in a number of Member States that are up there near the top of the tree. We need to modernise our university system at all levels in the EU and we need to avoid the kind of

duplication that has been referred to, where each university up to now might have felt that they had the capacity to have a centre of excellence for every single faculty. That is not possible or cost-effective, and it involves a great deal of fragmentation and duplication, which is exactly what we are trying to avoid.

But let us remember that the Commission does not have competence in this area. So what we can do – and what Commissioner Vassiliou is doing assiduously – is explain to the Member States that we cannot continue the policies of the past. We have to change; we have to decide which are the areas in which we will have – or a particular university will have – a centre of excellence, and we have to put in place a real programme of university modernisation generally throughout the Union.

2-491

President. – Question 18 by Ioannis A. Tsoukalas (H-000111/11)

Subject: Minimal checks and a high percentage of errors in projects in the 7th FP for research

From the Commissioner's answer to question E-8013/2010¹ serious questions arise as to the effectiveness of the checks on the 7th FP. Up to 31 August 2010 the competent services carried out only 118 checks on 193 participants, a percentage of 0.42% of participants in the 7th FP, whereas the percentage for the 6th FP was 5.7%. These findings are worrying since over 4% of the budget for the projects was judged to have been wrongly spent. If this trend is not halted, it cannot be ruled out that financial corrections of more than EUR 2 billion may be required for the whole of the 7th FP.

I ask the Commission:

What are the latest data on the number and outcome of checks that have been carried out on 7th FP projects? To what is the large number of errors due? Does it consider the results satisfactory and are efforts to simplify the rules for management of the 7th FP sufficient? What immediate actions will it take to deal with the problem?

2-492

Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, Member of the Commission. – I will try to be attentive to the interpreters.

A precondition for carrying out the ex-post auditing activity is the availability of a sufficiently important number of cost claims submitted by the beneficiaries. For the Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development, or ‘FP 7 2007-2013’, the first reporting period takes place 18 months after the start of the project.

As a consequence, the number of FP 7 cost claims available to be audited reached critical mass only in 2010. Moreover, the Commission's control strategy for research is designed to provide reasonable assurance on the legality and regularity of research expenditure on a multiannual basis over the whole period of the Framework Programme. As of 31 December last year

¹ Answer of 25.11.2010.

the Commission has closed 345 FP 7 audits, covering 432 participations in FP 7 projects. In the same period, financial corrections amounting to EUR 4.482 million due to errors were proposed as a result of auditing EUR 88.633.047 million of FP 7 contributions.

Research framework programmes are implemented mainly through cost-sharing grants based on the reimbursement of eligible actual costs. The main risk is that beneficiaries include ineligible costs in their costs statements. The risk is exacerbated by the conflict between the eligibility criteria and the usual cost-accounting practices of certain beneficiaries, in particular the requirement for beneficiaries to allocate personnel and indirect costs to projects while deducting various items considered ineligible for EU co-financing.

In view of this the Commission issued, in April 2010, a Communication putting forward possibilities for the simplification of research funding rules and procedures. Simplification and clarification of rules and procedures can reduce the scope for error and increase assurance of the regularity of expenditure, but also facilitate the participation of researchers in the framework programmes and the achievement of EU research policy objectives.

Following the overall consensus on a number of issues that could still be implemented under the current overall legal framework, on 24 January this year the Commission took short-term simplification actions comprising concrete measures with immediate and retroactive effect on FP7 projects.

2-493

Ιωάννης Α. Τσουκαλάς (PPE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω την κυρία Επίτροπο για τη λεπτομερή απάντηση, εξακολουθώ να σημειώνω πάντως ότι με δείγμα 0,4% οι αστοχίες φτάνουν το 4% ή στα 50 δισ. 2 εκατ. ευρώ. Ελπίζω ότι το μοντέλο δεν είναι γραμμικό και όταν πραγματοποιηθούν έλεγχοι 4% δεν θα βρούμε αστοχίες 40%. Καταλαβαίνω, επίσης, ότι είναι πολύ δύσκολο από τη μία μεριά να ζητάμε από την κυρία Επίτροπο να απλουστεύσει τις διαδικασίες διαχείρισης του εβδόμου και να προβλέψει απλούστευση για το όγδοο, ενώ ταυτοχρόνως ζητούμε λεπτομερέστερους ελέγχους. Αυτό φαίνεται αντιφατικό, όμως νομίζω ότι δεν είναι. Ένα μου φαίνεται καλό, όλοι μας ενδιαφερόμαστε για την έρευνα και ξέρουμε ότι η Ευρώπη μόνο από εκεί μπορεί να σωθεί, όπως και οι χώρες μέλη.

2-494

Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, Member of the Commission. – Madam President, I think our aim has to be to keep things as simple as possible for our stakeholders and to ensure – insofar as we can – that beneficiaries can directly apply their usual cost accounting practices for personnel costs, avoiding the need to implement a parallel accounting system as they had to up to now. That obviously brings complexity and a risk of errors. At the end of the day, we accept – I think everyone has to accept – that researchers are not interested in being involved in the misuse of EU funding. They are rather

interested in the real, pure basic research that they do, which can lead on to the wonderful innovations that we can see in countries, not just throughout Europe but indeed throughout the world. So we make things as uncomplicated as possible, as simple as possible, for stakeholders.

2-495

President. – Question 19 by Silvia-Adriana Ticau (H-000114/11)

Subject: Involvement of SMEs in European research and innovation

On 9 February 2011 the Commission launched the Green Paper *From Challenges to Opportunities: Towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding*. Following public consultation, the Commission will develop a common strategic framework to facilitate both the guidance of research and innovation (R&I) activity, to address the challenges of today's society, and the simplification of the procedures for accessing European funds for R&I, reduction of the amount of time taken to introduce the outcomes of research within the market, and greater involvement of European enterprises in R&I activities. Within the context of the EU 2020 Strategy, the EU has set itself the target of the funds allocated to R&I activities reaching 3% of GDP by 2020. Because the private sector has a low level of financing for R&I, I would like to ask the Commission: what measures does it envisage to stimulate the involvement of this sector in the funding of European R&I? What measures does the Commission envisage to help SMEs overcome the difficulties encountered in accessing European funds for R&I? Does the Commission plan to allocate a European funding quota solely for SMEs?

2-496

Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, Member of the Commission. – The Commission is committed to facilitating the access to financing of small and medium sized enterprises in EU research and innovation programmes and to helping them ultimately bring the fruits of their innovation to market.

This is a priority for the Commission, as stated in the Communication on Innovation Union adopted on 6 October last, in the Small Business Act for Europe adopted in June 2008 and in the review of the Small Business Act adopted on 23 February this year.

In addition, the Green Paper 'From Challenges to Opportunities: towards a common strategic framework for EU Research and Innovation funding', identified the key questions for future EU research and innovation support, including a number of specific questions on how to better meet the needs of SMEs.

An overall aim of the common strategic framework is to make participation in EU programmes more simple and attractive, in particular for SMEs. For the future, important elements to consider in this context are a single entry point with common IT platforms, more standardised rules, a streamlined set of funding instruments that cover the full innovation chain, and simpler and more consistent procedures for receiving funding.

Following the Green Paper consultation, the Commission will bring forward its legislative proposals for the common strategic framework by the end of this year. We have already introduced in the latest Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) work programmes – a number of measures specifically targeting SMEs, including earmarked budgets. The budgetary share of SMEs is forecast to grow from the current 14.3 % to over the 15 % target foreseen in the legislation. SMEs need support on their doorstep. Easier access to FP7 is provided by the Enterprise Europe network, a partnership between the Commission and nearly 600 business organisations such as chambers of commerce of industry, chambers of crafts, innovation agencies and regional development agencies. More precisely, based on agreed guidelines, this network, together and in cooperation with the national contact points of FP7, assists SMEs by providing support for awareness raising, capacity building for participation in the framework programme, engaging new SMEs in the proposals, partner search, joint actions addressed to SMEs and conducting consultations on inclusion of SME-related call topics in work programmes. Several hundred SMEs were able to submit FP7 proposals with the support of the network.

2-497

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Madam President, SMEs encounter many difficulties in accessing EU funds for research and development. Either they do not obtain a loan to ensure the co-financing part, or the red tape is too much of a burden for them. Does the Commission have any plans to elaborate a common and simple set of rules in order to increase the participation of SMEs in EU research programmes? Does the Commission intend to allocate, let us say, about 30% of EU research funds just for SMEs?

2-498

Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, Member of the Commission. – Three concrete measures were adopted on 24 January this year, with immediate effect, on the management of EU research grants in the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7), and each of these responds directly to concerns that have been expressed repeatedly by participants – and would-be participants – in FP7. One is allowing more flexibility as to how personnel costs are calculated. Another is that SME owners whose salaries were not formally registered in their accounts can now be reimbursed through flat-rate payments. And a new steering group of senior officials, taken from right across the Commission services, is involved in removing inconsistencies. This is very important for the application of the rules that are there already.

We designed an e-learning platform specifically targeted at SMEs. It is going to go online this year, and it aims to facilitate the access of SMEs to R&D projects. The exploration of its results will offer free online training and customised information and, very importantly, a communication forum. All of those taken together improve substantially the situation for SMEs and obviously, under the common strategic framework, I

have no doubt that we will get other very good ideas about what else we might be able to do to help them.

2-499

President. – Question 26 by Bernd Posselt (H-000107/11)

Subject: Air pollution in German cities

How does the Commission assess the state of air pollution in German cities, for instance in Munich, and what measures does it propose?

2-500

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – The ambient air quality directives set several limit values for several pollutants with different attainment deadlines. Apart from promoting good practices at the implementation committee meetings amongst other fora, the Commission focuses its efforts on checking if compliance with the limit values set in the directive has truly been met.

Since 1996, the directive has required that Member States develop and implement an overall strategy, including long and short-term measures. The latter category is particularly relevant to address situations where there is risk of exceeding the particulate matter PM 10 limit values, for example. Plans must be prepared as soon as the limit values plus the margin of tolerance are exceeded, to show how compliance will be reached by the attainment date.

Whilst the air quality plans have to be communicated to the Commission within two years of the exceeded limit measured, the competence and responsibility for deciding on the measures to be included in the air quality plans rests entirely with the Member States. This is in line with the subsidiarity principle and acknowledges the fact that national and/or local authorities are best placed to identify the most efficient and tailor-made measures to address high concentration levels in their air quality zones.

The Commission's compliance checking focuses mainly on whether limit values are met, less so on how they are met. The latest data submitted by Germany for the year 2009 confirm that 70 out of about 80 air quality zones continue to show an excess for PM limit values. Most zones were granted an extension of the compliance date until 11 June this year because they had prepared an air quality plan with a clear timetable and measures showing how compliance will be met by the exceedance deadline. Munich is one of these zones. The time extension was granted, provided that the competent authorities adjust the air quality plan to include short-term measures that are effective for controlling and, where necessary, suspending activities that contribute to the risk of the limit values being exceeded.

As far as NO₂ is concerned, the Commission expects that many Member States will face similar problems as with PM. Exceedances prior to 2010, possibly extended

to the end of 2014, do not constitute a breach of European legislation at the current time but trigger the requirement to prepare an air quality plan. Member States have until the end of September 2011 to submit the data for the year 2010.

2-501

Bernd Posselt (PPE). – Danke, Herr Kommissar, für die sehr gute und präzise Antwort. Ich habe zwei kurze Zusatzfragen: Erstens, klärt die Kommission, ob die einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten tatsächlich nach den gleichen Kriterien und gleich streng messen, oder gibt es da Unterschiede? Zweitens, haben Sie konkrete Vorschläge – zumindest für die Städte –, wie man die Luftverschmutzung reduzieren kann?

2-502

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – The criteria are the same for all countries. It is true that owing to geographical conditions, sometimes cities like Milan in Italy have a more difficult job to reach the same criteria than other cities. However, it is of the utmost importance that all citizens in the European Union be guaranteed the same level of health and protection. That is the issue in this respect.

Of course, if there are issues that are locally or regionally specific, we award attention to that and we do try to address these issues in a collaborative way with the authorities so that we find the proper solutions. Our aim is always to target and find a solution – to be strictly helpful and helpfully strict, if you like.

Concerning the second question, we normally do not give specific recommendations to any of the cities or regions, simply because we believe that the authorities there are much better placed and know the situation better than we do. We do check if compliance is met, but normally the kind of standardised approach that gives good results is a mixture of various measures, some which are more short-term orientated and others are more structural.

2-503

President. – Our next question comes from Mrs Kadenbach, who is replaced tonight by Mr Arsenis.

2-504

Question 27 by Karin Kadenbach (H-000116/11)

Subject: EU Biodiversity Strategy

In 2010, the International Year of Biodiversity, the European Council adopted an ambitious 2050 vision and 2020 target for biodiversity conservation in the EU. Subsequently, under the Convention on Biological Diversity, the world's governments adopted an ambitious global vision and 2020 mission for biodiversity conservation, and a Strategic Plan setting out 20 testing targets.

When does the Commission expect to publish an EU Biodiversity Strategy, setting out the ambitious measures needed to achieve the EU and global biodiversity conservation targets?

Can the Commission confirm that the new Strategy will call for no further negative changes in the conservation status of

all protected habitats and species across the EU, both within and outside Natura 2000 sites, by 2020, with a view to restoring all habitats and species to favourable conservation status by 2050?

Other than ongoing training for judges, and guidance documents previously announced by the Commission, what concrete measures are planned to improve the implementation of EU environmental law? Does the Commission have any plans to set up an EU environmental inspection force and adopt legislation on environmental inspections, as called for by Parliament?

2-505

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – The Commission is putting the finishing touches on the new EU biodiversity strategy, which will provide a framework for action to tackle biodiversity loss over the next decade. We are aiming for adoption in early May. Because the draft strategy is still under internal consultation within the Commission, I am not able to provide many details on its contents. I can however reassure you that it responds to both the EU's ambitious mandate set by the Council last year and to the global commitments the EU signed up to in Nagoya last October in the framework of the Convention of Biological Diversity.

The strategy will be developed around six sub-targets focusing on tackling some of the main drivers of biodiversity laws and the pressures exerted on biodiversity: nature conservation, restoration and green infrastructure, agriculture and forestry, fisheries, invasive species and the European Union's contribution to global biodiversity.

The strategy will benefit substantially from implementation of the EU's existing legislation, including effective and adequately financed management of the Natura 2000 network. It will also be essential to consider how reforms to the common agricultural policy and common fisheries policy and the future cohesion policy can help deliver the necessary support for this strategy. The 2020 EU headline target requires the halting of biodiversity laws and the degradation of ecosystems and the services they provide.

I can therefore assure you that the strategy will contain actions geared to reaching this objective. This will include actions aimed at stepping up implementation of the Birds and Habitats Directives and ensuring significant steps are taken towards achieving a favourable conservation status for species and habitats of European importance. As regards the implementation and enforcement of the EU's environmental legislation more generally, the Commission intends to come out with a new communication on this issue later this year. The aim is not to replace existing relevant communications but rather to improve upon them by focusing on the overall general structure and knowledge-base that underpins the implementation of this environmental acquis.

In the context of this initiative we will recall in detail all possible options for strengthening monitoring and

control capabilities at EU level and the national inspection systems. It should be recognised that the EU's legal framework on environmental inspection has already been improved during the last years, notably with the adoption of a recommendation providing for minimum criteria for environmental inspections in the Member States as well as the inclusion of various provisions in sectoral environmental legislation.

The communication is still under preparation and the precise content has not yet been agreed on. We will hold stakeholder consultations, including with Parliament through its relevant committees, so that its members will have the opportunity to express their views and give us their input.

2-506

Kriton Arsenis (S&D). – Thank you, Commissioner, for the detailed answer. We are looking forward to seeing the new EU Biodiversity Strategy and, of course, Parliament will have a lot of ideas and we are going to elaborate on this.

Going further into the issue we discussed about Nagoya and the strategy, could you please comment on how we are progressing in implementing the Nagoya decisions and in particular the ABS protocol? What progress has been made? What are the deadlines there? On marine-protected areas, have we had any progress? There is special mention of this in the Nagoya targets. How are we progressing there?

Also, you mentioned that there will be efforts for biodiversity in the CAP, which is one of the instruments we have to protect biodiversity, but Parliament has also asked for protection of wilderness and road-free areas. Finally, we need more communication on the Natura 2000 areas, especially for farmers. What are you planning to do on this?

2-507

Bernd Posselt (PPE). – Herr Kommissar, ich möchte nur fragen: Konzentrieren Sie sich bei diesem Thema sehr auf Naturschutz und auf den Schutz wildlebender Tiere und Pflanzen, oder kümmern Sie sich auch um alte Haustierrassen und Nutzpflanzen, deren Vielfalt ebenfalls sehr gefährdet ist?

2-508

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE). – There is one thing I would like to add. We are talking about biodiversity. One issue that is urgent at the moment is that some Member States – among them mine – are trying to get lower targets from the European Union on nature legislation. I would really like to know whether the Commissioner agrees that we could go for lower targets or whether we should stick to the current ones.

2-509

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – Concerning Nagoya and how we are getting on, things are developing pretty well with regard to the ABS, so there is no problem. There are small problems with translation but we are well on track concerning the substance, and we are already planning to start prepara-

tion of the legislation after it has been signed so that we can then go on to the ratification process. It is taking some time, but I do not see any serious obstacles.

Concerning marine protected areas, we are lagging behind still. We are trying to push things ahead, and owing to the commitments we made in Nagoya we will have to do more in Europe than at present – also owing to Natura 2000 itself and the commitments which we have made.

On the CAP and Natura 2000 financing, I am trying to do my best to ensure that this is represented very well in the first pillar and in the third pillar and that biodiversity gets proper attention in the future common agricultural policy. Commissioner Ciołoş, Commissioner Hedegaard and myself prepared a joint letter which we sent to the last Environmental Council of Ministers. In that letter we agreed on the issues, and on the direction in which we want to go.

On the question by Mr Posselt, the whole Natura 2000 protection story as agreed is currently protecting 18% approximately of European land in the shape of the so-called Natura 2000 areas, and then we have two directives. One is the Birds Directive and another one is the Habitats Directive, under which it is clearly specified what is protected, how, on which level and so on. So basically it is pretty broad legislation and is not only covering some specific endangered and disappearing species or other. We want to act in such a way that we have broad protection, but the fact is that a lot of species in EU areas which have been identified as being endangered are in a pretty bad condition, so we would certainly have to do more.

On the question of targets, the answer is pretty simple. At this moment we should not focus on the question of lowering targets, we should rather focus on the serious question of the implementation of Natura 2000, which means preparing the management plans and reserving enough financing. This will not be easy in this situation, but it is certainly a kind of financing for the future.

2-510

President. – Question 28 by Nikolaos Chountis (H-000122/11)

Subject: Waste management in Greece

In its answer of 9 August 2010 to Written Question E-3732/2010² the Commission said that it 'considers landfill disposal to be the least and last desirable manner for managing and treating waste'. In Greece there are plans to construct 61 landfill sites with cofinancing arrangements. These plans have naturally met with opposition from local residents in many areas (Lefkimi, Grammatiko and especially Keratea), who are forced to accept this 'least and last desirable' solution. According to the press, environmental organisations, political parties and local authorities, the government's persistence in seeking to impose this technology and methods for collecting and managing waste are connected with certain corporate interests, something that could result in a fresh political and economic scandal.

² Answer of 9.8.2010

Can the Commission answer the following questions: Independently of the choices made by each country, does it consider it preferable from an ecological and environmental point of view to use the option proposed by environmental organisations (WWF, Greenpeace, SOS Mediterranean, etc.) that waste should be sorted by households at source rather than recycled at waste plants? Will it undertake to study these proposals without delay and send a representative to the areas concerned to hold discussions with all the bodies affected?

2-511

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission*. – The new Waste Framework Directive has set up a five-step hierarchy for waste management. Waste prevention is regarded as the most desirable option, followed by preparing waste for re-use, recycling and other ways of recovery, including energy recovery, with disposal such as landfill as the last resort. Deviations from the hierarchy for specific waste streams are possible.

However, Member States departing from the hierarchy would need to provide a sound justification. Therefore, waste disposal in landfills that lie at the bottom of the waste hierarchy must be considered by the Member States as the least favourable waste management option.

High purity of waste materials, such as paper and glass, is a prerequisite for the use of waste as a secondary raw material by manufacturing industries. That is why separate collection of recyclable waste streams at source is usually the most favourable method of waste collection. Under the Waste Framework Directive, Member States are obliged to introduce by 2015 separate collections for paper, metal, plastic and glass. Again there is certain flexibility for Member States to adapt their waste collection systems to the specific national circumstances, notably in cases where highly efficient and advanced sorting technologies are available. In the absence of such technologies, however, separate collection at source is the cheapest and the easiest method to obtain high quality secondary raw materials from waste.

Greece faces serious problems with illegal landfill disposal and was condemned, as you know, by the Court in 2005 due to the huge number of illegal landfills that had been operating in its territory. This issue has not been resolved yet. Nevertheless, in December 2010, the Greek authorities provided an action plan according to which all the legal landfills will be closed by the end of June this year. The Commission welcomes this plan, including the construction of new landfill sites, under the condition that this is unavoidable as a last resort option to maintain the waste disposal network that meets mandatory sanitary standards in line with European legal requirements.

The construction of landfills complying with the standards of the EU Landfill Directive is already progress compared to the practice of illegal dumping of waste. The Commission urges the Greek authorities to complete their planning and the construction of the landfill sites – programmes that benefit already from EU funds. However, Greece must steadily go beyond these

measures and move away from landfill as a predominant waste management option towards a modern waste management policy based on waste recovery and recycling.

According to the latest Eurostat statistics, in Greece around 82% of municipal waste is land-filled whereas the average in the European Union is 38%. Additionally, the performance of the recycling sector in Greece is very low and only 17% of municipal waste is recycled.

The implementation of the waste directive is a top priority both for the Commission and for me personally. We will monitor the national waste policies through the assessment of the Member States' waste management plans. We are waiting for an updated waste management plan from Greece. In addition, we are carefully monitoring the implementation of the Greek action plan and the process of closing all the illegal landfills, including the plan for the EU-funded projects.

We will also monitor the use of EU funding to ensure that the projects to be financed are consistent with the objectives and requirements defined in our waste legislation. In the case of Greece, it is essential to reduce landfill and to increase recycling rates through separate collection and recyclable materials.

Proper waste management should be seen as an opportunity as it can create business and jobs across the country. It is also essential to achieve the new resource sufficiency objectives through the application of best practices.

Finally, tomorrow I am flying to Greece, where I will be on a two-day full visit and we will, of course, discuss all these questions in detail there.

2-512

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, η τελευταία αναφορά του Επιτρόπου μου δίνει κάποιες ελπίδες. Αφού λοιπόν κύριε Επίτροπε θα πάτε αύριο στην Ελλάδα, επισκεφτείτε μια περιοχή κοντά στην Αθήνα, όπου για τέσσερις μήνες τώρα υπάρχει καθημερινή σύγκρουση των κατοίκων με αστυνομικές δυνάμεις που στρατοπεδεύουν εκεί, με τραυματισμούς και άλλα συμβάντα, σχετικά με την εγκατάσταση ΧΥΤΑ, έτσι όπως το αναλύσατε, και με δεδομένο ότι πρέπει να κλείσουμε τις χωματερές.

Η ερώτηση είναι: εφόσον πρόκειται για τη χειρότερη από τις αποδεκτές λύσεις, για ποιό λόγο κάνετε δεκτές μελέτες περιβαλλοντικών επιπτώσεων, όταν σε πολλές εγκαταστάσεις, όπως και σ' αυτή που ενδεχομένως επισκεφτείτε, ουσιαστικά έχουμε απορρίμματα που καταλήγουν σε ρέματα. Αυτό είναι σκάνδαλο και η καταστροφή που γίνεται στο περιβάλλον - αν δεν παρέμβετε, αν δεν σταματήσετε αυτό το οικονομικό σκάνδαλο, διότι οι εγκαταστάσεις αυτές συγχρηματοδοτούνται από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση - δεν θα αποφευχθεί.

Σας παρακαλώ να παρέμβετε άμεσα, διότι τα πράγματα δεν είναι τόσο θεωρητικά όπως τα αναλύσατε και σας ευχαριστώ εν πάση περιπτώσει.

2-513

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – I am going to the places close to Athens. I will be having a debate on the first day with three committees from the Hellenic Parliament and we will certainly discuss this issue too. I am aware of that and of the seriousness of the issue. Maybe I could tell you why we are actually in favour and we are even co-financing some of the landfill, even if we do believe that this is on the lowest level of the preferred options in the waste hierarchy.

The first and absolutely most important thing that must be considered of course is human health, so we have to be sure that this is protected by all means. I think it is important that we definitely look for and try to find the best possible options but sometimes it is simply necessary to go step by step.

I have seen from the data I receive from all across Europe that once a country starts seriously on separate collections, the route to very high levels of recycling and very low levels of municipal land filling is very short. So separate collection is the fundamental thing and when this is done well then things can move fast. But sometimes, unfortunately, land filling is still the only possible option and, if we want to take care of human health in this context, we simply have to provide that.

2-514

President. – Questions which have not been answered for lack of time will receive written answers (see Annex).

That concludes Question Time.

(The sitting was suspended at 20.20 and resumed at 21.00)

2-515

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND
Vizepräsident

2-516

14 - Politische Parteien auf europäischer Ebene und Regelungen für ihre Finanzierung (Aussprache)

2-517

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt folgt der Bericht von Marietta Giannakou im Namen des Ausschusses für konstitutionelle Fragen über die Anwendung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 2004/2003 über die Regelungen für die politischen Parteien auf europäischer Ebene und ihre Finanzierung (2010/2201(INI)) (A7-0062-2011).

2-518

Μαριέττα Γιαννάκου, Εισηγήτρια. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Κοινοβούλιο καλείται σήμερα να συζητήσει την έκθεση την οποία εκπόνησα εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Συνταγματικών Υποθέσεων και αφορά στον Κανονισμό που έχει σχέση με το Καθεστώς των ευρωπαϊκών πολιτι-

κών κομμάτων, καθώς και τη χρηματοδότησή τους από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Παρά το γεγονός, ότι υπάρχει ανάλογος κανονισμός, ωστόσο μέχρι στιγμής τα ευρωπαϊκά πολιτικά κόμματα δεν απολαμβάνουν ενός καθεστώτος που είναι αντάξιο της Συνθήκης της Λισαβόνας και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, δηλαδή ένα καθεστώς όπως ορίζει το άρθρο 10, παράγραφος 4, της Συνθήκης της Λισαβόνας το οποίο μιλά για τα πολιτικά κόμματα σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο που συμβάλλουν στη διαμόρφωση της ευρωπαϊκής πολιτικής συνείδησης και στην έκφραση της βούλησης των πολιτών της Ευρώπης. Διότι δεν νοείται, φυσικά, πολιτικό ευρωπαϊκό κόμμα να λειτουργεί ως διεθνής μη κυβερνητική οργάνωση στο επίπεδο του βελγικού κράτους. Γι' αυτό και αποδεχόμενη την έκθεση του Γενικού Γραμματέα για τη χρηματοδότηση των κομμάτων, αλλά και την εισήγησή του για τη δημιουργία καθεστώτος, όπως επίσης την εισήγηση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου στην προηγούμενη έκθεση του 2003 για την ανάγκη να υπάρξει τέτοιο καθεστώς - αλλά τότε δεν είχε εγκριθεί ακόμα η Συνθήκη της Λισαβόνας - και τέλος την απόφαση του Προεδρείου της 10ης Ιανουαρίου, η Επιτροπή Συνταγματικών Υποθέσεων, μετά και από σοβαρή ακρόαση με όλα τα πολιτικά κόμματα, τους Προέδρους και τους γραμματείς, σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο, αλλά και διακεκρμένους καθηγητές των οικονομικών και του συνταγματικού δικαίου, καθώς και μετά από ακρόαση της διεθνούς διαφάνειας και του Ελεγκτικού Συνεδρίου της Ένωσης, ενέκρινε αυτή την έκθεση στην οποία απαιτεί - ζητά από την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή να φέρει αντίστοιχη πρόταση προκειμένου να υπάρξει ένα πραγματικά ευρωπαϊκό καθεστώς πολιτικών κομμάτων.

Το καθεστώς αυτό βεβαίως θα έχει ορισμένα κριτήρια, όπως ορίζει η έκθεση, δηλαδή θα πρέπει να έχει σε τουλάχιστον επτά χώρες εθνικά κόμματα ως μέλη ή και περιφερειακά, εφόσον οι περιφερειακές αρχές των χωρών αυτών έχουν νομοθετικές αρμοδιότητες. Ταυτόχρονα, θα υπάρχει διάκριση ανάμεσα στην αναγνώριση των ευρωπαϊκών κομμάτων και στην χρηματοδότησή τους. Για να υπάρξει χρηματοδότηση θα πρέπει οπωσδήποτε να έχουν εκλέξει τουλάχιστον έναν βουλευτή στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο. Βέβαια, τα κόμματα θα έχουν τη δυνατότητα να εγγράφουν μέλη άτομα, απλούς πολίτες, εκτός από το να έχουν κόμματα ως μέλη.

Αυτό που προτείνεται περιλαμβάνει όχι μόνο τα ευρωπαϊκά πολιτικά κόμματα, αλλά και τα ιδρύματά τους. Ζητείται λοιπόν - και αυτό είναι το σημαντικό σημείο - ένα νομικό, πολιτικό και φορολογικό καθεστώς για τα ευρωπαϊκά κόμματα, βεβαίως στο πλαίσιο και υπό την κάλυψη του ευρωπαϊκού νομικού καθεστώτος, γενικότερα δε των ευρωπαϊκών νόμων.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Συνταγματικών Υποθέσεων συζήτησε αρκετά το θέμα και κατέληξε σ' αυτή την πρόταση με ελάχιστες διαφοροποιήσεις, βέβαια, που φαίνονται μέσα στις τροπολογίες. Στην ουσία κατέληξε στο συμπέρασμα ότι πρόκειται για την ενίσχυση της δημοκρατίας, πρόκειται για την ισχυρότερη παρουσία των πολιτών στο επίπεδο των ευρωπαϊκών οργάνων μέσω της δημιουργίας ενός τέτοιου καθεστώτος και, βεβαίως,

όσον αφορά τα θέματα της χρηματοδότησης ορίζεται ότι το 10% θα πρέπει να προέρχεται από ιδίους πόρους καθώς και ότι υπάρχει η δυνατότητα για τους δωρητές το ποσό των 12.000 ευρώ που υπήρχε μέχρι σήμερα, να γίνει 25.000 ευρώ. Σας ευχαριστώ κύριε Πρόεδρε και ζητώ από την Ολομέλεια, φυσικά, να υπερψηφίσει αυτή την έκθεση.

2-519

Maroš Šefčovič, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to discuss with you the report on European political parties and their foundations. I would also like to thank Mrs Giannakou for preparing this own-initiative report.

We in the Commission consider that report to be a very important one. We know that European political parties play an important role in European integration. In particular they contribute to ensuring that political issues are presented and discussed from the European perspective in time, before the elections to the European Parliament, thus avoiding situations where these elections are dominated by purely national issues, which, as we well know, is very often liable to be the case. I therefore welcome the forward-looking tone of the report and look forward to discussing its content tonight and in the future as well.

Article 12 of Regulation (EC) 2004/2003 stipulates that the European Parliament shall publish by 15 February 2011 a report on the application of this regulation and the activities funded. The report shall indicate, where appropriate, possible amendments to be made to the funding system. We welcome, as I said, Mrs Giannakou's own-initiative report and the accompanying resolution as a positive step, but it must be underlined that information on the actual implementation of the current regulation and the activities funded could be more precise and improved.

In this context and in the light of the vote by Parliament tomorrow, the Commission could be called upon to act through a further revision of Regulation (EC) 2004/2003 and the Financial Regulation, or through new legislation. Should Parliament come to the conclusion that the relevant existing legislation requires modifications, or that new legislation is required, the Commission will seriously examine these conclusions and, if it agrees, will take the necessary initiatives.

The Commission will also reflect on how Regulation (EC) 2004/2003 could be further improved in the longer term in order to support the development of stronger and genuinely transnational political parties and foundations at European level, with a view to developing a truly political European public space.

On the specific issue of a legal statute for European political parties, I am aware that this is not the first time that Parliament has called for such a statute. This issue is addressed in some detail in a study that was commissioned by the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (AFCO) and I believe that the study itself clearly

demonstrates that a range of complicated constitutional, political and practical issues are at stake with regard to establishing such a statute. The matter therefore requires a very careful and detailed analysis indeed.

The same can be said about some of the other issues brought up in the report. For the proposals that would require amendments to the Financial Regulation, the Commission also sees the need for a wider reflection on legislative solutions and the timing of the possible changes.

In conclusion, Mrs Giannakou's report and the accompanying draft resolution raise issues that are at the heart of European integration and its democratic nature, and which therefore need our full attention. I look forward to the debate on those issues tonight and in the future as well.

2-520

Carlo Casini, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, prima di tutto desidero ringraziare sentitamente l'on. Giannakou, la quale ha svolto un grande e intelligente lavoro.

Quando si parla di partiti politici, bisogna prendere atto di due difficoltà. In primo luogo, in nessun paese i partiti godono di molta stima. In secondo luogo, quando si fanno le elezioni europee i partiti politici vengono considerati come diretti a perseguire interessi dello Stato nazionale e non interessi europei. Dunque vi è, a livello di opinione pubblica, una carenza di valutazione positiva sia dei partiti sia della loro funzione in ordine alla costruzione europea.

È urgente dunque reagire. Non solo nel trattato di Lisbona, come è già stato ricordato, ma in molte costituzioni, in quasi tutte le costituzioni europee, la funzione dei partiti è considerata di interesse nazionale, e dunque indispensabile per costruire la democrazia e per perseguire il bene comune. È importante sottolineare che sto parlando di costituzioni, non di leggi ordinarie, e che dunque sto parlando degli assetti fondamentali degli Stati e della stessa Unione europea.

Perciò è urgente definire lo statuto dei partiti che siano veramente europei e cioè non soltanto la somma algebrica di singole formazioni nazionali le quali non hanno una struttura permanente di carattere europeo sul territorio. Occorrono partiti che invece pensino e si proponano in funzione europea. L'esigenza che sto rappresentando è tanto più grande se davvero vogliamo pervenire a una legge elettorale europea uniforme che, auspicabilmente, dovrebbe prevedere persino un collegio unico europeo oltre ai collegi nazionali. Questo aumenterà il senso di appartenenza dei cittadini europei all'Europa.

Vengo ora al nocciolo del mio intervento. Come è già stato sottolineato – e ringrazio anche in anticipo anche il Commissario – la mia commissione ha lavorato molto, ha tenuto audizioni e numerose riunioni, ma bisogna che

ci sia una proposta, un'iniziativa della Commissione europea, la quale collochi i partiti europei all'interno del diritto dell'Unione con una forma giuridica nuova di diritto pubblico, con una personalità giuridica valida anche in tutti gli Stati membri e con un'uniformità organizzativa che consenta loro di agire come rappresentanti dell'interesse pubblico europeo. Ringrazio l'on. Giannakou e il Commissario per le sue promesse.

2-521

Enrique Guerrero Salom, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor Presidente, señor Comisario, señora Giannakou, gracias por la elaboración de este informe, que creo que será muy útil para que la Comisión dé pasos adelante en la conformación de un sistema mejor de reconocimiento y protección de los partidos políticos europeos.

La democracia europea es, genuinamente, democracia representativa. El edificio de la democracia representativa es el que se ha mantenido firme desde que, a mitad del siglo XIX, la ampliación del sufragio convirtió en real la promesa de las revoluciones liberales de otorgar la representación al pueblo, para dirigir sus destinos. El edificio representativo tiene firmes cimientos, pero, de vez en cuando, necesita reformas y necesita nuevas vías para expresarse con mayor calidad. Ése ha sido, por ejemplo, el trabajo que ha realizado este Parlamento con la aprobación de la iniciativa ciudadana.

En definitiva, nunca ha pervivido la democracia sin representación libre y la representación nunca ha sido libre sin competición plural. Son los partidos políticos los que permiten esa representación plural. En democracia, los partidos expresan el pluralismo, son instrumentos fundamentales para la participación política: contribuyen a formar la opinión pública, ofrecen alternativas, programas de gobierno generales y sectoriales, coordinan y armonizan intereses sociales y contribuyen a la comunicación entre las demandas populares y los gobernantes.

Como ha señalado, con acierto, un teórico de los partidos políticos, los partidos no se desarrollaron para comunicar al pueblo cuáles eran las necesidades de los gobernantes, sino para comunicar a los gobernantes cuáles eran las aspiraciones de los ciudadanos.

Esto, que ha funcionado a nivel nacional, necesitamos que funcione ahora a nivel europeo. Se trata, por tanto, de ofrecer un marco y unas oportunidades para que los partidos políticos europeos cumplan, en el ámbito territorial europeo, estas funciones que se han venido cumpliendo en el ámbito nacional. Por ello, lo más fundamental es dotar a los partidos de un estatuto legal, y eso es lo que propone este informe; unos partidos que tengan una presencia territorial y que, al mismo tiempo, se comporten de acuerdo con reglas democráticas, una diferenciación entre el reconocimiento de los partidos y la financiación, que requiere apoyo popular.

Finalmente, esperamos de la Comisión que ponga en marcha los mecanismos para perfeccionar esta situación,

actualmente imperfecta, de la regulación de los partidos políticos.

2-522

Станимир Илчев, *от името на групата ALDE*. – Г-н председател, докладът на г-жа Giannakou следва логиката на събития от последните години, които имаха за цел да повишат политическия интерес на гражданите към политиката на Съюза.

Да се работи за регулиране на европейските партии днес означава да се работи за изграждане на гражданско пространство без граници. В този смисъл докладът Giannakou е покана към реформаторски настроените политици. Проекциите на този доклад са важни. Те ще доведат до превръщане на европейските партии в реално средство за засилване на представителното управление в Съюза.

Не случайно към този доклад бяха предложени почти 100 поправки и в резултат на общите усилия се оформиха 7 компромисни варианта, подкрепени от всички парламентарни групи. Мисля, че интересът към доклада в Комисията по конституционни въпроси беше стимулиран от идеята европейската партийна система да стане още по-гъвкава, атрактивна и рационална, а също така и адекватна на процесите в Европа чрез оформяне на общ политически правен и фискален статут на европейските партии.

Не става дума за организационно изграждане на партиите по един унифициран стандарт, а за следването на един по-общ модел. Основните разлики между партиите и фондациите също остават в сила, но има нови възможности за повишен синхрон в техните дейности.

Докладът и очакваните следващи развития трябва да променят познатото статукво, според което съществуващите в момента партии са просто организации на национални партии и нямат пряка връзка с избирателите в държавите-членки. В контекста на тази амбиция се препоръчва да започне разглеждане на условията за пряко индивидуално членство и участие на физически лица във вътрешнопартийния живот и дори в партийния мениджмънт.

Няколко чувствителни въпроса намират в този доклад своето тълкуване. Така например коректно се прокарва разграничение между критериите за учредяване на политическа партия и критериите за нейното финансиране. Докладът следва да получи подкрепа, за да може комисията да започне създаването на нов раздел във Финансовия регламент, посветен изключително на финансирането на европейските партии и фондации.

2-523

Gerald Häfner, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kollegen! Klare rechtliche Regelungen für politische Parteien in Europa sind wichtig zur Gestaltung einer europäischen Zivilgesell-

schaft, zur Entwicklung europäischer politischer Diskussionen und auch als Beitrag dazu, dass die europäischen Wahlen wirklich europäisch geführt werden, mit europäischen Wahlkämpfen und Argumenten, und nicht – wie es heute noch überwiegend der Fall ist – national. Ich bedanke mich deshalb ganz herzlich bei Frau Giannakou für den Bericht. Wir haben intensiv mitgearbeitet. Wir konnten anfangs nicht mit allem einverstanden sein. Aber mit dem, was im Ergebnis herausgekommen ist, können wir sehr gut einverstanden sein.

Ich will auf ein paar Punkte hinweisen, die uns in der Debatte besonders wichtig waren. Einer ist zum Beispiel, dass wir der Auffassung sind, dass Parteien, die am demokratischen Wettbewerb teilnehmen wollen, auch in sich demokratisch sein müssen. Das gilt insbesondere auch für die Wahl von Organen, für die Aufstellung von Kandidaten und Listen, und das ist ja nun in Ziffer 5 aufgenommen. Das scheint mir ein großer Fortschritt zu sein. Das gilt für eine Reihe weiterer Punkte, die ich jetzt nicht erwähnen will.

Ich will noch kurz auf den wichtigsten Punkt zu sprechen kommen: das Erfordernis, dass man bereits ein Mitglied im Europäischen Parlament hat. Ursprünglich war dies für die Anerkennung und die Finanzierung so vorgesehen. Jetzt ist dieses Erfordernis nur noch für die Finanzierung gegeben. Das war uns sehr wichtig, weil Anerkennung und Finanzierung sauber getrennt werden müssen. Anerkennung heißt, es muss einen freien Wettbewerb geben, dass sich in Europa neue Parteien zu neuen Themen mit neuen Gesichtern bilden können. Das darf man nicht zu sehr begrenzen. Aber was die Finanzierung betrifft, kann man diese selbstverständlich an ein Mindestmaß an Erfolg knüpfen. Insofern können wir auch mit diesem Ergebnis einverstanden sein, auch wenn wir das gerne noch deutlicher herausgearbeitet hätten und deswegen zu diesem Punkt noch einen Änderungsantrag vorlegen werden.

2-524

Daniel Hannan, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, democracy is not just a periodic right to put a cross on a ballot paper. Democracy depends also on a connection between government and governed – an affinity. To have a functioning democracy you need a ‘*demos*’, you need a unit with which we identify when we use the word ‘we’. If you take the ‘*demos*’ out of democracy you are left only with the ‘*kratos*’, with the power of a system that must compel by force of law what it may not ask in the name of civic patriotism.

You cannot create the institutions of functioning representative government by bureaucratic fiat. We have tried it in the European Union. We have created all the attributes and trappings: the European Parliament, the political parties, the elections and so on, but you cannot make people feel European in the same sense that somebody might feel Norwegian, Japanese, French, Portuguese or whatever it is.

A party should grow organically because its members recognise a community of identity and common interests. It is not something that we can do with public funding or at the stroke of a bureaucrat’s pen. So, to be clear, the ECR opposes this legislation, we oppose the concept of having transnational parties. We form some of our constituent members into an alliance of parties but we oppose the single statute. We oppose the increases in the budget – which seems to me an extraordinary allocation of resources in the present economic climate – and I oppose my compatriot and my friend Andrew Duff’s idea that these transnational parties should be allowed to spend effectively EU money in national referendum campaigns.

You will not create Europeans by spending public money. Not all the gold in all our national treasuries put together can serve to convince people of a false idea.

2-525

Helmut Scholz, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich kann es nur begrüßen, wenn das Europäische Parlament die Frage nach einer Demokratisierung europäischer Entscheidungsprozesse ernsthaft aufgreift und praktisch angeht. Der betreffende Weg geht dabei – so wie es im Bericht von Frau Giannakou gezeigt wird – auch über die Weiterentwicklung der europäischen Parteien, die zwar seit Jahren zur politischen Realität im europäischen Alltag gehören, bisher jedoch kein gleichberechtigter Partner und Akteur demokratischer Einflussnahme auf die EU-Politik sind. Wir brauchen politische Parteien, auch auf EU-Ebene, die von einer festen Verankerung in den Gesellschaften ausgehen und abgestützt auf innerparteiliche demokratische Strukturen und Regularien eine starke Rolle bei den Wahlen zum Europäischen Parlament und bei der Herstellung einer europäischen Öffentlichkeit spielen können.

Was den konkreten Bericht anbelangt, so hätte ich mir deutlich mehr Mut von der Berichterstatterin gewünscht, auf Grundlage des Initiativrechts des Parlaments einen wirklich großen Schritt bei der Weiterentwicklung des politischen Systems und auch des Parteiensystems in der Europäischen Union zu tun. Einen Schritt, der von vielen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern erwartet wird und der sie einlädt, mitzumachen. Die miteinander zusammenhängenden europäischen und nationalen Entscheidungsebenen und das Verhältnis der politischen Parteien hätten noch deutlicher angesprochen werden können, als gemeinsames Agieren, das transparent und beeinflussbar ist.

Ja, das Europäische Parlament soll jetzt Kommission und Rat entschlossen auffordern, in diesem Sinne initiativ zu werden! Ich erwarte dabei auch eine konstruktive Zusammenarbeit mit Kommission und Rat.

2-526

John Stuart Agnew, *on behalf of the EFD Group*. – Mr President, this legislation will allow the EU to throw money at referendum campaigns to ensure that it purchases the right result first time, for a change!

The UK will in future be holding a referendum each time the EU proposes to remove power from its electorate. The EU is frightened out of its wits that we may give a series of wrong answers. So it intends to remove money from UK taxpayers to indoctrinate them into its version of the path of true righteousness.

Fronting the legislation is Andrew Duff, a liberal democrat MEP from my own region. Support in the UK for his party has collapsed recently – a party of course desperate for EU institutions to govern the UK. Never has the EU's gerrymandering been so clearly displayed alongside its contempt for UK voters. It is sowing the seeds of its own destruction, because the legislation will allow us to fund the referendum campaign that many in my country have for a very long time been waiting for – the one that gives us the opportunity to remove ourselves entirely from its control.

2-527

Nicole Sinclaire (NI). – Mr President, would my colleague Mr Agnew agree with me that a political party that would accept funding under this legislation, as a single European party, and which in particular would have to observe the EU's programme and activities and the founding principles of European law, and the development of European law at all levels regionally, nationally and at European level, would be a party which has lost its principles? Would you agree with me, Mr Agnew?

2-528

John Stuart Agnew (EFD). – Mr President, I say to Ms Sinclaire that we will take what we can out of this because we use the devil's money to do God's work. That is what we do, and well you know it.

2-529

Nicole Sinclaire (NI). – Will you accept the principle of European law though?

2-530

John Stuart Agnew (EFD). – No, of course we do not. That is why we are here.

2-531

Rafał Trzaskowski (PPE). – Mr President, let me first thank our rapporteur, Mrs Giannakou, and the Commission for their excellent cooperation and for an excellent report.

Are we really in a process of creating a European *demos*, as my honourable colleague Mr Hannan just told us? I do not know, I am not venturing that far. I think what we want to do at this particular moment is to strengthen the nascent European public space and basically invigorate the debate on European issues. I mean, the idea in this House is to bring European citizens closer to what we are discussing here and what could be simpler than basically starting to discuss European issues with them.

By the way, I can only speak for myself, but I am no bureaucrat – I am a directly elected member of this House.

The debate is actually to increase the visibility of European political parties, to which we all belong regardless of whether we are sitting on the Left, in the Centre or on the Right of this House. To bring them out of the shade, because at the moment no one really knows what they do, what is their status, whether they produce any added value – and we in the EPP believe that they do. That is the possibility, to actually have some programme presentation and in the future hopefully to fight European elections on European issues and not get bogged down in national rhetoric all the time.

This report is positive on three counts. First of all, it brings a certain balance between operational authority within the parliamentary groups and a clear link with what we do in this House, linking funding to presence in this House – in the European Parliament. Secondly, it brings organisational convergence between European political parties and European foundations, which is quite laudable, and thirdly it tightens and clarifies the funding of European political parties, which I think should be the goal for us all.

2-532

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D) – Keď sa pozrieme na dejiny európskej integrácie i na súčasné usporiadanie a fungovanie Európskej únie, dá sa pozorovať, že Európska únia sa dá vnímať nielen ako zoskupenie štátov, ale čoraz viac aj ako politická aréna s potenciálom pre vznik skutočnej európskej verejnosti.

Únia má nielen jednotný trh, vlastné zákonodarstvo, volený zastupiteľský orgán či vlastný systém súdnictva. Už dlhšie sú realitou aj politické strany na európskej úrovni. Nie sú iba zhromaždením národných strán. Majú vlastnú agendu, európsku agendu, a sú integrálnou súčasťou európskej politickej verejnosti. Posilnením politických strán na európskej úrovni sa upevní participatívna správa v Európskej únii a v konečnom dôsledku tým aj demokracia.

Z týchto dôvodov vítam prezentovaný návrh na reformu štatútu a financovania politických strán na úrovni Únie a chcem sa Vám, pán viceprezident, týmto aj osobne poďakovať za Vašu spoluprácu.

V záujme politických strán je v súčasnosti veľmi dôležité, aby získali spoločný a jednotný právny štatút. Treba prekonať rozdiel medzi režimom politických strán a pravidlami, ktoré sa uplatňujú v prípade európskych inštitúcií. To je možné na základe zavedenia spoločného politického, právneho a fiškálneho štatútu pre politické strany na európskej úrovni. Rovnako by bolo vhodné zvážiť, aby právo založiť takúto stranu mali len politické strany, ktoré pôsobia na národnej či regionálnej úrovni.

Na mieste je tiež otázka systému financovania. Systém schvaľovania financií pre politické strany na európskej úrovni by sa mal zjednodušiť. Pre zachovanie transparentnosti by mala existovať možnosť vykonávať finančné kontroly. Transparentné a bezpečné prostredie pre pôsobenie a financovanie európskych politických strán je žiaducim a ústretovým krokom i smerom k občanom členských štátov Európskej únie. Môže im byť nápomocné v ich každodennom živote. Štatút poli-

tických strán na európskej úrovni je významným posunom smerom k väčšej interakcii s občanmi, k zvýšeniu úrovne demokracie a k zvýšeniu verejného záujmu o európsku problematiku.

2-533

Andrew Duff (ALDE). – Mr President, national political parties are now failing to sustain European integration in a democratic and efficient manner. This is very serious. There is a gap to fill, and essential democratic sinews are needed to connect the citizen and the European powers that are exercised in Parliament and the Council. The time for European political parties has come, not as a substitute for national political parties but as a complement to them, to challenge and compete with each other for support for ideas and for candidates.

The development of European political parties is a critical link for the success of the transnational list proposal that this House is to be considering next month. I urge Parliament to support the Giannakou report with great courage and optimism for the future of post-national democracy.

2-534

François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, la création des partis politiques européens a été un grand pas en avant vers une meilleure démocratie européenne, capable d'exprimer la volonté des citoyens de l'Union.

Le rapport de Mme Giannakou va dans le bon sens, celui d'une simplification et d'une facilitation de l'action des partis politiques européens et de leurs fondations. Il va alléger les contraintes de la contrepartie exigée pour obtenir les financements publics et il va élargir les possibilités de mise en œuvre de ces crédits. Nous sommes notamment favorables à ce que les fondations agissent aussi en dehors du territoire de l'Union.

Mais à côté de ce mouvement général, qui encourage et étend les dispositions en faveur d'une démocratie européenne renforcée, une mesure va en sens inverse, dans le sens d'une restriction de la liberté des partis politiques européens. En effet, le règlement exigera désormais, parmi les critères pour reconnaître l'implantation d'un parti politique européen dans un État membre, que ce parti soit représenté par des élus d'une assemblée régionale ayant un pouvoir législatif.

Mon parti est un parti spécifique à la Corse. Il est membre de l'Alliance libre européenne, qui est un parti politique européen depuis l'origine. En Corse, nous avons regroupé 26 % des voix, obtenu un groupe d'élus nombreux à l'Assemblée de Corse, mais comme la France refuse de donner des compétences législatives à l'Assemblée de Corse, ce parti, même s'il devenait majoritaire sur l'île, ne serait pas comptabilisé au bénéfice de l'ALE. Cette disposition est très regrettable. Nous voulions attirer votre attention sur ce point.

2-535

Jacek Olgierd Kurski (ECR). – Panie Przewodniczący! Europejskie partie polityczne są nowym zjawiskiem w

polityce europejskiej, ale wraz ze wzrostem integracji i subsydiów zaczynają odgrywać coraz większą rolę. Partie i fundacje polityczne stały się uczestnikami życia politycznego Unii i jako takie powinny podlegać stosownym regulacjom uniemożliwiającym nadużycia. W niektórych przypadkach struktury ponadnarodowe chciałyby mieć jednak zbyt duży wpływ na politykę w suwerennych państwach członkowskich. Z niepokojem odbieram na przykład zapowiedź ingerencji partii unijnych w sprawy krajowe. Jako polski polityk nie mógłbym zaakceptować sytuacji, gdy jedna lub kilka europejskich partii politycznych urządzałyby w moim kraju np. kampanię referendalną, korzystając ze środków unijnych dla osiągnięcia konkretnego celu (np. w referendum w sprawie przystąpienia mojego kraju do strefy euro). Podobne obawy mogą żywić politycy innych krajów, np. Brytyjczycy.

Sprzeciwiam się również postulatowi zwiększenia wydatków na europejskie partie polityczne z kieszeni podatników. Tym bardziej, że w moim kraju rząd obcina o połowę subwencje dla narodowych partii politycznych oraz knebluje opozycji możliwość dotarcia do społeczeństwa. Najpierw wspierajmy partie krajowe, potem międzynarodowe. Unia Europejska to wszakże Europa ojczyzn.

2-536

Daniël van der Stoep (NI). – Voorzitter, u maakte zojuist de opmerking dat ik te laat zou zijn met mijn "blauwe kaart". Dat was ik niet. Zelfs tijdens de speech van mijnheer Duff heb ik al duidelijk aangegeven dat ik wilde spreken. Ik weet niet precies wat de procedure is. Mag ik alsnog de "blauwe kaart" trekken of gaat u verder met het debat? Ik zou graag nog een vraag willen stellen aan mijnheer Duff over wat hij verteld heeft, want hij begon over de transnationale lijst. Ik wist niet dat wij het daarover gingen hebben en ik wil hem graag een vraag daarover stellen.

2-537

Der Präsident. – Herr Kollege van der Stoep, wegen mir können Sie die Frage stellen.

2-538

Daniël van der Stoep (NI) (*De spreker stelt een "blauwe kaart"-vraag aan de heer Duff (artikel 149, lid 8, van het Reglement)*). – Kijk, mijn probleem met die transnationale lijst, waarover mijnheer Duff is begonnen in zijn verslag dat wij binnenkort gaan bespreken, is niet zozeer het feit dat er een transnationale lijst wordt gemaakt. Ik ben daar vanzelfsprekend al volledig op tegen. Mijn probleem ligt echter daarin dat alleen partijen hieraan mee mogen doen - maar wij hebben het nu over Europese politieke partijen - die dus in minstens zeven lidstaten meedoen.

Mijn partij is een partij die opkomt voor het belang van Nederland. Wat dat betreft hebben wij weinig boodschap aan partijen die in andere lidstaten voor hun eigen land opkomen. Dat gun ik ze van harte. Maar u sluit daarbij dus ook een heleboel partijen uit die niet kunnen meedoen voor die 25 zetels. Dat baart mij ontzettend zorgen. Ik weet niet hoe u dat precies ziet, hoe u daar

precies aan mee wilt doen. Kunt u daar de dingen dan gemakkelijker voor maken? In ieder geval voelen wij ons ernstig uitgesloten.

2-539

Andrew Duff (ALDE). – Mr President, the proposal that I am promoting is that a transnational list should be drawn from at least a third of the Member States. That is not very many. If Mr van der Stoep cannot attract colleagues with political affinity from six other states, I recommend that he examines the validity and credibility of his political opinions.

2-540

Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL). – Hr. formand! Lad mig starte med at slå fast, at jeg er en stor tilhænger af politiske partier på nationalt plan, på europæisk plan og også på internationalt plan. Men et politisk parti er jo noget andet og meget mere end et partiapparat. En af de helt store demokratiske udfordringer er, at politiske partier mindre og mindre afspejler befolkningen som helhed. Det giver sig bl.a. udtryk, i, at de politiske partier taber medlemmer. I mange lande har man valgt at kompensere for det gennem øgede statstilskud til partierne. Men øgede statstilskud er ingen garanti for en tættere forbindelse mellem partiernes ledelse og apparater på den ene side og partiernes medlemmer på den anden side. Tværtimod bliver risikoen for udvikling af et selvstændiggjort bureaukratisk apparat større, jo mere økonomisk uafhængige partiernes apparater bliver af medlemmerne. Derfor må jeg sige, at jeg er skeptisk over for idéen om europæiske partier godkendt af EU, støttet med beløb af EU. Ikke fordi jeg har noget imod europæiske partier. Europæiske partier skal vokse nedefra politisk, organisatorisk og økonomisk. Hvis det ikke er muligt, er det nok fordi, der ikke er tilstrækkelig opbakning. Der findes ingen genvej til demokrati, heller ikke når det gælder opbygningen af europæiske partier.

2-541

Νικόλαος Σαλαβράκος (EFD). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχήν συγχαίρω την εισηγήτρια κυρία Γιαννάκου για την ισοροπημένη και σωστή έκθεσή της και θεωρώ ότι η ανάπτυξη των πολιτικών κομμάτων με ευρωπαϊκή προοπτική που ξεπερνάει τα εθνικά σχήματα είναι καθοριστική για την κινητοποίηση της κοινής γνώμης στον χώρο της Ένωσης και τη δημιουργία ενδιαφέροντος στους πολίτες της Ευρώπης να συμμετέχουν στα κοινά.

Διανύουμε κύριε Πρόεδρε, όπως είναι γνωστό, μια εποχή απαξίωσης των πολιτικών, αλλά και των πολιτικών κομμάτων στα οποία ανήκουν, αφού οι ευρωπαίοι πολίτες νιώθουν έρμια των πολιτικών, οικονομικών και πολιτικών εξελίξεων. Στην παρούσα λοιπόν συγκυρία η έκθεση της κ. Γιαννάκου έρχεται να βελτιώσει την εμφάνιση των πολιτικών κομμάτων προς την κατεύθυνση της ενοποίησης της Ευρώπης, σε μια αναγκαία μεταρρύθμιση που θα δημιουργήσει "Ευρώπη" με ισότιμους πολίτες, με κοινό πολιτικό, νομικό και φορολογικό καθεστώς, αλλά και με ευκαιρίες ανάπτυξης.

2-542

Nicole Sinclair (NI). – Mr President, earlier today I spoke in this Chamber about my constituency, the West Midlands, and the economic hardships it is going through. One of the last things that people there want is more money to be spent on politicians – they already have too many politicians, including MEPs, wasting their money as it is.

What this is, is a step, and Europe is willing to throw this money at creating that further step on the road to a super state. It has its Parliament, its President and its Foreign Affairs Adviser, and now it wants the political parties to go with that. Because what it wants is a nation called the European Union. Even the most euro-sceptic members of this Parliament are willing to trade their principles to take their money. Well done! Is that what Europe wants? Does it want to buy its way to power?

2-543

Mariya Nedelcheva (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, dans nos démocraties, il y a les parlements qui sont la voix des citoyens et puis, il y a les partis politiques et leurs fondations, qui sont les têtes pensantes, les "propulseurs d'idées" et les animateurs du débat. Les parlements sont les moteurs de la démocratie et les partis politiques fournissent l'essence.

Ici, dans notre Parlement, nous déplorons constamment le désintérêt des citoyens pour l'Union. Nous pleurons les taux d'abstention aux élections européennes et les votes sanctions lors des référendums. Si l'on veut une vraie démocratie européenne, il nous faut nous pencher sérieusement sur la place que nous voulons accorder aux partis politiques européens dans l'espace public que nous essayons de construire.

Nous avons déjà fait beaucoup avec le traité de Lisbonne et l'initiative citoyenne européenne. Il nous faut maintenant donner aux partis politiques européens les moyens de leurs ambitions. Mais attention, je ne pense pas que ces moyens doivent permettre aux grands partis de devenir des Hégémons inébranlables. Il faut que les petites structures aient, elles aussi, accès au débat. C'est important pour combattre l'image négative des partis et convaincre les citoyens que les partis politiques ne sont pas les mal-aimés de la démocratie.

Je crois que le renforcement de l'espace public européen que nous essayons de construire passe par une définition claire des conditions de financement et par la transparence dans la gestion des moyens de financement. La démarche doit être inclusive, de sorte que l'on ne privilégie pas les grands partis au détriment des petits, et inversement.

Un autre point que j'aimerais aborder relève de la continuité que l'on assurera entre les niveaux européen, national et régional. Le statut européen que nous allons mettre en place doit permettre la concordance avec les législations nationales en la matière, de sorte que, justement, tous les niveaux soient imbriqués les uns dans les autres.

Finalement, il nous faut aussi regarder de très près ce qui est dit dans le paragraphe 23 du rapport car, par extension, nous devons réfléchir aux liens que les partis européens pourraient nouer avec ceux du reste du monde. Les valeurs démocratiques qui sont les nôtres, nous devrions pouvoir les partager avec nos partenaires dans le reste du monde, parce que le monde globalisé dans lequel nous vivons aujourd'hui appelle à ce que les décideurs politiques proposent ensemble des solutions aux problèmes.

2-544

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D). – Europos politinių partijų vaidmens svarba yra įtvirtinta ir Lisabonos sutartyje, kuria siekiama sukurti veiksmingą Europos politinę erdvę. Mūsų politikų darbas yra skatinti savo piliečius domėtis Europos Sąjunga, padaryti ją suprantamesnę ir prieinamesnę bei įtraukti juos į sprendimų priėmimą. Tačiau tam būtina tinkamai, aiškiai ir vienodai reglamentuoti Europos politinių partijų ir fondų veiklą bei užtikrinti demokratinį tokių partijų vidaus veikimą. Šios politinės partijos, kaip demokratijos skatinimo šaltinis, turi turėti vienodą teisinį ir mokestinį statusą, kas sudarytų sąlygas užtikrinti geresnį Europos piliečių supratimą apie partijas ir geresnį jų atstovavimą. Ypač svarbu, kad tokių politinių partijų vidaus valdymo organų formavimas būtų grindžiamas skaidriais principais, leidžiančiais užtikrinti demokratiškus visų partijos organų rinkimus ir demokratinis sprendimų priėmimo procesus.

2-545

Alexandra Thein (ALDE). – Herr Präsident! Die wenigsten Bürger wissen, dass es europäische Parteien und Stiftungen gibt. Bisher sind diese lediglich Dachorganisationen ihrer nationalen Mitgliederparteien, gegründet nach nationalem, überwiegend belgischem, Recht.

Was machen diese europäischen Parteien? Sie diskutieren europäische Themen, halten Parteitage ab und sind bei einer Reform der Wahlen zum Europäischen Parlament unerlässlich. Nach dem Vertrag von Lissabon sollen sie helfen, eine europäische Demokratie zu schaffen, einen politischen Raum auf europäischer Ebene.

Mit dem morgen zur Abstimmung stehenden Initiativbericht wird die Kommission aufgefordert, die Rechtsgrundlage für diese europäischen Parteien zu reformieren. Sie werden in Zukunft auf einem europäischen Rechtsstatut beruhen und eine europäische Rechtspersönlichkeit besitzen. Wir Liberale haben uns dafür eingesetzt, dass zwischen der Anerkennung als europäische Partei und ihrem Anspruch auf Finanzierung streng unterschieden wird, da hier Begehrlichkeiten bestanden. Wichtig ist auch, dass europäische Parteien parteiintern demokratisch sein müssen, was keine Selbstverständlichkeit ist.

2-546

Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR). – Mr President, the tide of opinion is moving one way in many of our nations, but the European Union and this Parliament curiously seek

to swim in a different direction. There is no demand from our citizens for transnational politicians. This Parliament now wants to spend even more public money, when our national governments are having to make reductions in public expenditure.

I speak, Mr President, in my capacity as President of New Direction, the Foundation for European Reform. To my mind, it is unacceptable that the costs of political foundations should be increasing at a rate of over 30% year on year. In 2009, EUR 6.3 million was spent; by 2012 this will have doubled to EUR 12.3 million. Some might say that if you object to this, why does your Foundation accept funding? Well, the answer to that is quite simply that any funds we do not accept are distributed among the foundations of the other political groups; we would be funding the activities of our political opponents. We need to find a way of returning money to our national exchequers.

2-547

Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, νομίζω ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, εκτός από την οικονομική κρίση, δοκιμάζεται από κρίση δημοκρατίας και κρίση νομιμοποίησης. Οι πολιτικές που εφαρμόζονται εξοργίζουν και απογοητεύουν τους πολίτες, οι διαδικασίες λήψης των αποφάσεων τους απομακρύνουν από τη συμμετοχή, όπως έδειξαν οι πρόσφατες ευρωεκλογές. Γι' αυτό, κάτω από προϋποθέσεις, τα ευρωπαϊκά πολιτικά κόμματα με τα ιδιαίτερα πολιτικά τους χαρακτηριστικά, μπορούν να συμβάλλουν στην ενεργοποίηση των πολιτών, στη διεκδίκηση λύσεων υπέρ των λαών και όχι των οικονομικά ισχυρών. Οι κανόνες λοιπόν πολιτικής και νομικής αναγνώρισης και η αναγκαία χρηματοδότηση πρέπει να διευκολύνει τη δράση τους, να αναπτύσσουν ελεύθερα τις πολιτικές τους, τις εναλλακτικές τους προτάσεις - αυτή είναι η ουσία της δημοκρατίας - και να είναι ανεπηρέαστοι από εξωτερικούς περιορισμούς, πολιτικούς ή οικονομικούς. Γι' αυτό, έχω επιφυλάξεις στα συγκεκριμένα σημεία της έκθεσης, στο μέτρο που θα μπορούσαν να χρησιμοποιηθούν ως περιορισμοί στην ελεύθερη και ανεξάρτητη οργάνωση και δράση των πολιτικών κομμάτων.

Η λειτουργία, η δράση και η οργάνωση των κομμάτων πρέπει να είναι θέμα δικής τους επιλογής και όχι υπό την αίρεση πολιτικού κυρίαρχου συσχετισμού.

2-548

Jaroslav Paška (EFD) – Správa o uplatňovaní nariadenia o štatúte a financovaní politických strán na európskej úrovni vyhodnocuje skúsenosti z uplatňovania tejto právnej normy pri spravovaní politických subjektov so širokou európskou pôsobnosťou.

Popri hodnotení súčasného stavu sa pani Marietta Giannakou rozhodla sformulovať aj viaceré návrhov na zdokonalenie súčasného právneho prostredia.

Asi najvýznamnejšou zmenou by mal byť prechod formy štatútu od súčasného ekvivalentu belgickej mimovládnej organizácie k spoločnému a jednotnému európskemu právnemu štatútu politických strán.

Druhou významnou zmenou by mala byť úprava percentuálneho podielu nezávislých zdrojov financovania na 10 % z celkového rozpočtu pri politických stranách.

Vzhľadom na to, že v roku 2012 by mali európske politické strany a ich nadácie dostať od Európskeho parlamentu viac ako 30 miliónov EUR, bude však potrebné zabezpečiť maximálnu transparentnosť pri nakladaní s uvedenými finančnými prostriedkami. V záujme ďalšieho zlepšenia politickej práce v Európskej únii je možné takéto zmeny podporiť.

2-549

Daniël van der Stoep (NI). – Voorzitter, de Partij voor de Vrijheid zit hier in het Parlement voor de Nederlandse burger. Wij zitten hier omdat wij vinden dat de Europese Unie zoals deze nu bestaat het Nederlands belang niet dient. Wij zijn niet tegen de Europese Unie, maar wij willen alleen dat deze zich beperkt tot economische samenwerking. Voorzitter, een Europese politieke Unie is voor ons dan ook volstrekt ondenkbaar. De macht moet bij de lidstaten liggen, want alleen die kunnen bepalen wat het beste is voor hun eigen burgers. Europese politieke partijen hebben geen enkele meerwaarde voor het welzijn van de burgers van de Europese Unie en van Nederland.

Voorzitter, de bepaling in het Verdrag van Lissabon dat - en ik citeer - de politieke partijen op Europees niveau bijdragen tot de vorming van een Europees politiek bewustzijn en tot de uiting van de wil van de burgers van de Unie is een belachelijke en wereldvreemde constatering. Het interesseert de burger terecht niets. Gezamenlijk hebben die Europese partijen tussen 2004 en 2010 zo'n 67 miljoen euro aan Europese subsidies ontvangen. Volstrekt nutteloos en weggegooid belastinggeld. Een politieke partij moet per definitie zonder subsidies kunnen functioneren, dus óók de Europese politieke partijen. Het zijn belangenclubjes die niemand kent, waar niemand op zit te wachten en die wij kunnen missen als kiespijn.

2-550

Γεώργιος Τούσσας (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κεντρικό ζήτημα που βάζει η έκθεση για την χρηματοδότηση των ευρωπαϊκών κομμάτων και των πολιτικών ιδρυμάτων τους, είναι η δημιουργία ενιαίου καθεστώτος για τα ευρωπαϊκά κόμματα, σύμφωνα με ευρωενωσιακή νομοθεσία.

Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση - με τη νομοθεσία της να καθορίζει ενιαίο τρόπο δομής και λειτουργίας για τα ευρωπαϊκά κόμματα, να αναμειγνύεται στην εσωτερική λειτουργία τους, στο καταστατικό και το πολιτικό τους πρόγραμμα - με πρόσχημα την δήθεν χαλάρωση του χρηματοδοτικού καθεστώτος, ανοίγει το κουτί της Πανδώρας με οικονομικές και, κατ' επέκταση, πολιτικές κυρώσεις σε βάρος των πολιτικών κομμάτων, δηλαδή ασφυκτικότερο έλεγχο της λειτουργίας και της δράσης τους από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, άσκηση πίεσης στα εθνικά πολιτικά κόμματα για βαθύτερη ενσωμάτωσή τους στην αντιλαϊκή πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, επίθεση στα κόμματα εκείνα που αμφισβητούν την

αντιλαϊκή πολιτική, τη στρατηγική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, την εξουσία του κεφαλαίου. Δεν πρόκειται επομένως για κανέναν κοινοβουλευτικό συντονισμό, αλλά για ευρωπαϊκά κόμματα, ιδεολογικούς και πολιτικούς μηχανισμούς της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για την χειραγώγηση του εργατικού λαϊκού κινήματος.

Γι' αυτούς τους λόγους θα καταψηφίσουμε την έκθεση - πρόταση για τα ευρωπαϊκά κόμματα, τα πολιτικά ιδρύματα και την χρηματοδότησή τους.

2-551

Elena Băsescu (PPE). – Finanțarea transparentă a partidelor politice europene este fundamentală în sprijinirea valorilor democratice. Avem nevoie de un spațiu european în care partidele politice să fie active, iar cetățenii să fie în centrul preocupărilor Uniunii Europene. Adoptarea statutului juridic european reprezintă un pas în îmbunătățirea cadrului de reglementare a partidelor europene.

Referitor la țara mea, avem în vigoare Legea nr. 334 din 2006, revizuită în 2010. În spațiul public, însă, se dezbate dacă nu ar fi mai oportun ca finanțarea pentru candidații la primării și parlament să fie suportată din bugetul de stat. Plafonul propus este de aproximativ 11 600 de euro pentru fiecare candidat. Prin asumarea acestor standarde de cost, s-ar elimina mita electorală și finanțările ilegale. Partidele ar avea în primul rând candidați competenți, și nu oameni capabili să-și promoveze propria campanie.

2-552

Diane Dodds (NI). – Mr President, this debate tonight is symptomatic of all that is wrong with the 'more Europe' agenda. It is simply staggering for me to have listened and to see how greatly removed the debate is from the agenda of ordinary citizens. Mr Duff quite rightly acknowledges that there is a gap to fill between the European powers and the individual citizens. That is absolutely right, but that gap will not be filled by developing European parties and, as another contributor to the debate has said, giving those parties the resources to match their ambitions.

I would challenge Mr Duff to go to his constituency at the weekend and try to sell those views to local community groups that have had their funding cut because of austerity measures imposed by his coalition government in the United Kingdom. The gap will be filled, however, by giving people their say on Lisbon, on increasing federalism, and on the litany of red tape that comes from these institutions.

2-553

Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission. – Mr President, I start my concluding remarks by thanking once again Mrs Giannakou for her report because I think that this debate has very clearly proven that the concern and the issues she raised in her report are legitimate; they are at the heart of European integration and of its democratic nature.

The exchange of views clearly demonstrated as well how sensitive these issues are and, therefore, if this House approves this proposed legislative resolution tomorrow, the Commission will respect its commitment stemming from the framework agreement and will respond to this resolution within three months.

However, as you may have felt from this debate, it is quite clear that this would be a very sensitive, elaborate, political and legal task because there are a lot of issues that are both legally and politically very sensitive. Our preliminary analyses on the statute of the European political parties is in this direction but, of course, we now need to study very carefully the legal basis, potential legal form and, as we see now, we would most probably need a separate legal act on this issue. That is because the revising of the regulation from 2003-2004 would simply not be sufficient because it targeted the funding issue and not the issue of the statute of the political groups. So this would be one angle, which we would have to look at very carefully.

Several speakers raised the question of amending the Financial Regulation. Here, again, we would need to look very carefully at the requirements, scope and the timing and we certainly took very careful note of the calls in this report for more flexibility. As you know, we already took some steps in 2007 and we will examine these proposals very carefully. However, it is quite clear that it might be very difficult to agree on the changes and have them incorporated into the current revision of the Financial Regulation and its implementing rules.

Of course, Parliament is a legislator and is free to raise this issue in the current ongoing interinstitutional process, if it so wishes. My thanks again, Mr President, and we are certainly looking forward to the ensuing debate on this issue once the resolution has been adopted and the Commission's response has been prepared.

2-554

Μαριέττα Γιαννάκου, Εισηγήτρια. – Θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω ιδιαίτερα τον Επίτροπο για όσα είπε και για τις δεσμεύσεις που ανέλαβε, καθώς και τους συναδέλφους οι οποίοι στήριξαν την έκθεση αυτή.

Πρώτον, νομίζω ότι έχει σημασία να επαναλάβω ότι όσο αφορά στη διαδικασία χρηματοδότησης, τα κόμματα δεν ζητούν περισσότερα χρήματα και ότι από την τροποποίηση του Κανονισμού του 2007 έχει προκύψει μεγαλύτερη διαφάνεια, όπως παραδέχθηκε και η ίδια η Διεθνής Διαφάνεια. Δεύτερον, τα κόμματα είναι θεμιτό να ζητούν ένα status ευρωπαϊκό και την ευθυγράμμιση του καθεστώτος αυτών με τα ευρωπαϊκά θεσμικά όργανα, καθώς και με την ευρωπαϊκή νομοθεσία και, βεβαίως, αυτό είναι προς ικανοποίηση των πολιτών.

Και τέλος κύριε Πρόεδρε, η δημιουργία ασφαλούς και διαφανούς περιβάλλοντος για τη λειτουργία και τη χρηματοδότηση των κομμάτων, είναι πράξη βαθιά δημοκρατική. Χρειαζόμαστε έναν ευρωπαϊκό χώρο ενεργών πολιτικών κομμάτων που θα φέρουν τους πολίτες στο επίκεντρο της Ένωσης και θα τους

βοηθήσουν στην καθημερινή τους ζωή. Αυτό θα σημαίνει μεγαλύτερη συμμετοχή, περισσότερη δημοκρατία και σε τελευταία ανάλυση, περισσότερη Ευρώπη.

2-555

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am 6. April, 12.00 Uhr, statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149)

2-556

Cristian Silviu Bușoi (ALDE), în scris. – Uniunea Europeană a fost în repetate rânduri criticată din cauza deficitului democratic. Pentru o democrație autentică, avem nevoie un spațiu politic european în adevăratul sens al cuvântului, iar partidele politice la nivel european sunt un instrument esențial pentru atingerea acestui scop. Propunerile de reformă a regulamentului privind statutul și finanțarea acestora prezente în acest raport sunt un pas înspre eficientizarea activității partidelor politice europene. Consider că acestea își pot îndeplini mult mai bine rolul dacă beneficiază de un statut politic și juridic uniform pe baza dreptului european. Actualul sistem în care aceste partide au personalitate juridică în baza legislației naționale, nu oferă condițiile cele mai favorabile pentru o comunicare eficientă a acestor partide cu electoratul din cele 27 de state membre. Introducerea unui statut european ar ajuta partidele politice la nivel european să se adapteze unei eventuale reforme de sistem electoral pentru alegerile europene, reforma aflată în discuție în prezent. De asemenea, salut facilitarea implicării partidelor politice europene în campanii pentru referendum-uri în ce privește chestiunile europene la nivelul statelor membre. De cele mai multe ori, aceste referendum-uri sunt dominate de chestiuni pur naționale. Implicarea partidelor europene ar putea ajuta la reorientarea dezbaterilor către subiectele reale ale acestor referendumuri.

2-557

Algirdas Saudargas (PPE), raštu. – Diskusijos kaip sustiprinti Europos politinių partijų vaidmenį plėtojant demokratiją Europoje ir formuojant viešąją nuomonę yra labai savalaikės. Nors parlamentas įgauna vis daugiau ir daugiau galių jo demokratijos deficitą nemažėja dėl vis mažesnio piliečių dalyvavimo Europos Parlamento rinkimuose. Politinės partijos Europos lygiu yra pagrindinės parlamentinės demokratijos priemonės padedančios formuoti europinį politinį sąmoningumą, skatinti domėjimąsi ES klausimais ir reikšti Sąjungos piliečių valią. Todėl visiškai pritariu ir sutinku su pranešėja, kad yra būtina sustiprinti politinių partijų Europos lygiu padėtį ir parengti joms aiškų ir vienodą teisinį statusą bei finansavimo modelį. Tokios partijos neturėtų likti svetimkūniais. Šiuo metu europinių politinių partijų vaidmuo viešojoje erdvėje yra gana ribotas. Jos yra tik nacionalines partijas jungiančios, o ne tiesiogiai su rinkėjais susisiekančios, organizacijos. Naujas tokių partijų teisinis statusas Europos Sąjungoje padėtų užtikrinti organizacinę vienovę, suteiktų galimybę efektyviau įgyvendinti savo vaidmenį. Noriu pažymėti, kad reikia ir toliau siekti saugios ir skaidrios partijų finansavimo aplinkos kūrimo. Partijų finansavi-

mas neturētų būti pagrįstas vien tik dotacijų režimu, reikia skatinti ir finansavimą iš savo lėšų, kuris yra partijų gyvybingumo ženklas.

2-558

**15 - Fischereiabkommen EG/Komoren –
Finanzielle Maßnahmen der Gemeinschaft
zur Durchführung der Gemeinsamen
Fischereipolitik und im Bereich des
Seerechts – Fischerei - Technische
Übergangsmaßnahmen – Einfuhr von
Fischereierzeugnissen aus Grönland
(Aussprache)**

2-559

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Gemeinsame Aussprache über

– den Bericht von Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos im Namen des Fischereiausschusses über die Empfehlung zu dem Vorschlag für einen Beschluss des Rates über den Abschluss eines Protokolls zur Festlegung der Fangmöglichkeiten und der finanziellen Gegenleistung nach dem partnerschaftlichen Fischereiabkommen zwischen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft und der Union der Komoren
(15572/2010 - C7-0020/2011 - 2010/0287(NLE)) (A7-0056/2011) und

– den Bericht von João Ferreira im Namen des Fischereiausschusses über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 861/2006 des Rates vom 22. Mai 2006 über finanzielle Maßnahmen der Gemeinschaft zur Durchführung der Gemeinsamen Fischereipolitik und im Bereich des Seerechts
(KOM(2010)0145 - C7-0107/2010 - 2010/0080(COD)) (A7-0017/2011) und

– den Bericht von Estelle Grelier im Namen des Fischereiausschusses über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur Änderung der Verordnung (EG) Nr. 1288/2009 des Rates zur Festlegung technischer Übergangsmaßnahmen für den Zeitraum vom 1. Januar 2010 bis zum 30. Juni 2011
(KOM(2010)0488 - C7-0282/2010 - 2010/0255(COD)) (A7-0024/2011) und

– den Bericht von Carmen Fraga Estévez im Namen des Fischereiausschusses über den Vorschlag für einen Beschluss des Rates mit Vorschriften für die Einfuhr von Fischereierzeugnissen, lebenden Muscheln, Stachelhäutern, Manteltieren, Meeresschnecken und deren Nebenprodukten aus Grönland in die Europäische Union (KOM(2010)0176 - 2010/0097(CNS)) (A7-0057/2011).

2-560

Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos, relator. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, caros Colegas, a vertente externa da Política Comum das Pescas assume

particular importância, uma vez que não é possível garantir as nossas necessidades em produtos da pesca apenas com base nos nossos recursos haliêuticos. A indústria pesqueira europeia apenas garante 40 % da nossa auto-suficiência.

Em 2009, importámos 15,5 mil milhões de euros e apenas exportámos 2,5 mil milhões de euros em produtos da pesca, o que significa que sem os acordos bilaterais com países terceiros, 3.000 embarcações estariam paralisadas e 40.000 postos de trabalho não existiriam, mas a vertente externa da Política Comum de Pescas também tem aspectos positivos para os nossos parceiros.

A União Europeia, ao contrário de muitos dos nossos concorrentes internacionais, não se limita a trocar peixe por dinheiro. Os acordos que celebramos têm por detrás os valores que defendemos, quer em termos de direitos humanos, quer de respeito pela sustentabilidade dos recursos. Segundo o Tratado, a competência exclusiva da União em matéria de conservação dos recursos biológicos aplica-se à gestão das actividades de pesca das frotas comunitárias em águas não comunitárias. As actividades que se inscrevem na dimensão externa da Política Comum das Pescas têm por principal objectivo alargar à escala internacional os princípios de uma pesca sustentável e responsável. Por isso, os outros objectivos que actualmente norteiam a dimensão externa da Política Comum das Pescas, como atrás referi, de manter a presença de uma frota comunitária no plano internacional e de garantir que essa frota abasteça o mercado comunitário, tornam-se cada vez menos pertinentes.

É neste enquadramento que deve ser entendido o relatório de que sou autor, que aqui hoje discutimos, sobre o Acordo de Pescas com a União das Comores. Trata-se de um Acordo que envolve o direito de acesso às águas comorianas para 70 embarcações europeias a troco de uma contrapartida financeira de cerca de 600.000 euros por ano, devendo cerca de metade desse montante ser destinado ao desenvolvimento do sector das pescas neste país que, recorde-se, não tem praticamente outros recursos e do qual dependem cerca de 30.000 dos seus 800.000 mil habitantes.

O Acordo contempla mecanismos de controlo das capturas, de contratação de tripulantes locais e uma cláusula relacionada com a suspensão ou a revisão, caso ocorram casos de violação de direitos humanos. Recorde-se que este pequeno país, independente da França desde 1975, já conheceu variados golpes de Estado.

Pelo exposto, proponho a aprovação do presente Acordo e chamo a atenção para as diversas recomendações que faço, designadamente as que referem à necessidade de melhorar significativamente a avaliação dos resultados.

Aproveito a oportunidade para utilizar o minuto que me resta para me referir a um outro aspecto de outro relatório, o relatório da Senhora Deputada Grelier, que

não merece o meu acordo e que motiva, juntamente com outros deputados, a apresentação de uma proposta de alteração. Refiro-me à alteração que visa permitir a continuação da actividade da pesca de pescada e tamboril com redes de tresmalho nas áreas 8, 9 e 10, ao largo da costa portuguesa, que foi proibida por decisão da Comissão, a partir de 1 de Outubro de 2010, por considerar que a mesma põe em causa determinadas populações de tubarões capturados acessoriamente sem que, contudo, exista qualquer estudo científico realizado que o comprove.

Nestes termos, a referida alteração propõe revogar esta decisão até 2012 por forma a que as autoridades portuguesas possam concluir estudos científicos que permitam, ou não, fundamentar esta decisão. Esta posição é, aliás, corroborada pelo Comité Económico e Social, pelo que apelo ao Parlamento que a aprove, por ser justa.

2-561

João Ferreira, relator. – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, este regulamento, o Regulamento (CE) n.º 861/2006, estabelece as medidas financeiras comunitárias relativamente à execução da Política Comum das Pescas e ao direito do mar. Ele constitui um importante instrumento financeiro da União Europeia na área das pescas. Conjuntamente com o Fundo Europeu das Pescas, constituem os dois principais instrumentos para a aplicação da Política Comum das Pescas.

Depois da adopção, em 2006, deste regulamento, vários elementos de legislação acessória relacionada foram sofrendo alterações, o que justifica agora que este regulamento seja alterado a fim de assegurar a coerência entre todos os elementos do quadro legislativo. Por outro lado, a Comissão considera que, em alguns casos, a experiência demonstrou a necessidade de garantir que as disposições do regulamento sejam ligeiramente adaptadas para darem uma melhor resposta às necessidades. Proponho-lhes, por isso, um âmbito limitado para esta revisão, mantendo, no essencial, os objectivos e a estrutura do regulamento original.

Mantendo, no essencial, este âmbito limitado, nós considerámos, todavia, que seria oportuno propor algumas alterações adicionais, que embora sendo pontuais poderão contribuir para um melhor alinhamento desta legislação com evolução recente do sector e com as suas perspectivas futuras. Para o resultado final, muito contribuiu o debate tido antes e durante a elaboração do relatório, assim como as opiniões e propostas dos relatores-sombra e de outros colegas que gostaria aqui de assinalar e valorizar, agradecendo a todos a sua participação.

Entre estas alterações propostas, que constam do relatório, saliento a referência à salvaguarda das actividades de pesca costeira, a possibilidade de financiar, para além da compra, também o desenvolvimento, pelos Estados-Membros, de tecnologia diversa a afectar ao sector da pesca, como equipamento e suporte lógico, redes informáticas que permitam

compilar, gerir, validar, analisar e desenvolver métodos de amostragem e proceder ao intercâmbio de dados relativos à pesca, entre outras.

No domínio da aquacultura, registo a possibilidade de introduzir o financiamento da recolha da gestão e utilização de dados ambientais para além dos dados socioeconómicos anteriormente previstos, promovendo-se assim um acompanhamento e uma monitorização ambiental e sanitária deste sector, de forma a contribuir para a sua sustentabilidade.

Quero, todavia, chamar aqui a atenção para as três alterações adicionais que estamos a propor a este relatório. Existe hoje um reconhecimento generalizado e crescente da importância de uma gestão das pescas apoiada num conhecimento científico actualizado e rigoroso sobre o estado dos recursos. Tal é uma condição imprescindível para o desenvolvimento sustentável da actividade. Por esta razão, propomos que se consagre a possibilidade de incremento das taxas de co-financiamento comunitário previstas no domínio da recolha, gestão e utilização de dados científicos, quer de base, quer complementares, sobre o estado dos recursos pesqueiros. A proposta é de elevar de 50 para 60 % este limite máximo.

De igual modo, no que diz respeito às actividades de controlo, propomos um igual aumento da taxa máxima possível de co-financiamento comunitário, mantendo-se as prerrogativas da Comissão, actualmente já existentes, quanto à possibilidade de financiamento de algumas acções a taxas superiores, isto num quadro em que os Estados-Membros e as suas autoridades de controlo têm e devem continuar a ter um papel fulcral na condução e execução das medidas de controlo nas suas águas.

Estas alterações resultam de uma tentativa de compromisso, tendo em conta as objecções que surgiram, de vários grupos, relativamente ao valor máximo de 75 %, inicialmente previsto. Elas são subscritas quer pelo nosso grupo, pelo GUE/NGL, quer por um conjunto de colegas de outros grupos políticos, o que evidencia a sua importância e o consenso, que creio, reuniram e podem reunir também na votação em plenário.

2-562

Estelle Grelier, rapporteure. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je commencerai mon propos en remerciant les collègues pour leur participation engagée et constructive aux travaux de la commission de la pêche sur ce rapport relatif aux mesures techniques transitoires, rapport qui a suscité un vif débat, tant l'importance des mesures techniques est grande, car elle détermine l'activité des pêcheurs et de la filière, en fixant les moyens utilisables par les pêcheurs pour capturer les poissons dans des zones précisées par ce règlement, dans l'objectif d'assurer la protection des juvéniles et le renouvellement des stocks, objectif partagé par tous et, en particulier, par les pêcheurs.

Le sujet de ce rapport est sensible et controversé, comme en témoignent les difficultés rencontrées par la Commission depuis 2008 pour aboutir à un accord avec le Conseil sur l'évolution de ces mesures, quand ces deux institutions étaient alors les seules concernées par la procédure.

À ce jour, les mesures techniques sont régies par un ancien règlement, amendé de mesures transitoires adoptées successivement, règlement qui a déjà fait l'objet d'une prolongation jusqu'au 30 juin 2011, faute d'accord avec le Conseil sur une nouvelle proposition réglementaire formulée en 2008 par la Commission, laquelle visait à simplifier et à clarifier la législation existante pour une meilleure application des règles et une prise en compte des caractéristiques régionales des pêcheries.

Aujourd'hui, alors que la nouvelle échéance se profile, le contexte a profondément évolué. En effet, depuis le traité de Lisbonne, la pêche relève maintenant en majeure partie de la procédure de codécision, le Parlement disposant du rôle important de colégislateur, rôle dont il compte bien se saisir en faisant se rapprocher les points de vue des pêcheurs et ceux des décideurs de la politique communautaire. Éluë d'une ville portuaire, je suis toujours frappée de constater la distance, voire la méfiance des acteurs de la filière pêche avec la PCP quand les agriculteurs, par exemple, se sentent manifestement plus en proximité avec la PAC.

De plus, le secteur de la pêche est en crise. Le malaise va croissant. Le vrai défi est celui de la conciliation à rechercher entre équilibre économique du secteur, et donc garantie de revenus décents aux pêcheurs, d'une part, et, d'autre part, durabilité et renouvellement des stocks halieutiques.

Enfin, la fin de l'application du règlement arrive alors que débutent les échanges sur la réforme de la politique commune de la pêche, qui doit se donner un cadre ambitieux, susciter l'adhésion des pêcheurs, des consommateurs et des citoyens, et associer l'ensemble de la filière aux analyses scientifiques, qui déterminent le niveau des quotas, et donc celui de l'activité de la filière.

Ce nouveau contexte suppose que la Commission établisse une véritable proposition sur l'évolution des mesures techniques, qu'elle semble, avec le Conseil, s'être épargnée à ce jour. Une nouvelle proposition devra veiller à l'adaptation des mesures techniques aux réalités vécues sur le terrain, en concertation avec les professionnels du secteur. Et elle devra rechercher la cohérence entre le nouveau règlement et le cadre de la prochaine PCP, notamment sur la question de la régionalisation des mesures, et s'attacher à une répartition claire des compétences entre Commission et États membres, élément de compréhension et d'adhésion à cette politique communautaire.

Au vu de ce contexte et de ces enjeux, ma proposition est d'accéder à la demande de la Commission d'une prorogation jusqu'au 31 décembre 2012, sans modifica-

tion substantielle des mesures techniques en cours, si ce n'est un ajout concernant le maillage utilisable pour le poisson sanglier. Je reste cependant consciente que cette proposition est une forme de concession faite à la Commission et que les interrogations et les exigences d'évolution sont fortes chez les professionnels, déçus du report de ce chantier d'envergure. Dès lors, j'assortis cette acceptation d'une double demande, celle de l'évaluation de l'impact des mesures techniques actuellement en vigueur, essentielle pour une adaptation efficace, et la demande d'une réelle concertation avec l'ensemble des parties prenantes et, notamment les pêcheurs, pour l'élaboration du prochain règlement.

En conclusion, j'alerte l'attention sur le fait que cette future proposition de la Commission doit se faire dans un calendrier raisonnable, pour un nouveau règlement applicable au 1er janvier 2013, date d'entrée en vigueur de la nouvelle PCP. Il est fondamental de travailler dès à présent sur cette nouvelle proposition. Il ne serait pas raisonnable de procéder à une nouvelle prolongation à l'issue de cette nouvelle période de dix-huit mois d'application de l'actuel règlement. Les mesures techniques sur lesquelles porte mon rapport sont transitoires et validées comme telles.

2-563

Carmen Fraga Estévez, Ponente. – Señor Presidente, debo comenzar lamentando otra vez las complicaciones que ha adquirido un *dossier* por la resistencia del Consejo y de la Comisión a admitir los poderes de codecisión del Parlamento.

Se trata, en este caso, de una propuesta para que Groenlandia, como país y territorio de ultramar, pueda exportar en las mismas condiciones que se aplican a un Estado de la Unión Europea. Una situación beneficiosa, tanto para Groenlandia, que exporta a la Unión Europea el 87 % de sus productos pesqueros, como para la Unión y, en particular, para Dinamarca, receptora mayoritaria de dichas exportaciones.

Una de las condiciones para incluir a Groenlandia en el régimen de importaciones del mercado único es que acepte las normas sanitarias comunitarias, para lo que no hay el menor problema.

El comercio de los productos pesqueros entra en el ámbito de la Organización Común de Mercados, pese a lo cual, amparándose en la necesidad de cumplimiento de las normas sanitarias, la Comisión presentó su propuesta basándose en el artículo 203 del Tratado, lo que para nosotros significaba un procedimiento simple y sencillo de consulta.

Tanto la Comisión de Pesca como el Servicio Jurídico advirtieron desde el primer momento esta anomalía; no obstante, al no presentar la propuesta ningún problema de contenido, y vista su importancia para Groenlandia, aceptamos tramitar el informe bajo el procedimiento de consulta. Cuál no sería nuestra sorpresa cuando, a punto de votar ya el texto, sin previo aviso, el Consejo adoptó una propuesta completamente distinta, con numerosas

modificaciones que intentan disimular el evidente vínculo con la Organización Común de Mercados y evitar, así, la codecisión, en una maniobra gratuita, ya que –como he dicho anteriormente– el Parlamento habría aprobado el primer texto por consulta, sin ningún problema.

Al tener que enfrentarnos, sin embargo, a un nuevo texto, y ante la evidente prueba por parte del Consejo de que el objetivo era hurtar poderes al Parlamento, decidimos, ahora sí, utilizar éstos plenamente y solicitar una opinión formal a la Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos.

En dicha opinión, la Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos dictaminó que –y leo textualmente– «el objetivo de la propuesta es exigir a Groenlandia la transposición de las normas comunitarias en materia de salud, como requisito para la aplicación de las normas de la Unión Europea sobre el mercado interior de productos de la pesca», como figura en el artículo 3 de la propia propuesta, garantizando que las normas del acuerdo se ajusten a las normas aplicables establecidas en la Unión en materia de salud animal y seguridad alimentaria y de organización común del mercado de los productos de la pesca.

En consecuencia, la Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos dictaminó por unanimidad que los artículos 204 y 43, apartado 2, del Tratado, junto con el Protocolo nº 34, que contiene disposiciones y procedimientos específicos para los productos que están sujetos a la Organización Común de Mercados de productos de la pesca en Groenlandia, fueran el fundamento jurídico de la propuesta. Así pues, como ponente, elaboré un nuevo proyecto de informe, modificando la base jurídica, que es lo que mañana presentamos a su aprobación y que, para el Parlamento Europeo, entendemos que es nuestra primera lectura.

Por tanto, simplemente me resta decir a la Comisión y al Consejo —que creo que está ausente— que tienen ahora una oportunidad de rectificar y reconocer la nueva base jurídica, y, por tanto, considerar, como nosotros vamos a considerar mañana, que ésta es una primera lectura. El problema es de base jurídica y no de contenido.

Pido que este problema se solucione de cara al futuro.

2-564

Maria Damanaki, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I would like to thank all the rapporteurs for their work. Now let me refer to each report in turn, trying to focus on the substance in order to gain time.

Regarding the agreement between the European Union and the Union of Comoros, I would like to thank Mr Capoulas Santos for his work as rapporteur and am pleased to see the very strong support of the Fisheries Committee as a whole on the substance of this proposal.

As the House will be aware, the EU's commitment is to continue promoting responsible and sustainable fisheries in the waters of our partners, including the Indian Ocean region. It is very important to maintain bilateral

relationships with this region's countries and Comoros, in this case, in connection with the participation of the European Union in regional fisheries organisations such as the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission.

We have to be present there and that is why this agreement is important. At present, the European Union has four active fisheries partnership agreements in the Indian Ocean – namely with Seychelles, Madagascar, Mozambique and this one with the Union of Comoros. I would like to underline that it is very important for the Commission and the European Union to reach an agreement with Comoros, as the agreement plays an important role in terms of the presence of our fleet in the region.

It is also necessary to reinforce the dialogue on the sectoral policy in order to encourage the implementation of a responsible fisheries policy in this region.

Let me say a few words referring to the requests made by the rapporteur to the Commission in the conclusion to his report. I would like to report that the Commission is committed to keeping the European Parliament fully informed at all stages of the negotiation and conclusion of international agreements. We really mean it, and we want to make available all relevant information, but we do have to act in line with the commitments made in the Framework Agreement.

In practice, the Commission services have been honouring this commitment for more than one year now. The Commission is sending the European Parliament the same information as to the Council and at the same time. In particular, I am committed to making available ex-ante and ex-post evaluations of our agreements as soon as possible. To give you just one example: in view of tomorrow's vote on the resolution of the Fisheries Partnership Agreement with Mauritania, the Commission services have made arrangements that the evaluation report of this agreement will be available ahead of the foreseen schedule, so the members of this Parliament can vote after being informed about this report.

As regards participation of members of this Parliament as observers in international meetings, I must emphasise that the Framework Agreement applies to multilateral international conferences and meetings. At the same time, we intend to continue established successful practices of participation in bilateral negotiations. Nevertheless, any decision to include MEPs as observers in EU delegations is taken by the College of Commissioners on a case-by-case basis following the evaluation of the legal, diplomatic and technical possibilities pursuant to the Framework Agreement. I would, however, like to underline here that my personal attitude and that of the services is very positive and I would like to facilitate your participation.

Turning now to the second report on Community financial measures for the implementation of the common fisheries policy, I would also like to thank the

Fisheries Committee and the rapporteur, Mr Ferreira, for their work on this proposal. Thanks to their efforts, we have a text before us which is acceptable to the Council also. I am happy to say that this text is also acceptable to the Commission, so there has been excellent cooperation between the three institutions on this file. After a successful informal dialogue held on 2 March, a consensus was achieved on the outstanding points, so the Commission hopes that a first reading agreement can be achieved on this proposal. I hope we will be successful on that.

I would like to recall that this proposal rationalises the regulation on the so-called second financial instrument. This regulation covers spending in international relations, governance, data collection and scientific advice, and also control and enforcement. The revision intends to ensure coherence between the regulation and other elements of the legislative framework. It makes limited adaptations and clarifications of the provisions. I therefore urge the European Parliament to approve the proposal

I will turn now to the third report, on transitional technical measures, for which I warmly thank the rapporteur, Mrs Grelier. The purpose of this proposal is to extend existing transitional technical measures until the end of 2012. This is based on the assumption that the reformed common fisheries policy will enter into force on 1 January of next year. I hope we will be successful in that aim. My intention in proposing this extension is to avoid opening complex discussions on technical measures in the way of our reform. The Commission supports the amendment agreed by the Fisheries Committee on a mesh size range for boarfish, as it is based on scientific advice. I note the concerns of some Members and also by certain Member States who have sought additional amendments. We could not accept these as these had not yet been tested by scientists, or because scientists have actually not received full information from Member States in order to make an assessment.

Finally, I would like to say a few words on the report concerning the imports of fishery products from Greenland, and I would like here to thank the Chair of the Fisheries Committee, Mrs Fraga, for her work. I would like to underline that the measures proposed by the Commission address a long-standing request from Greenland. These measures seek to simplify the relevant sanitary measures and certification procedures and make Greenland part of the Single Market for fishery products and derived products.

This is entirely in line with our commitment in the agreement of 2006 to contribute to the development of Greenland and to cooperate in the area of food safety. The Commission is very pleased to note that all parties concerned – the Member States in Council with unanimity, Greenland, the European Parliament and also the national parliaments of the Member States – are prepared to deliver on this commitment and support the proposal.

Let me be clear: for us, the Commission, the relationship with Greenland is of extreme importance and I think that everybody understands why. It is a political priority, and I therefore hope that the discussions on the legal basis of this proposal will not risk putting in place these important measures.

I understood very well Mrs Fraga's concerns about the legal basis of the proposal and the competence of the European Parliament. I can say that the Commission will not stand in the way of finding a pragmatic solution. Although we remain convinced that the legal basis of our proposal is correct, we would accept – and I would like to clarify this – the Council adopting the position of Parliament. That will be okay with us. It is now up to the Council to consider the options and move the case forward in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty. I hope we can resolve this issue very soon in order to avoid an impact on our relations with Greenland. This is our first priority, so I am here to say that I would like to facilitate the work which Mrs Fraga has done in order to find a solution.

Finally, I would like to thank the Committee on Fisheries and all the rapporteurs for their work. I am sorry I have spoken too much, but I had four reports to comment on.

2-565

François Alfonsi, *rapporteur pour avis de la commission des budgets*. – Monsieur le Président, au nom de la commission des budgets, nous avons été saisis de ce rapport sur l'accord de pêche passé entre l'Union européenne et l'Union des Comores. La commission a approuvé cet accord.

Cependant, la commission a estimé, premièrement, que le vote du Parlement sur ce rapport perd son sens, dans la mesure où il est postérieur à sa signature. Le faible volume financier ici engagé limite l'impact de ce dysfonctionnement, mais pour l'avenir, il faudrait bien sûr pouvoir se prononcer en amont sur de tels accords.

Deuxièmement, la commission a estimé que le contenu de ces accords devait être analysé davantage sur le fond, en termes de surveillance de la réalité des prises effectuées et de protection des ressources halieutiques face à la pression de PECH, et aussi pour s'assurer que le volet développement local de ces accords est effectif et correctement appliqué. Aussi, la commission des budgets a prévu de se rapprocher de la commission de la pêche afin de tenir rapidement une réunion de travail approfondie à ce sujet.

2-566

Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa, *w imieniu grupy PPE*. – Szanowni Państwo! W dzisiejszej debacie omawiamy cztery sprawozdania, więc na początku chciałbym podziękować wszystkim sprawozdawcom za ich pracę oraz Komisji Europejskiej za współpracę. Na początek kilka słów na temat sprawozdania pani Grelier, które jest kompromisem między grupami politycznymi a Komisją Europejską, w związku z czym popieram wersję uzgodnioną i przegłosowaną w Komisji Rybołówstwa.

Ze względu na wejście w życie traktatu z Lizbony Komisja Europejska wycofała w 2010 r. wniosek w sprawie rozporządzenia Rady dotyczącego ochrony zasobów rybnych poprzez środki techniczne i miała opracować nowy plan. Nowy plan miał być zgodny z przepisami traktatu oraz uwzględniać reformę wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa. Wniosek miał zostać przedstawiony w trzecim kwartale 2011 r. Niestety wydaje się, że Komisja nie zdąży przygotować na czas projektu rozporządzenia, a co gorsze nie znajdzie środków finansowych na jego zmianę. To zła perspektywa. Głosując jutro nad przedłużeniem tymczasowego rozporządzenia, zobowiązujemy się względem rybaków do pracy nad nowym rozporządzeniem, które musi w końcu usystematyzować całą grę przepisów regulujących dozwolone metody oraz miejsca połowów ryb.

Pocieszające jest jednak, że najprawdopodobniej, zgodnie z najnowszymi informacjami, Komisja będzie chciała przekazać część kompetencji państwom członkowskim w kwestii środków technicznych. To bardzo dobry krok w stronę decentralizacji. Środki techniczne stosowane w poszczególnych basenach morskich są zróżnicowane w zależności od warunków lokalnych. W systemie zarządzania sektorem rybołówstwa należy porzucić tradycyjne podejście odgórne, kładąc nacisk na zasadę regionalizacji, która pozwala uwzględnić warunki panujące na poszczególnych akwenach morskich. Dlatego musimy zdecydowanie odrzucić wszelkie próby przyjmowania uniwersalnego, wspólnego modelu zarządzania rybołówstwem i wezwać do należytego uwzględniania szczególnych cech różnych europejskich mórz. Podejście indywidualne to właściwy kierunek w drodze ku zrównoważonemu zarządzaniu sektorem rybołówstwa. Dziękuję.

2-567

Ulrike Rodust, im Namen der S&D-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben wieder einmal ein ganzes Paket Fischereipolitik auf der Tagesordnung. Ich als Koordinatorin bin froh, dass wir zu zwei Verordnungen einen Kompromiss mit Rat und Kommission gefunden haben. Das gilt für den Bericht Grelier zu technischen Maßnahmen und den Bericht Ferreira zum zweiten Finanzierungsinstrument. Dem Fischereiabkommen mit den Komoren werden wir ebenfalls zustimmen können, wobei ich nicht verhehlen will, dass ich mir im Rahmen der Reform der Gemeinsamen Fischereipolitik eine grundlegende Neuausrichtung der Partnerschaftsabkommen wünsche.

Echte Probleme zwischen den Institutionen gibt es aber beim Thema Grönland, wo die Befugnisse des Parlaments nicht respektiert werden. Ich verliere langsam die Geduld, dass es immer noch nicht zu einer vernünftigen Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Institutionen kommt. Ich habe das an dieser Stelle bereits mehrfach angesprochen. Ich tue das auch heute wieder. Das Problem der Managementpläne muss dringend gelöst werden! Ich appelliere auch an die ungarische Ratspräsidentschaft, sich aktiv für eine

Lösung einzusetzen. Dass niemand aus dem Rat hier ist, zeigt allerdings ziemlich deutlich, wie wenig Respekt der Rat dem Parlament entgegenbringt. Ich finde das unglaublich!

Noch eine Bemerkung zum Bericht Grelier: Ich weiß, dass einige Kollegen frustriert sind, weil ihre Änderungswünsche nicht berücksichtigt werden konnten. Ich finde es aber auch sehr misslich, dass unsere Fischer mit alten technischen Maßnahmen arbeiten müssen. Schuld hieran ist aber der Rat, der sich nicht auf eine neue Verordnung einigen konnte. Wir müssen als ein Parlament, das eine große Verantwortung trägt, auch verantwortlich handeln und deshalb die bestehende Verordnung ohne Änderungen verlängern.

2-568

Pat the Cope Gallagher, on behalf of the ALDE Group.

– Mr President, I want to congratulate all the rapporteurs on the presentation of their reports and, due to the time constraints, I want to confine my remarks to the Grelier report.

The existing regulation on technical measures is causing major problems for small inshore vessels operating off the coast of Ireland and, indeed, off the west coast of Scotland. We cannot afford, as politicians, to sit and wait for the reform of the common fisheries policy when a new regulation is expected. Parliament has an opportunity to act now and I urge all political groups to support the very realistic amendments that have been tabled.

These small vessels which I referred to, short of 15 metres, are deprived of earning an income and, even more importantly, these vessels are forced to travel into dangerous waters. We are driving these vessels 80 kms off our coasts to catch fish outside the area, which is closed for cod recovery. My amendments refer to the use of tangle nets. These nets are used by small inshore vessels to catch shellfish and lesser spotted dogfish off the North-West coast. Tangle nets are not used to catch cod, they are not used to catch whiting or haddock and will have zero impact on these stocks, so these amendments, if passed, will allow these small vessels to survive in these areas. It is not good enough to suggest that we do not want to open discussions. That is what we are here to do.

In relation to boarfish, this is a new form of fishery. It has been developed primarily by fishermen from my own country. In December the Council established a TAC, of which Ireland was allocated 67%, and I am glad to hear the Commissioner says that there is scientific evidence to justify this. There are no references to boarfish under the existing regulation, so therefore I am pleased that the committee decided to accept my amendment to use the Commission proposal as a vehicle to introduce the appropriate mesh size of 32 to 54, thus avoiding the need to introduce new legislation that would take too long.

In conclusion, I urge all Members to think about

(The President cut off the speaker)

2-569

Isabella Lövin, för *Verts/ALE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Jag vill tacka alla föredraganden för ert goda arbete. Jag kommer dock att koncentrera mig på fiskeripartnerskapsavtalet med Komorerna.

Om jag någon gång behöver påminna mig varför vi gröna hittills har röstat nej till dessa fiskeripartnerskapsavtal så behöver jag bara ta fram en av utvärderingarna och läsa innantill ur det avtal med Komorerna som vi nu ska rösta om. Det här fattiga landet har EU haft ett avtal med sedan 1998. Enligt utvärderingen gav avtalet Komorerna 2,7 miljoner euro mellan 2005 och 2009. I avtalet anges att 60 procent av pengarna ska användas till att stödja den lokala fiskesektorn, kontroll och vetenskapliga uppskattningar av fiskebestånden.

Enligt utvärderingen har detta utvecklingsland ändå inte en enda fungerande fiskehamn, inte en enda kustbevakningsbåt, inget kustbevakningsflyg och ingen fiskeforskning. Landets egna fiskesektor är fortfarande helt outvecklad.

Komorerna erhåller alltså 2,7 miljoner euro för att släppa in EU:s båtar. Vi skattebetalare står för 65 procent av den summan och fartygsägarna för 35 procent. Dessa båtar, varav majoriteten är avsedda för tonfiskfiske, har under samma tid fångat fisk som enligt utvärderingen är värd 13,7 miljoner euro. Det är en väldigt god affär för fartygsägarna, men enligt utvärderingen har allt s.k. mervärde tillfallit EU.

Inga komorier har anställts som besättning på båtarna. Ingen landning av fisk har skett på Komorerna. All beredning av fisk har skett någon annanstans, t.ex. på Seychellerna. Jag håller med kommissionsledamoten om att det är bra att EU är närvarande i IOTC, men min fråga nu till kommissionen är följande:

Hur tänker kommissionen se till så att detta nya avtal genomförs bättre än tidigare avtal? Hur ska t.ex. EU-flottan förmås anställa komorier ombord och hur ska kommissionen se till så att avtalet verkligen bidrar till utveckling på Komorerna så att talet om öronmärkta pengar till utveckling av fiskesektorn inte bara blir vackra ord utan också får konkret innehåll?

2-570

Marek Józef Gróbarczyk, w imieniu grupy *ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Na wstępie chciałbym bardzo serdecznie podziękować i pogratulować wszystkim posłom sprawozdawcom za pracę, jaką włożyli w przygotowanie swoich sprawozdań. Sprawozdania te stanowią ważny element w realizacji wspólnej polityki rybackiej.

Jednocześnie należy zwrócić uwagę na fakt różnicy zdań pomiędzy Parlamentem Europejskim a Komisją Europejską w kontekście umów międzynarodowych. W świetle przyjętej praktyki Komisji Europejskiej należy zaznaczyć, że wbrew Traktatowi z Lizbony, który

zakłada większy udział Parlamentu Europejskiego w tworzeniu aktów normatywnych, proces negocjacji w zakresie zawieranych umów z krajami trzecimi jest nadmiernie utajniany. Przeczy to zasadzie przejrzystości i ogranicza rolę Parlamentu Europejskiego, który musi przecież pełnić funkcję kontrolną. Poprzez wpływ na proces negocjacyjny posłowie mogą należycie wypełniać mandat poselski.

Pani Komisarz! Postuluję o większy udział członków Parlamentu Europejskiego w procesie negocjacyjnym, ponieważ obecnie realizowana forma zdawania ogólnego sprawozdania z procesu negocjacji przez urzędnika Komisji Europejskiej jest niewystarczająca.

2-571

Derek Roland Clark, on behalf of the *EFD Group*. – Mr President, after 30 years, the destructive practice of discards is to be addressed. Fleets at Grimsby are a few dozen fishing boats, where once there were a hundred. Two years ago West of Scotland fishermen tabled a plan to conserve white fish but, while they wait, stock depletion continues. A regional approach is suggested – why not? The EU divides the land into regions.

Much worse is the renewal of licences for European fleets to raid the waters of the Comoros islands – and raid it will be, for local fishermen cannot compete with the superior EU-powered trawlers. The same thing has been done to others in that area. Is the House surprised that Somali fishermen denied a living have resumed the age-old vice of piracy?

Five years ago, did Members see the TV pictures of hundreds of Western Saharans trying to seek refuge in the Canaries? EU licences had just been renewed for their waters and they too had seen it all before. In a pitiful, desperate attempt many died on the 800-mile journey in fishing boats never intended for the open sea. However, the EU does not care that people from the least-developed countries have been impoverished by its actions and, for that, it deserves to be condemned.

2-572

Diane Dodds (NI). – Mr President, one of our rapporteurs spoke of the distrust of fishermen for the common fisheries policy. It is little wonder, because the common fisheries policy currently constituted has seen the destruction of our fleet but has not seen the build-up of fish stocks. From my point of view, the sooner we can get fisheries policy returned to Member States, the better. However, I recognise that this is unlikely to happen in the short term, so I have a few observations to make on this joint fisheries debate.

First, the issue of establishing a Community financial measure for the implementation of the common fisheries policy. So long as the EU is able to interfere in our fisheries, it would seem to me that that interference should be properly funded. However, while we seek to guarantee the funding that is available for the administration of the CAP, we should bear a thought for the stakeholders – in particular our fishermen – who

struggle to keep abreast of the multitude of current rules and regulations, let alone those they are consulted upon.

I am increasingly hearing from a variety of maritime stakeholders that the entire industry is struggling to deal with this particular issue.

2-573

Alain Cadec (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, d'abord un cri du cœur. Le Parlement n'a qu'un siège, c'est Strasbourg.

Maintenant, je tiens à féliciter M. Ferreira pour son rapport sur les mesures financières communautaires relatives à la mise en œuvre de la PCP et au droit de la mer. Les modifications de ce règlement proposées par la Commission et le Parlement permettent de préciser les investissements communautaires possibles en matière de financement de recherche. Il met en cohérence le règlement et les évolutions du cadre législatif communautaire en matière de collecte, de gestion et d'utilisation des données.

Je me réjouis particulièrement de la possibilité de financer la recherche scientifique pour la pêche et l'aquaculture. Désormais, nous pourrions procéder à des études sur le degré de dépendance commerciale de l'Union européenne vis-à-vis des importations de pays tiers. Comme vous le savez, notre marché est dépendant à plus de 60 % des importations, et cela ne cesse d'augmenter. Il est indispensable de développer le soutien à nos producteurs européens, au lieu de développer l'ouverture commerciale tous azimuts, qui met à mal la production européenne.

En ce qui concerne le rapport Grelier, je tiens aussi à remercier la rapporteure. Les mesures techniques sont un sujet extrêmement sensible, qu'il convient de modifier rapidement, lorsque nous aurons les propositions de la Commission sur le paquet de réformes de la PCP. Ce rapport, que nous adopterons demain, permet de proroger un régime transitoire de mesures techniques réglementant les activités de pêche. Cette prorogation nous permettra, d'une part, d'éviter un vide réglementaire après le 30 juin de cette année, mais aussi de permettre les activités de pêche jusqu'à la réforme de la PCP et de conduire une étude d'impact approfondie sur l'ensemble des mesures techniques en vigueur. En effet, il n'est pas aujourd'hui raisonnable d'accepter des modifications de fond de ce rapport, car de telles modifications prolongeraient la procédure législative et entraîneraient de longues discussions au Conseil.

Enfin, je souhaite féliciter M. Capoulas Santos pour son rapport sur l'accord de partenariat de pêche avec les Comores et notre collègue Carmen Fraga sur le Groenland.

2-574

Ole Christensen (S&D). – Hr. formand! Jeg vil gerne starte med at takke ordførerne for indsatsen med henstillingen og de tre betænkninger. I morgen stemmer vi om importaftalen med Grønland, som jeg er S&D's skyggeordfører på. Jeg er glad for, at vi nu fjerner et

besværligt og dyrt bureaukrati og samtidig lever helt og fuldt op til EU's krav om fødevarerikkerhed. Aftalen giver Grønland en god mulighed for at afsætte sine fiskeriprodukter efter reglerne for det indre marked, så længe de lever op til EU's sundheds- og sikkerhedsmæssige krav. Grønlandske fisk bliver allerede i dag kontrolleret af de danske fødevarermyndigheder, både i Grønland og igen, når de eksporteres til EU. Det er et dyrt dobbeltarbejde, som aftalen heldigvis gør op med. Denne aftale har kun vindere, men har selvfølgelig været for længe undervejs. Men det var også vigtigt for Parlamentet, at vi fik fuldstændig klarhed over retsgrundlaget, og vi håber, at Kommissionen og Rådet går ind for dette.

Vi stemmer også om fiskeripartnerskabsaftalen med Comorerne. Som udgangspunkt er jeg meget positiv over for bæredygtige fiskeriaftaler. Bæredygtighed for fiskebestandene, for fiskerne, for lokalbefolkningen og endelig bæredygtighed for de EU-fiskere, der gør brug af aftalerne. Denne aftale med Comorerne er desværre ikke så bæredygtig, som jeg kunne ønske mig, da den ikke indeholder noget endeligt loft over, hvor meget EU-fartøjerne må fiske. Når den aftalte kvote på 4 850 tons pr. år er nået, koster hvert supplerende ton 65 EUR.

Tendensen til ikke at lægge et loft på, hvor meget EU-fartøjer må fange i tredjelands farvande, er skadelig og forkert. Det duer ikke, at vi fører forskellig fiskeripolitik, alt efter om vi er i egne farvande, eller det drejer sig om tredjelandsfarvande. Jeg vil også gerne presse på for, at man i endnu højere grad sikrer, at de penge, som EU yder i modydelse til tredjelande i forbindelse med indgåelse af fiskeriaftaler, øremærkes således, at pengene med sikkerhed kommer lokalbefolkningen til gode.

2-575

Britta Reimers (ALDE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Damanaki, meine Damen und Herren! Ich bin froh, dass dieses Thema nun endgültig vom Parlament verabschiedet wird, und danke den Berichterstattern für ihre Arbeit.

Die Änderung der Ratsverordnung zu den finanziellen Maßnahmen der Gemeinschaft ist eines der Hauptwerkzeuge, das wir brauchen, um die Gemeinsame Fischereipolitik umzusetzen. Dies gilt insbesondere für die Bereiche internationale Fischereibeziehungen, Datenerhebung und wissenschaftliche Studien. Ganz besonders wichtig sind die Kontrollsysteme der Gemeinsamen Fischereipolitik und deren Umsetzung.

Der Berichtstatter hat sich bemüht, seine Kollegen zu überzeugen, warum er eine Erhöhung der Kofinanzierungsrate auf ein Maximum von 75 % wünscht. Diesem Wunsch konnten wir nicht folgen. Die bestehenden Regelungen haben sich in der Praxis bewährt und lassen bereits Ausnahmen zu. Die Mitgliedstaaten machen von der Möglichkeit, Kofinanzierung zu beantragen, bereits jetzt Gebrauch, und es bedarf daher keines weiteren Anreizes.

Es ist wichtig, dass mit der Änderung der Verordnung nun der Weg für einen kohärenten rechtlichen Rahmen frei gemacht wird.

2-576

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, the Grelier report gives too many concessions to the Commission, I would say. West of Scotland fishermen find it difficult to understand why it is that the Commission can say that it wants to eliminate discards and at the same time reject amendments to these technical measures.

The Commission prefers to extend the current range of technical measures that are causing discards, including of haddock, for at least another 18 months. The Commission prefers another 18 months of so-called temporary measures, which have failed to conserve the stocks. Another 18 months of dumping dead fish back into the sea. I urge colleagues tomorrow to support all of the amendments in our vote and I hope that these amendments will be adopted and, if they are adopted, I hope that the Commission will change its attitude and grasp the opportunity that presents itself to act now on discards, not just talk about action at some time in the future.

2-577

Struan Stevenson (ECR). – Mr President, I have lodged an amendment to the Technical Measures Regulation to try to resolve the anomaly that Ian Hudghton just referred to, which has arisen off the west coast of Scotland.

In a well-intentioned attempt to conserve white-fish stocks in this area, the Commission introduced temporary catch composition rules for a period of 12 months at the end of 2009, but these temporary rules have already been rolled over for a further year under a catch-all agreement that extended all EU technical measures for 12 months. Now the Commission is seeking to roll the rules over yet again to the end of 2012 while it prepares a new framework for technical measures under the CFP reform package.

The unintended consequence of this will mean that a temporary regulation that was introduced for a period of only one year will now run for at least three years, during which time the circumstances in the west of Scotland have changed dramatically, forcing our fishermen to dump good fresh haddock back into the sea, dead. I hope Parliament will support my amendment tomorrow.

2-578

Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, felicitando os quatro relatores, permitam-me que me centre apenas em dois dos relatórios em debate. Em 2008, a ausência de acordo sobre um projecto de regulamento destinado a simplificar e clarificar o regulamento comunitário relativo à conservação de recursos haliêuticos, conduziu à adopção do actual regulamento que institui um conjunto de medidas transitórias inicialmente previstas para o período entre 1 de Janeiro de 2010 e 30 de Junho

de 2011. A presente proposta legislativa prolonga este regime de transição durante um período suplementar de 18 meses, ou seja, até 1 de Janeiro de 2013, na pendência de um novo regulamento de medidas técnicas que enquadre a PCP reformada.

Neste período de transição importa manter um quadro regulamentar das pescarias, salvaguardar o interesse dos pescadores, sem perder de vista o objectivo fundamental da defesa das pescarias sustentáveis. Ora a actual intenção de não prorrogação da utilização das redes de tresmalho e a sua interdição a partir de 1 de Outubro de 2010, entre os 200 e 600 metros de profundidade, sem uma base científica sólida, não constitui o bom exemplo do agora referido. A actual proibição desta arte de pesca, que durante décadas foi utilizada por um segmento da frota artesanal portuguesa para a exploração sustentada de espécies como o tamboril e a pescada, constitui um rude golpe económico e social para o sector e comunidades piscatórias mais dependentes da exploração destes recursos.

Peço, pois, o vosso apoio para fazer aprovar uma proposta que eu e os meus colegas Capoulas Santos e João Ferreira apresentámos ao plenário e que mais não pretende do que garantir, até 2013 aquilo que era lei até 1 de Outubro de 2010.

Refiro-me ainda à proposta de regulamento que estabelece medidas financeiras comunitárias relativas à execução da Política Comum das Pescas e ao direito do mar-o relatório Ferreira. Este, a par do FEP é o mais importante instrumento financeiro para apoio às pescas, prevendo financiamento no domínio das relações internacionais, governação, recolha de dados e pareceres científicos, bem como do controlo da execução da PCP.

Neste âmbito, manifesto o meu total apoio às propostas apresentadas em plenário pelo relator, de incrementar a possibilidade de co-financiamento comunitário, até 60%, no domínio da recolha, gestão e utilização de dados de base, bem como no que diz respeito à recolha, gestão e utilização de dados suplementares. O reconhecimento generalizado e crescente da importância de uma gestão das pescas, apoiada num conhecimento científico actualizado e rigoroso sobre o estado dos recursos justificam plenamente a aprovação das propostas do relator, bem como o seu relatório como um todo.

2-579

Josefa Andrés Barea (S&D). – Señor Presidente, señora Comisaria, felicito a los cuatro ponentes de los informes por su gran trabajo. Voy a centrarme en dos informes, dada la importancia que tienen.

Uno de ellos versa sobre el Acuerdo con la Unión de las Comoras. Estamos ante un acuerdo de pesca de la Unión Europea con un país al sudeste de África –lo digo por situarnos también espacialmente– donde el 60 % de la población vive por debajo del umbral de la pobreza y donde su única forma de ingreso es el turismo o las ayudas estatales.

Este Acuerdo fija la posibilidad de capturar la pesca excedente. Y lo repito: pesca excedente. Y, por otra parte, prevé una contrapartida para que se desarrolle el propio país, para mejorar sus infraestructuras y sus propias capacidades. Instaura un marco de colaboración bajo criterios de una pesca sostenible y responsable, preservando los recursos biológicos; hay que tener en cuenta que allí hay especies migratorias como el atún y cada año se fija, bajo criterios científicos, el *stock* del año siguiente. Facilita las investigaciones científicas y la presencia de observadores a bordo, así como el mantenimiento de la pesca de la zona, ya que se limita a un espacio de costa para que la pesca autóctona se desarrolle.

Este protocolo tiene un interés muy importante, por el acceso que tienen los buques de pesca europeos a la zona, por la ayuda al desarrollo, la mejora del empleo y la mejora de las perspectivas económicas. Pero también por un elemento muy importante: evita que pesquen terceros países donde la preservación del medio ambiente no esté adecuadamente asegurada. El 75 % de los recursos pesqueros en la zona son capturados por terceros países.

Por lo tanto, consideramos que este Acuerdo no solamente ayuda a la Unión de las Comoras sino que también ayuda a mantener el medio ambiente.

Hay que prestar también especial atención al importante informe Grelier, sobre un Reglamento que establece medidas técnicas que expirarían dentro de tres meses y para las que se pide que se prolonguen hasta diciembre de 2012, porque, si no, existiría un vacío legal, una inseguridad jurídica y una mala conservación de los recursos marinos.

Pero destacamos también la valoración de la declaración adjunta en que se pide a la Comisión que acepte determinadas modificaciones: algunas medidas técnicas propuestas por los Estados. Se ha mencionado aquí ya el tema de las redes, también hablamos del tema de la profundidad. Afecta a determinadas pesquerías y consideramos que la Comisión debería recogerlo por el impacto que tiene sobre las propias poblaciones. Afecta a las zonas 8, 9 y 10, y es importante subsanar estas deficiencias que se producen en la aplicación de un Reglamento que daña no solamente a las pesquerías, sino también a las poblaciones de origen.

2-580

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE). – Señor Presidente, voy a votar a favor de este Acuerdo, porque es positivo para la flota europea. En total, se beneficiarán de él setenta buques, doce más que con el convenio anterior, que llevarán, al menos, un tripulante local en estas embarcaciones.

Es positivo para las Comoras, su ciudadanía y su sector productivo, por las siguientes razones: en primer lugar, porque el acuerdo fomenta una cooperación basada en impulsar el desarrollo local, porque a esa tarea se destina la compensación financiera que conlleva; en segundo

lugar, porque impulsa el respeto de los derechos humanos por parte de los Gobiernos de la zona y porque ésta es condición clave para mantener el acuerdo; en tercer lugar, porque apoya las formas más artesanales de pesca que se practican allí y porque garantiza que las 8 500 personas que viven en las Comoras de este tipo de actividad dispongan de su propia zona de pesca: los buques europeos no podrán faenar dentro de las diez millas marinas que rodean cada isla.

Por último, porque promueve la sostenibilidad de la pesca en la zona y porque incluye un mecanismo de evaluación objetiva del estado de los *stocks* de pesca y establece mecanismos de cooperación científica para ello.

2-581

Seán Kelly (PPE). – A Uachtaráin, tá áthas orm cúpla focal a rá ar son mo ghrúpa maidir leis an ábhar seo agus, gan dabht ar bith, is ábhar conspóideach í an iascaireacht, ceann de na hábhair is conspóidí a thagann os comhair na Parlaiminte. Tá seanfhocal i mo thír féin a deireann ‘Ní lia duine ná tuairim’ agus tá sé seo fíor maidir leis na hiascairí agus an iascaireacht. Dá bhrí sin, tá sé deacair dúinne mar Fheisirí labhairt d’aon ghuth ar an ábhar ach, ag an am gcéanna, caithimid ar ndícheall a dheanamh.

2-582

Regarding Greenland in particular, I think the Commissioner gave a fairly balanced view of the situation. There are issues obviously regarding the confidence of the European Parliament vis-à-vis the Council, but, as she said herself, a pragmatic solution will be found and that is obviously desirable. It is important from the point of view of the European Union. It is equally important, or more important perhaps, from the point of view of Greenland – a country that is almost totally dependent on the European market for its fish and, of course, almost totally dependent on fishing for its economy.

One thing we can say regarding Greenland is that the fish coming from there, as envisaged here in this report, will be verifiable and be of top quality – unlike many of the fish coming into the European Union from the monstrous fish farms in South-East Asia, the quality of which cannot be verified, and indeed which many think come from polluted waters.

There is therefore a huge area for us to deal with, in particular because the Commissioner herself earlier this afternoon in Question Time painted a somewhat grim picture of the sustainability of fish stocks and coastal communities into the future. For that reason, there is a need to develop a major policy regarding aquaculture within Europe as part of the future CFP. In the meantime, I welcome the proposals here and I accept the Commissioner’s words on what will happen.

2-583

Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D). – Señor Presidente, señora Comisaria, estimados colegas, me sumo a las felicitaciones a los ponentes de estos cuatro informes.

Antes de referirme al informe del señor Ferreira y al informe de la señora Fraga Estévez, quiero expresar mi apoyo al informe del señor Capoulas Santos, que recomienda conceder la aprobación al Protocolo que fija las posibilidades de pesca y las contrapartidas financieras previstas en el Acuerdo de colaboración con la Unión de las Comoras, y recuerda la necesidad de que el Parlamento participe activamente en este proceso.

Comparto también los aspectos fundamentales del informe de la señora Grelier sobre medidas técnicas. Pido a la Comisión que acelere la evaluación de su impacto y que dé prioridad a la elaboración de un nuevo reglamento sobre las mismas para que pueda ser adaptado cuanto antes, a ser posible antes de 2013.

El informe Ferreira modifica el Reglamento (CE) n° 861/2006 sobre medidas financieras comunitarias, una de las herramientas utilizadas para la aplicación de la Política Pesquera Común, junto al Fondo Europeo de Pesca. Aclara su alcance, lo ajusta las necesidades reales de la política pesquera común en el marco del nuevo Tratado de Lisboa; por eso lo valoro positivamente.

Sin embargo, en línea con el ponente y teniendo en cuenta que una de las condiciones fundamentales para lograr una pesca sostenible es garantizar un conocimiento actualizado y preciso de la situación de las poblaciones de pesca, lamento que en el ámbito de la recopilación, la gestión y el uso de datos no se hayan podido aumentar los porcentajes de cofinanciación.

El informe Fraga Estévez afecta al establecimiento de normas en materia de salud animal y seguridad alimentaria para las importaciones de determinados productos pesqueros y derivados de la pesca procedentes de Groenlandia, bien tengan su origen en Groenlandia o procedan de terceros países.

Las normas afectan, prácticamente, al 90 % de las exportaciones de Groenlandia en este ámbito, que en el año 2007 ascendieron a doscientos cincuenta y un millones de euros. Existe un amplio consenso en aplicar a estos productos importados las normas que rigen el comercio en el interior de la Unión Europea, al que Groenlandia continúa asociada. De este modo, se va a extender el mercado único de los productos de la pesca y derivados.

Es evidente que no existe un acuerdo sobre cuál debe ser la base jurídica y por eso valoramos muy positivamente la actitud de la Comisión de favorecer un acuerdo. El Parlamento sigue el informe de su Servicio Jurídico, la opinión de la Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos, en la posición que se mantiene desde la Comisión de Pesca.

Esperamos que estas cuestiones se puedan solucionar, que se dé a Groenlandia la prioridad que tiene y que merece, y que se alcance un acuerdo legislativo.

2-584

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D). – Aș dori să îi felicit pe toți cei patru raportori pentru munca depusă în acest pachet de măsuri în domeniul pescuitului.

Vreau să subliniez că măsurile financiare comunitare privind punerea în aplicare a politicii comune în domeniul pescuitului reprezintă un instrument major de finanțare al Uniunii Europene în acest sector și ele trebuie adaptate în permanență la nevoile cetățenilor implicați în domeniu și în strânsă concordanță cu provocările actuale. Mijloacele financiare necesare punerii în aplicare a politicii comune a pescuitului includ și finanțarea pentru proiecte în domenii precum relații internaționale, guvernanta, colectarea datelor, consiliere științifică și sisteme de control, precum și punerea în aplicare a acestei politici.

Consider că gestionarea pescuitului trebuie să se bazeze pe informații științifice actuale, referitoare la stadiul în care se află stocurile, tocmai pentru a permite o adaptare cât mai eficientă a dispozițiilor regulamentului în vigoare, în funcție de nevoile reale.

2-585

Maria Damanaki, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I would like to give you some short explanations concerning your remarks.

With regard to the discussion on the Fisheries Partnership Agreements, we are now trying, in the framework of our proposal for the reform, to ensure the good implementation of these fisheries agreements for the benefit of the local population. Until we have the new proposal for the new generation of fisheries agreements, we have tried to improve the current situation. We are trying to ensure the implementation of the Comoros agreement and to do our best for the local population.

With regard to the problems mentioned in connection with Parliament and the information given to Members of Parliament about the agreements, the Commission has given all information – even restricted information – to Members of Parliament and this is what we will do in the future.

With regard to the technical measures and Mrs Grelier's report, I can understand that there were a lot of concerns because we are now prolonging the current regulation. We had to do so, because we have to wait for the implementation of the reform, but I can understand why you are urging us to take some measures in order to have new regulation before the end of 2013. What I can say – as I cannot give you promises I cannot keep – is that we will do our best to accelerate the procedure for a new regulation and also for the implementation of the basic regulation for the reform in order to give the Member States some competences regarding technical measures.

Regarding the next issue – the Financial Regulation – I hope that we will achieve a first reading approach, because this would be very good for the implementation of the regulation in the future.

With regard to the case of Greenland, I would like to reiterate that we are here to find a solution on the legal basis of the proposal. For the Commission, it is very important to work on the substance because a good relationship with Greenland is an absolute political priority for us. I can reiterate that the Commission is here to facilitate and to find a compromise with the Council.

2-586

Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos, *relator*. – Senhor Presidente, apenas poucos segundos para agradecer as referências que foram feitas e que vão ao encontro daquilo que era a minha própria expectativa. Sabemos que há pequenos aspectos relativamente aos Acordos de Parceria, que carecem de ser corrigidos.

Registei com apreço a posição da Senhora Comissária, incluindo a sua posição pessoal relativamente à participação dos deputados europeus e espero que essa sua posição pessoal possa influenciar a posição institucional da Comissão para chegarmos ao objectivo que pretendemos.

2-587

João Ferreira, *relator*. – Senhor Presidente, queria também eu agradecer os comentários que todos foram fazendo e a resistência apreciável que a esta hora todos ainda demonstram. Devo dizer, em relação aos comentários que foram feitos sobre o relatório das medidas financeiras, que as alterações que propomos não põem em causa o consenso até agora obtido no tríplice. Eu penso que, salvaguardado esse consenso, será possível ir um pouco mais longe e agradeço, nesse sentido, os comentários que aqui foram feitos por diversos colegas, de apoio às alterações propostas.

Creio que, como diziam alguns dos colegas, a não aprovação destas alterações seria uma incompreensível incoerência de uma União Europeia que, por um lado, reivindica uma crescente participação e atribui a determinadas áreas uma importância crescente, mas que por outro lado resiste em atribuir os recursos financeiros que são necessários para efectivamente reconhecer essa importância crescente.

Relativamente ao relatório das medidas técnicas transitórias, quero sublinhar- isso foi feito também em diversas intervenções- a alteração que é subscrita por mim e por outros dois colegas, que visa eliminar a discriminação negativa sem base científica que o justifique, e sublinho sem base científica que o justifique, a discriminação negativa que é imposta a alguns segmentos da frota portuguesa artesanal que utilizam as redes de tresmalho. Esta frota tem demonstrado, ao longo do tempo, a capacidade de utilizar os recursos em causa, nomeadamente o linguado e a pescada, de uma forma sustentável. Não havendo razões sólidas, científicas que justifiquem esta proibição, ela não devia ser levada por diante, até atendendo às consequências negativas significativas que isso vai implicar no plano económico e social.

Por iguais razões, quero aqui dizer, e para terminar, Senhor Presidente, que apoiamos as propostas também feitas pelos colegas irlandeses e escoceses sobre este mesmo relatório.

2-588

Estelle Grelier, *Berichterstatterin*. – Herr Präsident! Ich werde mich bemühen, langsamer zu sprechen – versprochen!

2-589

Monsieur le Président, je remercie les collègues pour leurs interventions, plutôt favorables à ce rapport, et qui font écho aux débats qui se sont tenus lors des réunions de la commission de la pêche.

Je partage la position de Mme la commissaire d'accepter l'amendement qui précise la taille des filets pour la capture du poisson sanglier et de ne pas accéder aux demandes particulières de modification de certaines mesures techniques, au motif qu'elles ne sont pas étayées par des études d'impact pour les bateaux et les écosystèmes concernés, ou que ses données scientifiques n'ont pas été transmises par les États membres, et que l'ensemble des mesures qui sont toutes liées entre elles n'ont pas été évaluées.

Je me permets d'insister – comme l'ont fait les précédents orateurs ce soir – sur l'urgence pour la Commission de procéder, au plus vite, à l'évaluation des mesures en cours et à l'élaboration, sur cette base, d'une nouvelle proposition en parallèle du processus de réforme de la PCP, et non pas à la fin de celui-ci. Je souhaitais vous rendre, Madame la Commissaire, attentive à ce point, et j'ai pris bonne note de votre volonté d'accélérer l'élaboration de la proposition.

En conclusion, je rappellerai l'importance d'un travail conjoint entre les institutions européennes et la filière pêche sur le recueil et le partage des données scientifiques, qui me semble être la condition d'une politique commune de la pêche renouvelée, juste et partagée, dotée de moyens suffisants – et c'est un point important –, qui allie enjeux économiques et pérennité de l'activité, dans l'intérêt de tous, des pêcheurs, des consommateurs et des citoyens.

2-590

Carmen Fraga Estévez, *Ponente*. – Señor Presidente, tengo que agradecer especialmente a la Comisaria la respuesta que ha dado a mi pregunta, diciendo que estaría dispuesta a aceptar la modificación de la base jurídica, y espero que también el Consejo siga la misma línea que ha indicado la señora Comisaria.

En cualquier caso, estuve reflexionando sobre la posibilidad de pedir mañana una devolución de este expediente a comisión, antes de llegar al voto final, pero después he reflexionado mejor y he visto que esto sólo puede retrasar aún más esta propuesta, que creo que es positiva para Groenlandia y también para la Unión Europea, y que sería conveniente no retrasarla más.

Espero, de todas maneras, que el Consejo acceda a las pretensiones, justificadísimas, de la Comisión de Pesca y espero que se llegue a una solución, dado que el único problema es la base jurídica y no el contenido.

En cualquier caso, celebro que hayamos llegado a este resultado; siempre nos queda, además, la posibilidad de ir al Tribunal de Justicia si vemos que conviene seguir con este tema. De todas maneras, demostramos la buena voluntad mañana, al emitir nuestra opinión, y esperamos que el Consejo reaccione y considere que ésta, como he dicho, es la primera lectura del Parlamento.

Por tanto, gracias a la Comisaria por su disposición a colaborar en este tema y simplemente, y a todos mis colegas que han colaborado y han apoyado este informe. Sólo me queda esperar que el Consejo acceda a nuestras pretensiones, que están, como digo, justificadas y avaladas no solamente por la Comisión de Asuntos Jurídicos sino también por los Servicios Jurídicos del Parlamento Europeo.

2-591

Der Präsident. – Die Gemeinsame Aussprache über vier Berichte betreffend Fischereiangelegenheiten ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung über alle vier Berichte findet am 6. April um 12.00 Uhr statt.

2-592

**16 - Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung:
siehe Protokoll**

2-593

17 - Schluss der Sitzung

2-594

(Die Sitzung wird um 23.20 Uhr geschlossen.)

НЕОКОНЧАТЕЛНО ИЗДАНИЕ

В настоящото издание (достъпно и в интернет - вж. страница последна) всяко изказване фигурира на езика, използван от оратора. Окончателно издание е достъпно едва впоследствие. Ораторите, които желаят в текста на изказванията им да бъдат нанесени корекции, следва да ги представят на Отдел "Протоколи и пълни стенографски протоколи на пленарни заседания" в едноседмичен срок на адреса, посочен на страница последна (по електронна поща поставете в полето "Относно" "CRE / дата").

EDICIÓN PROVISIONAL

La presente edición (disponible también en Internet - véase última página) contiene todas las intervenciones en la lengua usada por el orador. La edición definitiva estará disponible posteriormente. Las correcciones que los oradores deseen efectuar en el texto de su intervención deben enviarse a la Unidad de Actas y Actas Literales de la Sesión Plenaria en el plazo de una semana a la dirección que figura en la última página (para el e-mail: asunto «CRE / fecha»).

PROZATÍMNÍ VYDÁNÍ

V tomto vydání (které je rovněž k dispozici na internetu – viz poslední strana) je každé vystoupení zaznamenáno v jazyce, ve kterém je řečník přednesl. Řečníci, kteří si přejí provést opravy ve znění svých vystoupení, mohou do jednoho týdne předat opravy oddělení pro doslovný záznam a zápis z plenárního zasedání na adresu uvedenou na poslední straně (v příslušném e-mailu uvést v předmětu zprávy (subject): „CRE / datum“).

FORELØBIG UDGAVE

Denne udgave (findes også på internettet - se sidste side) indeholder samtlige taler på det af taleren anvendte sprog. En endelig udgave offentliggøres senere. Enheden for Plenarmødeprotokoller og -referater bør inden en uge, på den adresse der er angivet på sidste side, underrettes om de ændringer, som talerne måtte ønske at foretage i deres indlæg (ved henvendelse pr. e-mail, skriv venligst "CRE / dato" under "subject").

VORLÄUFIGE AUSGABE

Diese Ausgabe (auch im Internet abrufbar — siehe hintere Umschlagseite) enthält alle Reden in der vom Redner verwendeten Sprache. Eine endgültige Ausgabe wird später veröffentlicht. Etwaige Korrekturen, die die Redner am Text ihrer Reden vorzunehmen wünschen, sollten innerhalb einer Woche dem Referat Plenarprotokolle an die auf der Rückseite angegebene Adresse zugesandt werden (für E-Mail: im Betreff erwähnen: CRE / Datum).

ESIALGNE VERSIOON

Käesolevas versioonis (mis on kättesaadav ka internetis – vt viimast lehekülge) on toodud kõikide sõnavõtude originaaltekstid. Lõplik versioon avaldatakse hiljem. Sõnavõtjatel, kes soovivad oma sõnavõttus teha muudatusi, palutakse edastada muudatused ühe nädala jooksul täiskogu istungite protokollide üksusele viimasel leheküljel toodud aadressil (e-posti puhul märkida teemaks „CRE / kuupäev“).

Списък на съкращенията на политическите групи

PPE	Група на Европейската народна партия (Християндемократи)
S&D	Група на прогресивния алианс на социалистите и демократите в Европейския парламент
ALDE	Група на Алианса на либералите и демократите за Европа
Verts/ALE	Група на Зелените/Европейски свободен алианс
ECR	Европейски консерватори и реформисти
GUE/NGL	Конфедеративна група на Европейската обединена левица - Северна зелена левица
EFD	Група „Европа на свободата и демокрацията“
NI	Независими членове

Lista de las siglas de los grupos políticos

PPE	Grupo del Partido Popular Europeo (Demócrata-cristianos)
S&D	Grupo de la Alianza Progresista de los Socialistas y Demócratas en el Parlamento Europeo
ALDE	Grupo de la Alianza de los Demócratas y Liberales por Europa
Verts/ALE	Grupo de los Verdes/Alianza Libre Europea
ECR	Grupo de los Conservadores y Reformistas Europeos
GUE/NGL	Grupo Confederal de la Izquierda Unitaria Europea/Izquierda Verde Nórdica
EFD	Grupo Europa de la Libertad y de la Democracia
NI	No inscritos

Seznam zkratek politických skupin

PPE	Skupina Evropské lidové strany (Křesťanští demokraté)
S&D	Skupina Pokrokové aliance socialistů a demokratů v Evropském parlamentu
ALDE	Skupina Aliance liberálů a demokratů pro Evropu
Verts/ALE	Skupina Zelených/Evropské svobodné aliance
ECR	Skupina Evropských konzervativců a reformistů
GUE/NGL	Skupina konfederace Evropské sjednocené levice a Severské zelené levice
EFD	Skupina Evropa svobody a demokracie
NI	Nezařazení poslanci

Liste over forkortelserne for de politiske grupper

PPE	Det Europæiske Folkepartis gruppe (Kristelige Demokrater)
S&D	Gruppen for Det Progressive Forbund af Socialdemokrater i Europa-Parlamentet
ALDE	Gruppen Alliancen af Liberale og Demokrater for Europa
Verts/ALE	Gruppen De Grønne/Den Europæiske Fri Alliance
ECR	Gruppen De Europæiske Konservative og Reformister
GUE/NGL	Den Europæiske Venstrefløjs Fællesgruppe/Nordisk Grønne Venstre
EFD	Gruppen for Europæisk Frihed og Demokrati
NI	Løsgængere

Liste der Abkürzungen der Fraktionen

PPE	Fraktion der Europäischen Volkspartei (Christdemokraten)
S&D	Fraktion der Progressiven Allianz der Sozialisten & Demokraten im Europäischen Parlament
ALDE	Fraktion der Allianz der Liberalen und Demokraten für Europa
Verts/ALE	Fraktion der Grünen / Freie Europäische Allianz
ECR	Fraktion Europäische Konservative und Reformisten
GUE/NGL	Konföderale Fraktion der Vereinigten Europäischen Linken/Nordische Grüne Linke
EFD	Fraktion Europa der Freiheit und der Demokratie
NI	Fraktionslos

Fraktsioonide lühendite nimekiri

PPE	Euroopa Rahvapartei (kristlike demokraatide) fraktsioon
S&D	Euroopa Parlamendi Sotsialistide ja Demokraatide Progressiivse Liidu fraktsioon
ALDE	Euroopa Demokraatide ja Liberaalide Liidu fraktsioon
Verts/ALE	Roheliste / Euroopa Vabaliidu fraktsioon
ECR	Euroopa Konservatiivide ja Reformistide fraktsioon
GUE/NGL	Euroopa Ühendatud Vasakpoolsete / Põhjamaade Roheliste Vasakpoolsete liitfraktsioon
EFD	Vaba ja Demokraatliku Euroopa fraktsioon
NI	fraktsioonilise kuuluvusega parlamendiliikmed

BG

ES

CS

DA

DE

ET

ΠΡΟΣΩΡΙΝΗ ΕΚΔΟΣΗ

Η παρούσα έκδοση (διαθέσιμη και στο Διαδίκτυο - βλ. οπισθόφυλλο) περιέχει τα πρωτότυπα όλων των αγορεύσεων. Η τελική έκδοση θα είναι διαθέσιμη αργότερα. Οι αγορητές που επιθυμούν να επιφέρουν διορθώσεις στις αγορεύσεις τους καλούνται να τις διαβιβάσουν στη μονάδα Πρακτικών της Ολομέλειας στο αργότερο μέσα σε μία εβδομάδα στη διεύθυνση που αναγράφεται στο οπισθόφυλλο (για το e-mail: να αναγράφεται στο θέμα "CRE / ημερομηνία").

PROVISIONAL EDITION

This edition (also available on the Internet – see back cover) contains the texts of all speeches in the original language used by the speaker. The final edition will be available later. Speakers wishing to correct their speeches are requested to send any corrections within a week to the Plenary Records Unit at the address shown on the last page (if using e-mail, please enter 'CRE / date' in the subject line).

EDITION PROVISOIRE

Dans la présente édition (disponible également sur Internet - v. dernière page) chaque intervention figure dans la langue utilisée par l'orateur. Une édition définitive sera disponible ultérieurement. Les orateurs qui désirent voir apporter des corrections au texte de leur intervention sont priés de transmettre celles-ci à l'unité des Procès-verbaux et des Comptes rendus de la plénière dans un délai d'une semaine à l'adresse figurant en dernière page (pour l'e-mail: mentionner dans le sujet "CRE / date").

EAGRÁN SEALADACH

Is é atá san eagrán seo (atá ar fáil ar an Idirlíon chomh maith - feic clúdach cúil) ná téacsanna bunaidh de gach aitheasc. Beidh eagrán deiridh ar fáil níos déanaí. Ba cheart do chainteoirí aon cheartúcháin a chur in iúl don Aonad do Thaifead na gCruinnithe lómánacha trí ríomhphost a sheoladh laistigh de sheachtain chuig an seoladh ar an leathanach deiridh (cuir 'CRE/dáta' mar ábhar an ríomhphoist le do thoil).

EDIZIONE PROVVISORIA

La presente edizione (disponibile anche su Internet all'indirizzo indicato all'ultima pagina) contiene tutti i discorsi nella lingua usata dall'oratore. L'edizione definitiva sarà pubblicata successivamente. Gli oratori che desiderino rivedere il testo dei loro interventi sono pregati di far pervenire le correzioni entro una settimana all'unità Processi verbali e resoconti integrali della seduta plenaria all'indirizzo indicato all'ultima pagina (per l'e-mail indicare nell'oggetto "CRE / data").

PAGAJDU VERSIJA

Šajā izdevumā (pieejams arī internetā — sk. pēdējo lappusi) visas runas ir oriģinālajā valodā. Galīgā versija būs pieejama vēlāk. Runātāji, kas vēlas labot savas runas, tiek lūgti izlaboto tekstu vienas nedēļas laikā nosūtīt Plenārsēžu protokolū un stenogrammu nodājai uz adresi, kura norādīta pēdējā lappusē (epastā kā tematū rakstīt: CRE / datums).

Συνομογραφίες των πολιτικών ομάδων

PPE	Ομάδα του Ευρωπαϊκού Λαϊκού Κόμματος (Χριστιανοδημοκράτες)
S&D	Ομάδα της Προοδευτικής Συμμαχίας των Σοσιαλιστών και Δημοκρατών στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο
ALDE	Ομάδα της Συμμαχίας Φιλελευθέρων και Δημοκρατών για την Ευρώπη
Verts/ALE	Ομάδα των Πρασίνων / Ευρωπαϊκή Ελεύθερη Συμμαχία
ECR	Ευρωπαίοι Συντηρητικοί και Μεταρρυθμιστές
GUE/NGL	Συνμοσπονδιακή Ομάδα της Ευρωπαϊκής Ενωτικής Αριστεράς/Αριστερά των Πρασίνων των Βορείων Χωρών
EFD	Ευρώπη ελευθερίας και δημοκρατίας
NI	Μη Εγγεγραμμένοι

List of abbreviations denoting political groups

PPE	Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats)
S&D	Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the European Parliament
ALDE	Group of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe
Verts/ALE	Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance
ECR	European Conservatives and Reformists Group
GUE/NGL	Confederal Group of the European United Left - Nordic Green Left
EFD	Europe of Freedom and Democracy Group
NI	Non-attached Members

Liste des sigles des groupes politiques

PPE	Groupe du Parti populaire européen (Démocrates-Chrétiens)
S&D	Groupe de l'Alliance progressiste des Socialistes et Démocrates au Parlement européen
ALDE	Groupe Alliance des démocrates et des libéraux pour l'Europe
Verts/ALE	Groupe des Verts/Alliance libre européenne
ECR	Groupe des Conservateurs et Réformistes européens
GUE/NGL	Groupe confédéral de la Gauche unitaire européenne/Gauche verte nordique
EFD	Groupe Europe Liberté Démocratie
NI	Non-inscrits

Liosta de ghiorrúcháin na ngrúpaí polaitiúla

PPE	Grúpa Pháirtí an Phobail Eorpaigh (Na Daonlathaithe Críostaí)
S&D	An Grúpa d'Aontas Forchéimnitheach na Sóisialaithe agus na nDaonlathaithe i bParlaimint na hEorpa
ALDE	Grúpa Chomhghuaillíocht na Liobrálaithe agus na nDaonlathaithe
Verts/ALE	An Grúpa Glas/Grúpa na Saor-Chomhghuaillíochta Eorpaí
ECR	An Grúpa do Choimeádaigh agus Leasaitheoirí na hEorpa
GUE/NGL	Grúpa Cónasctha den Chlé Aontaithe Eorpach - den Chlé Ghlas Nordach
EFD	An Grúpa d'Eorpa na Saoirse agus an Daonlathais
NI	Feisirí Neamhcheangailte

Elenco delle sigle dei gruppi politici

PPE	Gruppo del Partito popolare europeo (Democratico Cristiano)
S&D	Gruppo dell'Alleanza Progressista di Socialisti e Democratici al Parlamento europeo
ALDE	Gruppo dell'Alleanza dei Democratici e dei Liberali per l'Europa
Verts/ALE	Gruppo Verde/Alleanza libera europea
ECR	Gruppo dei Conservatori e Riformisti europei
GUE/NGL	Gruppo confederale della Sinistra unitaria europea/Sinistra verde nordica
EFD	Gruppo Europa della libertà e della democrazia
NI	Non iscritti

Saraksts ar politisko grupu saīnājumiem

PPE	Eiropas Tautas partijas grupa (Kristīgie demokrāti)
S&D	Eiropas Parlamenta sociālistu un demokrātu progresīvās alianses grupa
ALDE	Eiropas Liberāļu un demokrātu apvienības grupa
Verts/ALE	Zaļo un Eiropas Brīvās apvienības grupa
ECR	Eiropas Konservatīvo un reformistu grupa
GUE/NGL	Eiropas Apvienotā kreiso un Ziemeļvalstu Zaļo kreiso spēku konfederālā grupa
EFD	grupa „Brīvības un demokrātijas Eiropa”
NI	Pie politiskajām grupām nepiederošie deputāti

EL

EN

FR

GA

IT

LV

NEGALUTINĖ REDAKCIJA

Šioje redakcijoje (ją taip pat galima rasti internete – žr. paskutinį puslapį) pateikiami visų pranešimų tekstai originalo kalba. Galutinė redakcija bus paruošta vėliau. Kalbėjusiųjų, norinčių pataisyti savo pranešimus, prašome pateikti savo pataisymus Plenarinių posėdžių protokolų ir stenogramų skyriui paskutiniame puslapyje nurodytu adresu ne vėliau kaip per vieną savaitę (siunčiant el. paštu, dalyko skiltyje nurodykite CRE / data).

IDEIGLENES KIADÁS

A jelen kiadásban (amely az Interneten is hozzáférhető, ld. az utolsó oldalt) minden felszólalás a felszólaló által használt nyelven szerepel. A végleges kiadás elkészítésére később kerül sor. Azok a felszólalók, akik javításokat kívánnak tenni felszólalásuk szövegében, szíveskedjenek a kívánt javításokat egyhetes határidőn belül eljuttatni a plenaris ülésnek jegyzőkönyvéért és szó szerinti jegyzőkönyvéért felelős osztálynak, az utolsó oldalon szereplő címre (az e-mailek tárgyában tüntesse fel a következőt: „CRE / dátum”).

EDIZZJONI PROVIŻORJA

Din l-edizzjoni (li tinstab ukoll fuq l-Internet - ara l-qoxra ta' wara) fiha t-testi originali tad-diskorsi kollha. L-edizzjoni finali tkun disponibbli aktar 'il quddiem. Dawk li jixtiequ jikkoreġu d-diskors tagħhom huma mitluba li jgħaddu, fi żmien għimgħa, l-verżjonijiet riveduti lill-Unità tal-Minuti u ta' l-Atti tal-Plenarja, fl-indirizz indikat fuq il-qoxra ta' wara (jekk tuża l-email, jekk jogħġbok ikteb CRE / id-data fil-linja indikata).

VOORLOPIGE UITGAVE

Deze uitgave (ook te vinden op Internet - zie achterkant) omvat alle redevoeringen in de taal waarin zij zijn uitgesproken. Een definitieve versie in elk van de officiële talen zal op een later tijdstip verschijnen. Sprekers die verbeteringen in de tekst van hun redevoeringen wensen aan te brengen, kunnen deze binnen een week aan de Afdeling notulen en volledig verslag plenaire vergaderingen op het op de achterkant aangegeven adres doen toekomen (Voor e-mail: onder onderwerp vermelden: CRE / datum).

WYDANIE TYMCZASOWE

Niniejsze wydanie (dostępne również na stronach internetowych - zob. ostatnia strona) zawiera teksty wszystkich przemówień w językach mówców. Wydanie ostateczne będzie dostępne później. Mówcy, którzy chcieliby wnieść poprawki do tekstu swojego przemówienia, proszeni są o przesłanie poprawek do Wydziału protokołów i stenogramów z posiedzenia plenarnego w terminie jednego tygodnia na adres podany na ostatniej stronie (zaznaczając w temacie wiadomości e-mail: CRE / data).

EDIÇÃO PROVISÓRIA

A presente edição (também disponível na Internet - cf. última página) contém todas as intervenções na língua utilizada pelo respectivo orador. A edição definitiva será publicada ulteriormente. As correções que os oradores desejem efectuar no texto das respectivas intervenções devem ser transmitidas, no prazo de uma semana, à Unidade da Acta e do Relato Integral das Sessões, para o endereço que figura na última página deste caderno (para a transmissão via e-mail, é necessário inscrever a menção "CRE / data" no campo assunto).

Frakcijų pavadinimų sutrumpinimų sąrašas

PPE	Europos liaudies partijos (krikščionių demokratų) frakcija
S&D	Europos Parlamento socialistų ir demokratų pažangiojo aljanso frakcija
ALDE	Liberalų ir demokratų aljanso už Europą frakcija
Verts/ALE	Žaliųjų frakcija / Europos laisvasis aljansas
ECR	Europos konservatorių ir reformuotojų frakcija
GUE/NGL	Europos vieningųjų kairiųjų jungtinė frakcija / Šiaurės šalių žalieji kairieji
EFD	Laisvos ir demokratiškos Europos frakcija
NI	Nepriklausomi nariai

A képviselőcsoportok betűszó szerinti listája

PPE	az Európai Néppárt (Kereszténydemokraták) képviselőcsoportja
S&D	az Európai Szocialisták és Demokraták Progresszív Szövetsége képviselőcsoport
ALDE	Liberálisok és Demokraták Szövetsége Európáért képviselőcsoport
Verts/ALE	a Zöldek/Európai Szabad Szövetség képviselőcsoport
ECR	Európai Konzervatívok és Reformisták képviselőcsoport
GUE/NGL	az Egységes Európai Baloldal/Északi Zöld Baloldal képviselőcsoport
EFD	a Szabadság és Demokrácia Európája képviselőcsoport
NI	független képviselők

Lista ta' abbrevjazzjonijiet ta' gruppi politici

PPE	Grupp tal-Partit Popolari Ewropew (Demokristjani)
S&D	Grupp tal-Alleanza Progressiva tas-Socjalisti u d-Demokratiċi fil-Parlament Ewropew
ALDE	Grupp ta' l-Alleanza tal-Liberali u d-Demokratiċi għall-Ewropa
Verts/ALE	Grupp tal-Hodor/Alleanza Ħielsa Ewropea
ECR	Konservattivi u Riformisti Ewropej
GUE/NGL	Grupp Konfederali tax-Xellug Magħqud Ewropew - Xellug Aħdar Nordiku
EFD	Grupp għall-Ewropa Ħielsa u demokratika
NI	Membri mhux affiljati

Lijst van afkorting van de fracties

PPE	Fractie van de Europese Volkspartij (Christen-democraten)
S&D	Fractie van de Progressieve Alliantie van Socialisten en Democraten in het Europees Parlement
ALDE	Fractie Alliantie van Liberalen en Democraten voor Europa
Verts/ALE	Fractie De Groenen/Vrije Europese Alliantie
ECR	Fractie Europese Conservatieven en Hervormers
GUE/NGL	Confederale Fractie Europees Unitair Links/Noords Groen Links
EFD	Europa van Vrijheid en Democratie
NI	Niet-ingeschrevenen

Lista skrótów grup politycznych

PPE	Grupa Europejskiej Partii Ludowej (Chrześcijańscy Demokraci)
S&D	Grupa Postępowego Sojuszu Socjalistów i Demokratów w Parlamencie Europejskim
ALDE	Grupa Porozumienia Liberalów i Demokratów na rzecz Europy
Verts/ALE	Grupa Zielonych / Wolne Przymierze Europejskie
ECR	Grupa Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformistów
GUE/NGL	Konfederacyjna Grupa Zjednoczonej Lewicy Europejskiej / Nordycka Zielona Lewica
EFD	Grupa Europy Wolności i Demokracji
NI	Niezzrzeszeni

Lista das siglas dos grupos políticos

PPE	Grupo do Partido Popular Europeu (Democratas-Cristãos)
S&D	Grupo da Aliança Progressista dos Socialistas e Democratas no Parlamento Europeu
ALDE	Grupo da Aliança dos Democratas e Liberais pela Europa
Verts/ALE	Grupo dos Verdes/Aliança Livre Europeia
ECR	Grupo dos Conservadores e Reformistas Europeus
GUE/NGL	Grupo Confederal da Esquerda Unitária Europeia/Esquerda Nórdica Verde
EFD	Grupo Europa da Liberdade e da Democracia
NI	Não-inscritos

LT

HU

MT

NL

PL

PT

EDIȚIE PROVIZORIE

În prezenta ediție (disponibilă și pe internet – consultați ultima pagină), fiecare intervenție figurează în limba utilizată de către vorbitor. Ediția definitivă va fi disponibilă la o dată ulterioară. Vorbitorii care doresc să aducă modificări textului intervenției lor sunt rugați să le transmită în termen de o săptămână Unității Proceese-verbale și Stenograme Ședințe Plenare, la adresa indicată pe ultima pagină (în cazul trimerilor pe e-mail: menționați la rubrica subiect „CRE/data”).

EDBEŽNÉ VYDANIE

Toto vydanie, ktoré sa nachádza aj na internete (pozri poslednú stranu), obsahuje znenie všetkých prejavov uvedených v pôvodnom jazyku rečníka. Konečná verzia bude k dispozícii neskôr. Rečníci, ktorí chcú vložiť opravy do svojich prejavov, môžu zaslať všetky opravy na adresu Oddelenia pre zápisnice a doslovné zápisy z plenárnej schôdze uvedenú na poslednej strane, a to do jedného týždňa (ak ide o e-mailovú korešpondenciu, treba uviesť ako predmet = CRE / dátum).

ZAČASNA VERZIJA

V začasni različici (na razpolago tudi na svetovnem spletu - glej hrbtno stran) so govori v jeziku, v katerem je govorec nastopil. Naknadno bo na razpolago tudi končna različica. Govorci, ki želijo vnesti popravke v besedilo svojega govora, naj jih v roku enega tedna posredujejo službi za zapisnike in dobesečne zapise plenarnega zasedanja na naslov, naveden na hrbtni strani (prek elektronske pošte: omenjeno v zadevi "CRE / datum").

VÄLIAIKAINEN VERSIO

Julkaisu (joka on saatavilla myös Internetissä – katso takakansi) sisältää kaikkien puheiden alkuperäiset versiot. Lopullinen julkaisu ilmestyy myöhemmin. Puhujia, jotka haluavat tehdä korjauksia puheisiinsa, pyydetään toimittamaan korjatut versiot täysistuntopöytäkirjoista ja sanatarjoista istuntoselostuksista vastaavalle yksikölle viikon kuluessa takakannessa mainittuun osoitteeseen (sähköpostia varten: asiakenttään maininta "CRE / päivämäärä").

PRELIMINÄR UTGÅVA

Denna utgåva (som också finns tillgänglig på Internet – se nedan) innehåller samtliga anföranden på originalspråket. En slutlig version kommer att offentliggöras senare. Talare som önskar justera sina anföranden ombuds skicka den justerade versionen till enheten för plenarsammanträdesprotokoll inom en vecka, se adress nedan (för e-post: ange som ärende "CRE / datum").

Lista siglelor grupurilor politice

PPE	Grupul Partidului Popular European (Creștin Democrat)
S&D	Grupul Alianței Progresiste a Socialiștilor și Democraților din Parlamentul European
ALDE	Grupul Alianței Liberalilor și Democraților pentru Europa
Verts/ALE	Grupul Verzilor/Aliața Liberă Europeană
ECR	Grupul Conservatorilor și Reformiștilor Europeni
GUE/NGL	Grupul Confederal al Stângii Unite Europene/Stânga Verde Nordică
EFD	Grupul Europa Libertății și Democrației
NI	Deputați neafiliați

Zoznam skratiek politických skupín

PPE	Poslanecký klub Európskej ľudovej strany (kresťanských demokratov)
S&D	Skupina Pokrokovej aliancie socialistov a demokratov v Európskom parlamente
ALDE	Skupina Aliancie liberálov a demokratov za Európu
Verts/ALE	Skupina zelených/Európska slobodná aliancia
ECR	Európski konzervatívci a reformisti
GUE/NGL	Konfederatívna skupina Európskej zjednotenej ľavice - Severskej zelenej ľavice
EFD	Skupina Európa slobody a demokracie
NI	Nezaradení poslanci

Seznam kratic političnih skupin

PPE	skupina Evropske ljudske stranke (krščanskih demokratov)
S&D	skupina Napredne zveze socialistov in demokratov v Evropskem parlamentu
ALDE	skupina Zaveznitstva liberalcev in demokratov za Evropo
Verts/ALE	skupina Zelenih/Evropske svobodne zveze
ECR	skupina Evropskih konservativcev in reformistov
GUE/NGL	konfederalna skupina Evropske združene levice - Zelene nordijske levice
EFD	skupina Evropa svobode in demokracije
NI	samosojni poslanci

Poliittisten ryhmien lyhenteet

PPE	Euroopan kansanpuolueen (kristillisdemokraatit) ryhmä
S&D	Euroopan parlamentin sosialistien ja demokraattien progressiivisen liiton ryhmä
ALDE	Euroopan liberaalidemokraattien liiton ryhmä
Verts/ALE	Vihreät / Euroopan vapaa allianssi -ryhmä
ECR	Euroopan konservatiivit ja reformistit
GUE/NGL	Euroopan yhtyneen vasemmiston konfедераatioryhmä / Pohjoismaiden vihreä vasemmisto
EFD	Vapaa ja demokraattinen Eurooppa
NI	Sitoutumattomat

Förteckning över förkortningarna för de politiska grupperna

PPE	Europeiska folkpartiets grupp (kristdemokrater)
S&D	Gruppen Progressiva alliansen av socialister och demokrater i Europaparlamentet
ALDE	Gruppen Alliansen liberaler och demokrater för Europa
Verts/ALE	Gruppen De gröna/Europeiska fria alliansen
ECR	Gruppen Europeiska konservativa och reformister
GUE/NGL	Gruppen Europeiska enade vänstern/Nordisk grön vänster
EFD	Gruppen Frihet och demokrati i Europa
NI	Grupplösa

PARLEMENT EUROPEËN

Secrétariat général - Procès-verbaux et Comptes rendus de la Plénière
L-2929 LUXEMBOURG

e-mail : pv-cre@europarl.europa.eu

Internet : <http://www.europarl.europa.eu>

(aller vers: "Activités", "Plénière", "Débats")

RO

SK

SL

FI

SV