

**ВТОРНИК 9 МАРТ 2010 Г.**  
**MARTES 9 DE MARZO DE 2010**  
**ÚTERÝ, 9. BŘEZNA 2010**  
**TIRSDAG DEN 9. MARTS 2010**  
**DIENSTAG, 9. MÄRZ 2010**  
**TEISIPÄEV, 9. MÄRTS 2010**  
**TPITH 9 MAPTIOY 2010**  
**TUESDAY, 9 MARCH 2010**  
**MARDI 9 MARS 2010**  
**MARTEDI' 9 MARZO 2010**  
**OTRDIENA, 2010. GADA 9. MARTS**  
**2010 M. KOVO 9 D., ANTRADIENIS**  
**2010. MÁRCIUS 9., KEDD**  
**IT-TLIETA, 9 TA' MARZU 2010**  
**DINSDAG 9 MAART 2010**  
**WTOREK, 9 MARCA 2010**  
**TERÇA-FEIRA, 9 DE MARÇO DE 2010**  
**MARȚI 9 MARTIE 2010**  
**UTOROK 9. MARCA 2010**  
**TOREK, 9. MAREC 2010**  
**TIISTAI 9. MAALISKUUTA 2010**  
**TISDAGEN DEN 9 MARS 2010**

2-002

**PRESIDE: MIGUEL ANGEL MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ**  
*Vicepresidente*

2-003

## **1 - Apertura del período de sesiones**

2-004

**El Presidente.** – Declaro abierto el periodo de sesiones 2010-2011 del Parlamento Europeo.

2-005

## **2 - Apertura de la sesión**

2-006

*(Se abre la sesión a las 09.00 horas)*

2-007

## **3 - 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**

2-008

## **4 - Cuadro de indicadores del mercado interior - Protección de los consumidores - SOLVIT (debate)**

2-009

**El Presidente.** – El primer punto en el orden del día es el muy importante debate conjunto sobre tres informes que tratan del mercado interior y la protección del consumidor:

- el informe de Róza, Gräfin von Thun Und Hohenstein, en nombre de la Comisión de Mercado Interior y Protección del Consumidor, sobre el Cuadro de indicadores del mercado interior (SEC(2009)1007 - 2009/2141(INI)) (A7-0084/2009),
- el informe de Anna Hedh, en nombre de la Comisión de Mercado Interior y Protección del Consumidor, sobre la protección de los consumidores (2009/2137(INI)) (A7-0024/2010), y
- el informe de Cristian Silviu Buşoi, en nombre de la Comisión de Mercado Interior y Protección del Consumidor, sobre SOLVIT (2009/2138(INI)) (A7-0027/2010).

2-010

**Róza, Gräfin von Thun Und Hohenstein, sprawozdawca.** – Cieszę się, że mogę zaprezentować 19. tabelę wyników rynku wewnętrznego przedstawioną w lipcu zeszłego roku. Ten dokument pokazuje, że państwa członkowskie coraz lepiej radzą sobie z wdrażaniem prawa unijnego. Po raz kolejny osiągnięty został cel, ten cel, który głowy państw i rządów postawiły sobie po to, aby średni deficyt wdrażania dyrektyw nie przekraczał poziomu 1%. Ale i tak liczba dyrektyw, które nie zostały jeszcze wdrożone w jednym lub w kilku państwach członkowskich, czyli fragmentaryzacja rynku, ciągle jeszcze jest za duża. To jest ponad 100 dyrektyw rynku wewnętrznego. Ponadto aż 22 dyrektywy nie zostały wdrożone przez kolejne 2 lata po upływie terminu na transpozycję. Państwa członkowskie muszą zrobić jeszcze więcej, by rynek wewnętrzny stał się źródłem korzyści dla wszystkich Europejczyków.

W chwili, kiedy prezentuję państwu to właśnie sprawozdanie mam już w ręku kolejną tabelę wyników, jubileuszowe 20. wydanie, które pokazuje kolejny postęp we wdrażaniu ustawodawstwa unijnego. Deficyt transpozycji spada bowiem do 0,7%, czyli znacznie poniżej ustalonego celu. To jest najlepszy wynik w historii. Widać naprawdę wyraźnie, że praca Komisji Europejskiej, której wynikiem jest niniejsza publikacja, mobilizująco wpływa na państwa członkowskie. Tej dobrej, ciężkiej pracy można Komisji serdecznie pogratulować.

Kolejną dobrą wiadomością jest to, że fragmentaryzacja rynku spada z 6% do 5%. Niemniej jednak 74 dyrektywy pozostają niewdrożone w jednym lub w kilku państwach Unii Europejskiej, co utrzymuje bariery, bardzo szkodliwe bariery, w ramach rynku wewnętrznego dla obywateli i przedsiębiorców. Musimy razem pozbywać się tych barier.

W tym celu w sprawozdaniu Komisji Rynku Wewnętrznego proponuje się ściślejszą współpracę pomiędzy wszystkimi, współodpowiedzialnymi za wdrażanie ustawodawstwa unijnego oraz tymi, którzy ze wspólnego rynku korzystają. Proponujemy organizowanie corocznego forum rynku wewnętrznego *Single Market Forum SIMFO*, które skupiałoby instytucje europejskie, ale także skupiałoby państwa członkowskie, parlamentarzystów krajowych oraz przedstawicieli biznesu i przedstawicieli konsumentów. Takie forum będzie okazją do wymiany doświadczeń i najlepszych praktyk w zakresie wdrażania prawa unijnego oraz przygotowania strategii dla sprostania wyzwaniom, które ciągle jeszcze są przed nami.

Aby pozbyć się tych szkodliwych barier wzywamy Komisję Europejską do stosowania testu rynku wewnętrznego dla wszelkiej nowej unijnej legislacji po to, aby mieć pewność, że nie wpłynie ona negatywnie na wypracowane przez Unię Europejską 4 swobody. Niezwykle ważne jest także, aby dostarczyć obywatelom jasnej informacji o tym, jak rynek wewnętrzny działa, pamiętając o tym, że 20 lat temu rynek wewnętrzny został stworzony właśnie dla nich.

Aby zaprezentować pełniejszy obraz rozwoju rynku wewnętrznego Komisja Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów wzywa do równoczesnego publikowania tabeli wyników rynku wewnętrznego, sprawozdania SOLVIT, opracowań Biura Porad dla Obywatela (*Citizens Signpost Service*) i tabeli wyników rynków konsumenckich.

Na koniec chciałabym podziękować wszystkim, którzy pracowali nad tym sprawozdaniem, prosić państwa o głosowanie, bo jestem pewna, że to zapoczątkuje w przyszłości szybszym, właściwym wdrażaniem unijnej legislacji, w ramach porządków prawnych państw członkowskich. Dzięki temu Europejczycy będą napotykać mniej barier w rynku wewnętrznym, a przecież to właśnie jest sprawą zasadniczą do rozwoju naszej europejskiej gospodarki, ale również naszej europejskiej tożsamości.

2-011

**Anna Hedh, föredragande.** – Herr talman! Först och främst vill jag börja med att tacka skuggföredraganden och övrig personal för det goda samarbete vi har haft under tiden vi har arbetat med konsumentresultattavlan. Jag är också glad över att vi än en gång har fått fram ett betänkande som stöds av en överväldigande majoritet i utskottet för den inre marknaden och konsumentskydd.

Jag har alltid hävdat att vi behöver trygga och nöjda konsumenter i EU för att den inre marknaden ska fungera fullt ut. Därför var det glädjande att vi 2007 fick en kommissionsledamot med ansvar för just konsumentfrågorna. Meglena

Kuneva visade prov på starkt personligt engagemang och stor öppenhet som bidragit till att det har gått framåt med konsumentskyddspolitikerna och konsumentfrågorna. Konsumentresultattavlan är också ett av Meglena Kunevas verk.

Trots oron för uppdelningen av ansvaret för konsumentfrågorna mellan två kommissionsledamöter hoppas vi att arbetet kommer att fortsätta att utvecklas och bära frukt och att fokuseringen på konsumenterna inte försvagas av den nya kommissionen. Detta är ett ansvar som faktiskt är större nu, i och med att artikel 12 i Lissabonfördraget säger att konsumentskyddskraven ska beaktas när unionens övriga politik och verksamhet utformas och genomförs. Detta utgör ett viktigt steg för konsumenterna och något som jag inte tänker låta någon glömma i mitt fortsatta arbete som politiker.

Jag välkomnar verkligen den andra utgåvan av resultattavlan för konsumentmarknaden. Resultattavlan är ett av flera verktyg för att förbättra den inre marknaden och jag tycker att just det perspektiv som resultattavlan utgår ifrån är särskilt intressant, eftersom det handlar om medborgarnas förväntningar och problem och eftersom det gör den inre marknaden bättre för just konsumenterna. Resultattavlan har analyserat konsumentmarknaden enligt samma indikatorer som förra gången, nämligen pris, leverantörbyte, säkerhet, klagomål och kundtillfredsställelse.

Så småningom kommer dessa säkert att behöva utvecklas och förbättras och även nya indikatorer kommer att behöva tas in. I dagsläget anser jag dock att de utgör en tillräcklig grund, utifrån vilken man kan fastställa prioriteringar och dra slutsatser om vilka ytterligare analyser som behöver göras. Det är otroligt viktigt att vi har tålamod och ger resultattavlan tid att utvecklas. Den är fortfarande en nyfödd baby.

I den andra resultattavlan för konsumentmarknaden har vi bland annat sett tydliga indikationer på att konsumenterna har mer problem med tjänster än med varor och att priserna ökar mer sällan i sektorer där konsumenterna ofta byter leverantör. Den gränsöverskridande e-handeln utvecklas också långsammare på grund av gränshinder som gör konsumenterna oroliga och osäkra. Dessutom kan vi se att en effektiv tillämpning av lagstiftningen och faktiska prövningsmöjligheter är av avgörande betydelse för att marknaden ska fungera väl.

Uppgifter visar också att det finns stora skillnader mellan medlemsstaterna och att det finns utrymme för att förbättra prövningsmöjligheterna. Därför uppmanar jag nu kommissionen att följa upp grönboken om en kollektiv prövningsmöjlighet.

En effektiv tillämpning och tillsyn av EU:s konsumentskyddsbestämmelser är en förutsättning för att man ska öka konsumenternas förtroende. Tillsynen i EU är dock långt ifrån enhetlig och enligt statistiken finns det betydande skillnader mellan medlemsstaterna när det gäller budgeterna för marknadsövervakning och antalet medverkande inspektörer. Såväl kommissionen som de nationella tillsynsmyndigheterna måste därför öka sina ansträngningar för att uppnå målet att åstadkomma ett gott konsumentskydd och se till att konsumenterna känner sig trygga, så att de kan utnyttja alla möjligheter på den inre marknaden.

Det är mycket viktigt att stärka mekanismer för marknadsövervakning och tillsyn för att öka konsumenternas förtroende. Konsumenterna kommer nämligen att vara en avgörande faktor för den ekonomiska återhämtningen i Europa.

2-012

**Cristian Silviu Buşoi, Raportor.** – Doresc să mulţumesc în primul rând celor cu care am avut ocazia să lucrez pe raportul SOLVIT, Secretariatului Comisiei IMCO, tuturor raportorilor din umbră, precum şi celorlalţi colegi care şi-au manifestat interesul pentru acest dosar şi care au avut o contribuţie importantă la rezultatul final.

SOLVIT este o reţea care oferă soluţii informale problemelor care pot apărea din cauza implementării necorespunzătoare a legislaţiei privind piaţa internă. Este o inovaţie deosebit de utilă pentru consumatorii europeni şi întreprinderile din Uniunea Europeană, în vederea obţinerii beneficiilor pe care legislaţia europeană le aduce. Avem deseori probleme de implementare a legislaţiei europene privind piaţa internă, iar SOLVIT mi se pare o alternativă viabilă la calea judiciară, tribunalele fiind şi așa aglomerate cu tot felul de cauze diferite.

Nu putem trece cu vederea faptul că SOLVIT se confruntă cu un număr de cazuri în creştere constantă şi că, din acest punct de vedere, este, oarecum, victima propriului succes. Pentru ca SOLVIT să poată oferi asistenţă de calitate cetăţenilor şi întreprinderilor din Uniunea Europeană, e necesar ca în acele centre SOLVIT care nu dispun de personalul necesar, acesta să fie suplimentat.

Suplimentarea trebuie să se facă în mod raţional şi controlat, ţinând cont de populaţia ţării şi de numărul anterior de cazuri cu care centrul s-a confruntat în trecut. Această analiză trebuie făcută pentru a suplimenta personalul, exclusiv acolo unde este realmente nevoie. Bineînţeles că suplimentarea personalului SOLVIT implică şi nişte costuri. Raportul invită statele membre să recurgă la toate mijloacele disponibile pentru finanţarea suplimentării personalului, inclusiv la modalităţile alternative de finanţare.

O altă axă a acestui raport este promovarea rețelei SOLVIT, pe care, personal, – și cred că toți sunteți de acord cu mine – o consider de o importanță majoră. Apelând la SOLVIT, IMM-urile pot economisi sume importante pe care să le investească în alte domenii generatoare de creștere economică și mai utile pentru dezvoltarea acestora decât asistența juridică de care ar avea nevoie pentru soluționarea unor probleme, iar în ceea ce privește consumatorii individuali, SOLVIT le oferă acestora avantajul evitării procedurilor judiciare lungi și costisitoare.

Însă, pentru a beneficia de avantajele SOLVIT, cetățenii și întreprinderile trebuie în primul rând să cunoască eficiența rețelei. De aceea, consider că ar trebui să avem o implicare activă, atât a autorităților naționale, cât și a Comisiei Europene și a membrilor acestui Parlament, pentru promovarea SOLVIT. Mijloacele sunt multiple: de la mass-media la campanii de informare organizate de statele membre, până la crearea unui portal unic SOLVIT. De asemenea, serviciile publice care se ocupă de implementarea legislației europene în domeniul pieței interne ar putea desemna un responsabil pentru comunicarea SOLVIT, ceea ce, din nou, ar spori eficiența rețelei și ar contribui la promovarea ei. În calitate de deputați europeni, putem lua noi înșine inițiativa promovării SOLVIT și putem contribui la sensibilizarea colegilor noștri la nivelul parlamentelor naționale.

Schimbul de bune practici între statele membre în ceea ce privește promovarea SOLVIT și soluționarea problemelor de funcționare a acestei rețele este un alt element pe care prezentul raport îl încurajează puternic. Astfel, ideile bune pot fi difuzate și aplicate la nivel european în beneficiul tuturor.

În fine, nu putem să ignorăm faptul că uneori SOLVIT se confruntă cu numeroase cazuri care nu sunt de competența sa sau care sunt deosebit de complexe, ce își cer soluții pe alte căi. Petițiile adresate Comisiei pentru petiții a Parlamentului European pot fi o soluție pentru acele cazuri care sunt prea complexe pentru a fi rezolvate la nivelul SOLVIT. De aceea, una dintre propunerile acestui raport este ca portalul SOLVIT să facă trimitere la website-ul Comisiei pentru petiții a Parlamentului European, precum și către comisiile de specialitate din parlamentele naționale.

Acestea sunt doar câteva dintre ideile pe care se bazează raportul SOLVIT. Consider că aceste propuneri au capacitatea de a îmbunătăți funcționarea rețelei, în vederea unei asistențe de calitate oferite consumatorilor și întreprinderilor. SOLVIT are un potențial enorm, trebuie să analizăm însă continuu performanțele acestuia pentru a valorifica la maxim potențialul.

2-013

**Michel Barnier**, *membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, je trouve d'abord qu'il est très important que nous soyons côte à côte avec mon collègue John Dalli pour répondre à vos questions et vous informer de la mise en œuvre de ces différents outils ou textes.

Dans ma vie politique, j'ai, Mesdames et Messieurs, souvent pensé que l'effet de suivi était au moins aussi important que les effets d'annonce. Je trouve donc très important, quand on est dans un parlement national, ou au Parlement européen, quand on est à la Commission, que l'on ait des instruments pour vérifier, pour évaluer la mise en œuvre concrète, sincère, des textes que l'on vote. Je pense aussi que, pour bien agir, il faut bien comprendre et c'est précisément ce sur quoi vos rapporteurs se sont penchés avec beaucoup de qualité et de vigilance.

Vous me permettrez de remercier très sincèrement Mme Thun und Hohenstein et M. Bușoi, pour ce qui me concerne plus directement, ainsi que Mme Hedh, pour la qualité de leurs rapports.

De quoi parlons-nous? Nous parlons du marché intérieur. Je disais hier soir, assez tard, dans cet hémicycle, que, dans le moment de crise et de difficulté économique où nous sommes, nous ne pouvons pas nous permettre de ne pas utiliser toutes les potentialités. Si le marché intérieur, le grand marché européen, fonctionnait normalement, comme il devra fonctionner, nous pourrions gagner par nous-mêmes, en nous-mêmes, entre 0,5 et 1,5% de croissance supplémentaire.

En ce moment, nous ne pouvons pas nous permettre de perdre cette opportunité. Il faut donc que le marché intérieur fonctionne complètement dans toutes ses dimensions et c'est, naturellement, la tâche que m'a confiée, sous votre contrôle, le président Barroso. Voilà pourquoi j'attache de l'importance à ce tableau d'affichage, comme à cet instrument SOLVIT, et à leur bon fonctionnement. Je pense que John Dalli dira précisément la même chose sur la question importante des consommateurs.

Mme Thun und Hohenstein a précisément rappelé les bonnes nouvelles ou les moins bonnes nouvelles de ce tableau d'affichage. Nous parlons là de 1 521 directives ou textes qui font fonctionner le marché intérieur, c'est considérable. Il y a, aujourd'hui, un déficit de transposition qui est, vous l'avez très bien dit, le plus bas jamais atteint. Il s'agit là d'une bonne nouvelle, il faut en remercier tous ceux qui, dans les États membres, parfois dans les régions, sont chargés de mettre en œuvre cette directive. Je voudrais également associer à ces remerciements, mes collaborateurs de la direction générale du marché intérieur.

Il y a aussi une moins bonne nouvelle, c'est que la qualité de la transposition, la qualité de la mise en œuvre n'est pas satisfaisante. Il faut donc que nous fassions un travail tous ensemble, avec le Parlement européen, avec les parlements

nationaux, avec les fonctionnaires dans chaque État membre. C'est l'objet, comme je vous l'ai dit lorsque j'ai été auditionné par le Parlement, des visites que je vais faire à partir de maintenant – j'ai déjà commencé – dans chacune des 27 capitales pour rencontrer personnellement, sous l'autorité des ministres compétents, les fonctionnaires chargés de mettre en œuvre les directives du marché intérieur, d'élaborer les éléments de ce tableau d'affichage ou de faire fonctionner SOLVIT, comme M. Buşoi l'a très bien dit.

Et voilà aussi pourquoi je dis à Róza Thun und Hohenstein que je suis d'accord avec cette idée d'un forum, c'est une très bonne idée. Il faut mettre les gens ensemble, et nous allons le faire ensemble, ici au Parlement, avec la Commission, les parlements nationaux et l'ensemble des responsables de chacun des États pour partager, évaluer, échanger les bonnes pratiques. Je crois fondamentalement à cette utilité de mettre les responsables en commun: le contrat plutôt que la contrainte, le contrat d'abord, la confiance et le travail en commun.

Pour SOLVIT, M. Buşoi a rappelé l'importance de cet outil qui commence à bien fonctionner. Nous avons aujourd'hui 1 500 cas qui ont été traités par la concertation, par la résolution, par la médiation, essentiellement des citoyens mais aussi d'un grand nombre d'entreprises. Comme l'a dit M. Buşoi, très justement, cela permet de faire des économies d'argent et de temps et ainsi les citoyens, les consommateurs, les entreprises sont replacées au cœur du marché unique plutôt que d'aller dans des procédures trop lourdes, pour pouvoir régler, comprendre et apporter une solution à leurs difficultés dans la mise en œuvre de telle ou telle disposition qui les intéresse, liée au marché intérieur.

C'est un peu le même esprit qui anime le plan d'action pour les services d'assistance du marché unique, le plan SMAS, pour offrir une meilleure information et un meilleur service aux citoyens et aux entreprises. Là aussi, on a fait des progrès, ce plan a permis un rapprochement entre différents services et des formulaires en ligne communs entre SOLVIT et le service d'orientation pour les citoyens.

Comme cela a été suggéré par vos rapporteurs, je pense, sous le contrôle de John Dalli, que nous pourrions faire un effort, que nous devons faire un effort pour présenter tous ces documents, tous ces résultats, toutes ces communications au même moment, pour rassembler et mieux coordonner ces différents outils qui rendent compte de la mise en œuvre des textes ou des directives liés au marché intérieur.

En tout cas, je donne mon accord pour cette meilleure coordination et je vous confirme mon engagement personnel pour bien utiliser ces différents instruments d'évaluation et de suivi des 1 500 directives liées au fonctionnement du marché intérieur.

2-014

**John Dalli**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I will be commenting on the report about these two very key European policies – the Consumer Markets Scoreboard and the Consumer Enforcement Package – that has been presented by Ms Hedh. I would like to thank Ms Hedh for her excellent work as a rapporteur.

Consumer policy lies at the heart of the economic and social challenges that we face today. It is all about people. Informed and empowered consumers drive innovation and competitiveness, but, perhaps most importantly, making the internal market work for consumers is our trump card in reconnecting with citizens. The central role given to consumer policy is reflected in a number of portfolios. Indeed, the College will be working together closely on ensuring that the rules adopted translate into practical benefit for consumers. I am here today with my friend Michel Barnier, just as an indication that this is the close way in which we will be working together. This will be our working practice.

The consumer dimension is to be developed in all portfolios and benchmarks will be adopted across the Commission to measure progress or the lack of it. The Consumer Scoreboard serves as an alarm system, telling us even when the internal market is letting consumers down. The scoreboard also serves to monitor progress in integrating the retail side of the internal market for consumers, SMEs and other retailers. It also helps to show whether Member States are doing enough to enforce new consumer law and to inform, educate and empower consumers.

Turning to enforcement, I am pleased to see that Parliament shares the Commission's view about the importance of giving people in practice the rights they have on paper. We have a long way to go in this regard. The communication of July 2009 aimed at identifying ways of making enforcement more effective, efficient and consistent throughout the European Union. It now needs to be translated into concrete action. One priority will be to step up efforts to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of our cross-border networks, which must send strong messages to traders that there is no safe haven in the EU where they can hide from pursuit. The same applies to cooperation with authorities in third countries. To achieve this, national enforcers need sufficient staff and resources. In tough economic times all public services are under pressure, but cutting back on enforcement of consumer rights can only be false economy. Free, open, well-policed markets encourage competition on quality and price and drive competitiveness. This benefits not only consumers but also the EU economy as a whole. Both the Commission and Parliament should work together to ensure that this message rings out loud and clear across Member States.

We also intend to continue the good work in establishing Europe-wide coordinated enforcement – so-called sweeps. However, these sweeps have shown that sometimes combining national efforts is not enough. European solutions are needed. I will therefore happily take up your invitation to explore the legal basis in the treaty with a view to strengthening consumer protection, in particular enhancing the Commission's capabilities, but this will be done and we will go down this road if we are first convinced that it will add value to work at national level.

Turning to redress, I agree that alternative dispute resolution mechanisms can offer cheap, simple and quick redress for consumers, while maintaining the reputations of businesses. One element of this strategy relates to the handling of collective claims. Here I intend to make sure, together with Vice-Presidents Almunia and Reding, that the Commission moves forward in a coordinated manner.

Finally, I count on your support to ensure that sufficient funding is made available post 2013, when the current consumer programme expires, to support the ambitious consumer policy, not least the continued delivery of an enhanced scoreboard. Together I am confident we can meet the complex challenges of today and tomorrow and work in partnership to ensure the internal market delivers its full potential to all our citizens.

2-015

**Simon Busuttill**, *Rapporteur ta' opinjoni tal-Kumitat għall-Petizzjonijiet*. – F'isem il-Kumitat għall-Petizzjonijiet jiena hejjejt opinjoni dwar in-netwerk ta' SOLVIT illi nagħtih appoġġ shiħ għax huwa mezz ta' kif jista' jgħin liċ-ċittadin illi jiltaqa' ma' diffikultà. Però jien nagħmel punt importanti li se naċċenna fuqu: il-htieġa ta' kooperazzjoni shiħa bejn l-istakeholders kollha illi jikkuntattjahom iċ-ċittadin. Iċ-ċittadini llum x'jista' jagħmel meta jkollu diffikultà? Jista' jew jiġi għand il-Parlament u jagħmel petizzjoni, u t-Trattat, Artikolu 194 jagħti dan il-poter lill-Parlament Ewropew, iċ-ċittadin jista' jmur għand il-Kummissjoni Ewropea u jagħmel ilment, iċ-ċittadin jista' jmur għand SOLVIT u jagħmel ilment. Ċittadin jista' wkoll imur għand l-Ombudsman Ewropew u jagħmel ilment imma dan kollu johloq konfużjoni shiħa u iċ-ċittadin li għandu lment ma jkunx jaf eżattament fejn imur biex xi hadd jgħinu. U għaldaqstant, fl-opinjoni tiegħi, f'isem il-Kumitat għall-Petizzjonijiet, jiena qiegħed nappella għal aktar kooperazzjoni bejn l-istituzzjonijiet kollha involuti sabiex iċ-ċittadin ikun jaf eżattament fejn għandu jmur u fejn jista' jinqeda.

2-016

**Zuzana Roithová**, *za skupinu PPE*. – Vážený kolegové, páni komisaři, internetová služba SOLVIT funguje už osmým rokem a dokázala úspěšně vyřešit 83 % stížností občanů a podniků způsobených nesprávnou aplikací evropského práva v členských státech, a to do deseti dnů. V roce 2008 SOLVIT svým neformálním řešením předešel soudním sporům a škodám ve výši 32 milionů EUR.

Problém, který naše tři zprávy odhalují, má dvě roviny: především je to liknavost řady členských zemí, s jakou implementují evropské právo do národní praxe, a to manko je sto směrnic, které nemají plný účinek na vnitřním trhu. Víím, že to je malé procento, ale je to procento důležité. Za druhé je to velmi špatné využívání praktického nástroje SOLVIT. Např. v České republice je dobře odborně veden, ale jen 7 % registrovaných podnikatelů vůbec o této službě ví. Ve Francii je situace úplně nejhorší. Podle statistik má SOLVIT na starost jen jeden stážista.

Jsem ráda, že náš výbor podpořil i mé návrhy, které jsem jako stínová zpravodajka předložila, např. opatření na posílení odborné administrativní kapacity sítě SOLVIT v členských státech. Zejména však jde o propagaci sítě v řadách podnikatelů, expatriátů, různých asociací, v národních parlamentech a také tady. Upozorňuji, že je nutné, aby se SOLVIT propojil s jednotnými kontaktními místy i poradenskými službami, které provozuje Komise, a samozřejmě je důležité, aby Komise zajistila včasné informování všech zemí o problémech řešených sítí SOLVIT. Tyto analýzy by měla Komise uvádět ve výročních zprávách, a tím bychom samozřejmě měli zlepšit využitelnost sítě SOLVIT.

Jsem ráda, že náš výbor napříč politickým spektrem podpořil všechny tři zprávy v tak širokém rozsahu, a věřím, že je podpoří také plenární zasedání. Děkuji všem zpravodajům za odvedenou práci.

2-017

**Evelyne Gebhardt**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Herren Kommissare, liebe Kollegen, liebe Kolleginnen! Heute geht es um Binnenmarkt, Verbraucherschutz, Mobilität der Menschen in der Europäischen Union. Darum geht es, wenn wir über diese drei Instrumente sprechen, und darauf möchte ich insbesondere eingehen.

Diese drei Themen zusammenzubringen, ist ein ganz großer Gewinn, den wir heute haben. Denn Wirtschaft und die Rechte der Verbraucher, der Arbeitnehmer und Arbeitnehmerinnen sind keine Gegensätze an sich, sondern sie müssen zusammengeführt werden. Das ist es, was wir für die Zukunft nach vorne bringen müssen. Deswegen ist es gut, dass wir diese gemeinsame Debatte heute führen.

Um dieses zu verwirklichen, müssen wir vor allem drei politische Grundsätze nach vorne bringen. Zum einen – und das hat Kommissar Barnier sehr gut vorhin ausgedrückt – geht es darum, dass der Protektionismus, der in den Mitgliedstaaten, in den nationalen Regierungen immer noch sehr stark vorhanden ist, überwunden wird. Das brauchen wir auf jeden Fall, das steht auf der Tagesordnung.

Der zweite politische Grundsatz ist, dass wir gleichzeitig die Rechte der Verbraucher und Verbraucherinnen und der Arbeitnehmer und Arbeitnehmerinnen auf einem sehr hohen Niveau sichern müssen. Das heißt, Binnenmarkt bedeutet nicht Abschaffung von Rechten, bedeutet nicht Deregulierung, sondern bedeutet, dafür zu sorgen, dass wir gemeinsame Rechte auf sehr hohem Niveau für diese Bereiche erhalten. Deswegen gibt es einen Punkt in dem Bericht von Frau von Thun Und Hohenstein, den wir nicht gut finden, nämlich der sogenannte Binnenmarktanzeiger oder Binnenmarkttest. Denn das ist der falsche Begriff. Er erweckt den Eindruck, dass es nur darum geht, wie der Markt funktioniert. Das ist es nicht! Wir müssen nachfragen, welche Auswirkungen die Gesetzgebung in der Europäischen Union auf die Rechte der Arbeitnehmer und Arbeitnehmerinnen, auf die Rechte der Verbraucher und Verbraucherinnen hat. Deswegen lehnen wir diesen Begriff ab, weil er ein falscher Begriff ist.

Drittens: Wir brauchen eine gute Durchsetzung der Rechte auf europäischer Ebene. Darum brauchen wir ein System der Sammelklagen, damit die Verbraucher und Verbraucherinnen in diesem Binnenmarkt nicht alleine stehen, sondern auch wirklich ihre Rechte durchsetzen können.

2-018

**Robert Rochefort, au nom du groupe ALDE.** – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, permettez-moi d'abord de vous dire que c'est une grande satisfaction de voir cet échange sur le marché intérieur et la protection du consommateur inscrit comme débat prioritaire ce matin.

Dans le contexte de crise économique, Monsieur Barnier, le marché intérieur est un atout que nous devons absolument mettre en valeur. Dans ce marché intérieur, évidemment, c'est la consommation qui est peut-être le moteur le plus important qu'il faut soutenir à très court terme. Mais pas n'importe quelle consommation. Il nous faut une consommation qui prépare l'avenir, qui soit en phase avec les enjeux du développement durable, une consommation responsable qui ne cherche pas toujours la promotion des produits de discount censés favoriser le pouvoir d'achat des familles mais qui, en fait, sont souvent de médiocre qualité et qui résultent de délocalisations presque systématiques de leur fabrication hors de l'Union. Nous savons qui en sont les principales victimes: les consommateurs qui ont le revenu le plus faible, les consommateurs les plus fragiles.

En un mot, il nous faut installer une nouvelle confiance entre les consommateurs et les entreprises, en particulier celles de la distribution, pour fortifier et faire se développer le marché intérieur de notre Union. Je voudrais adresser un message très clair à la Commission. Oui, Monsieur Dalli, vous aurez notre soutien mais nous avons cette inquiétude née du risque lié à la répartition des compétences entre vous. Nous avons peur que ceci aboutisse à une fragmentation de vos responsabilités. Nous serons en même temps extrêmement vigilants à ce que vous travailliez vraiment de façon cohérente ensemble. Nous attendons que les intérêts des consommateurs soient pris en compte réellement dans toutes les politiques de l'Union européenne, dans l'esprit du traité de Lisbonne.

Je vous donne un exemple immédiatement qui associe non seulement M. Barnier, M. Dalli mais aussi Mme Reding. Il est temps de donner suite au livre vert sur les recours collectifs. Nous attendons de vous que vous avanciez sur ce dossier. Puisque vous l'avez d'ailleurs cité, M. Dalli, je voudrais vous demander si vous avez déjà un calendrier sur ce sujet. Nous attendons aussi de vous que vous inventiez une forme spécifique européenne nouvelle pour que ces recours collectifs évitent les dérives trop connues du système américain, que nous inventions quelque chose qui soit au service de tous, qui n'oppose pas les intérêts des uns et des autres.

Je voudrais féliciter notre collègue, Mme Hedh, pour son rapport très complet. Je voudrais insister sur l'accent qu'elle met, à juste titre, dans son rapport, sur l'éducation à la consommation, qui est essentielle et qui doit se faire tout au long de la vie, qui n'est pas qu'une question du jeune enfant mais également du consommateur, tant les produits changent, tant les forces du marketing se sophistiquent.

*(Le Président interrompt l'orateur)*

Je voudrais juste, en conclusion, vous dire que les indicateurs, les tableaux de bord, c'est très bien – c'est l'ancien statisticien économiste qui parle –, mais ça ne remplace pas la volonté politique qui, elle, doit être la véritable mobilisation de notre action.

2-019

**Heide Rühle, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte anknüpfen an das, was Herr Barnier am Anfang sagte: die hohe Bedeutung des Binnenmarkts in der jetzigen Krise. Das hat sich ja wieder sehr deutlich gezeigt. Aber der Binnenmarkt setzt natürlich auch voraus, dass die Bürgerinnen und Bürger Vertrauen in ihn haben. Nur dann funktioniert er richtig. Daran mangelt es noch auf vielen Ebenen. Gerade wir Abgeordnete merken sehr häufig in den Debatten in unseren Heimatländern, dass diese Ängste vor dem Binnenmarkt bei den Bürgern durchaus noch vorhanden sind und dass Themen wie Protektionismus leider auch deshalb ziehen, weil sie nicht nur von Regierungsseite gesetzt werden, sondern auch viele Bürgerinnen und Bürger derartige Dinge unterstützen. Deshalb ist es umso wichtiger, dass wir im Parlament dafür sorgen, dass mehr Vertrauen in diesen Binnenmarkt geschaffen wird. Dazu ist natürlich

Verbraucherpolitik ein ganz zentrales Element. Verbraucherpolitik, Verbraucherschutz auf einem hohen Niveau kann das Vertrauen der Bürger in den Binnenmarkt stärken und schützen. Deshalb müssen wir in dem Bereich auch verstärkt arbeiten.

Ich begrüße es, dass Sie heute als Kommissare hier gemeinsam aufgetreten sind. Sie wissen ja, dass auch unsere Fraktion kritisiert hat, dass es nicht mehr einen allein zuständigen Kommissar oder eine allein zuständige Kommissarin für Verbraucherpolitik gibt, weil das Signal, das von Frau Kuneva ausging, ein sehr positives Signal war. Deshalb begrüßen wir es, dass Sie hier sehr deutlich zeigen, dass Sie in diesem Bereich kooperieren wollen. Wir hatten auch Angst, dass durch die Verteilung auf verschiedene Kommissare der Verbraucherschutz im Endeffekt zu kurz kommt. Ich hoffe aber, dass dieses Zeichen keine Eintagsfliege ist, sondern dass Sie hier sehr eng kooperieren werden, denn es liegen ja sehr wichtige Fragen vor uns, z. B. ist auch das Thema Verbandsklagerecht, das Thema Sammelklagen, noch nicht ausdiskutiert und müsste vorangetrieben werden. Auch das ist natürlich sehr wichtig, um Vertrauen bei den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern zu schaffen.

Wir brauchen mehr Instrumente, die deutlich machen, dass die Bürger im Binnenmarkt geschützt sind. SOLVIT ist dafür ein sehr wichtiges Instrument. Deshalb unterstützen wir auch den Bericht von Herrn Buşoi voll und ganz. SOLVIT, eine außergerichtliche Lösungsmöglichkeit, schafft Vertrauen in den Binnenmarkt, sorgt für mehr Kenntnisse über den Binnenmarkt, und hieran fehlt es auch sehr häufig noch auf Seiten der Behörden in den Mitgliedstaaten, da kann SOLVIT eine wichtige und zentrale Ergänzung bringen. Ich bin in diesem Jahr Berichterstatterin für den Haushalt und kann Herrn Dalli versichern, dass wir auf die Haushaltsfragen, auf die Mittelzuweisungen im Bereich Verbraucherpolitik, achten werden. Wir sind schon auf unseren Haushaltsausschuss zugegangen und haben betont, dass wir natürlich die Mittelfortschreibung wollen, dass wir wollen, dass entsprechende Gelder eingesetzt werden. Da können Sie mit unserer Unterstützung rechnen.

Insgesamt – um es noch einmal zusammenzufassen – finde ich, dass diese drei Berichte ein sehr wichtiges, ein sehr gutes Signal sind. Wir unterstützen sie. Es gibt einen Punkt, bei dem wir auch Kritik haben. Dabei geht es um den Binnenmarktcheck, den wir für etwas einseitig halten. Wenn man die Richtlinien überprüft, dann müsste man sie nach verschiedenen Gesichtspunkten überprüfen. Dabei spielt auch die Nachhaltigkeit eine wichtige Rolle, da spielen soziale Fragen eine wichtige Rolle. Es sollte nicht nur unter dem Aspekt des Binnenmarkts geprüft werden, sondern wenn, dann umfangreich. Und das Thema Subsidiarität darf in diesem Zusammenhang natürlich auch nicht zu kurz kommen. Deshalb halten wir die einseitige Erwähnung des Binnenmarktchecks für bedauerlich. Aber grundsätzlich unterstützen wir die Berichterstatterin, auch was den Binnenmarktcheck angeht, in ihren Ansätzen und werden dem Bericht zustimmen.

2-020

**Adam Bielan**, *w imieniu grupy ECR*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Proces budowy wspólnego rynku w oparciu o cztery swobody – przepływu osób, towarów, kapitału i usług – jest procesem wciąż niezakończonym, szczególnie jeśli chodzi o tą czwartą swobodę – przepływu usług – mamy jeszcze bardzo wiele do zrobienia. A jest to proces niezwykle istotny, szczególnie w czasie spowolnienia gospodarczego czy kryzysu gospodarczego, z jakim mamy do czynienia na naszym kontynencie. Właśnie w czasie spowolnienia gospodarczego powinniśmy mówić o zaletach wspólnego rynku, być może wtedy pojawi się wola polityczna, o którą apelował pan poseł Rochefort.

Chciałem z tego powodu pogratulować Prezydium Parlamentu Europejskiego, że dostrzega wagę problemu i zdecydowało się uczynić debatę nad tymi 3 sprawozdaniami debatą priorytetową na tym posiedzeniu Parlamentu. Dziękuję i gratuluję przewodniczącemu Komisji Rynku Wewnętrznego panu posłowi Harbourowi za skuteczność zabiegów w tym względzie. Gratuluję również wszystkim 3 sprawozdawcom tych 3 jakże ważnych sprawozdań. Nie mogę jednak nie dostrzec pewnego absurdu. Otóż dzisiaj na sesji plenarnej dyskutujemy na temat sprawozdania pani poseł Thun (świątecznego sprawozdania, chciałbym nadmienić), ale jest to sprawozdanie dotyczące tabeli wyników rynku wewnętrznego za rok 2008. Tymczasem kilka dni temu Komisja opublikowała już tabelę wyników rynku wewnętrznego za rok 2009. Myślę, że to jest kolejny argument za tym, aby w przyszłości Komisja publikowała wszystkie cztery ważne raporty monitorujące rynek wewnętrzny w tym samym czasie. Przecież tabela wyników rynku wewnętrznego, rynków konsumenckich, sprawozdanie o SOLVIT czy o biurach porad dla obywatela, wszystkie dotyczą tak na prawdę tego samego tematu i powinniśmy je otrzymywać jednocześnie.

Na koniec chciałbym wyrazić poparcie dla 2 głównych postulatów zawartych w sprawozdaniu pani poseł Thun. Popieram w pełni zarówno postulat organizowania co roku forum rynku wewnętrznego jak i, co bardzo ważne, postulat obowiązkowego testu, tzw. testu rynku wewnętrznego, który powinien być dodawany do każdej propozycji Komisji Europejskiej w przyszłości.

2-021

**Κυριάκος Τριανταφυλλίδης**, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, υπάρχει πλέον έντονη η άποψη, και επιβεβαιώνεται μέσα από τη Συνθήκη της Λισαβόνας αλλά και από τις θέσεις της ίδιας της Επιτροπής, ότι η πολιτική προστασίας των καταναλωτών πρέπει να επικεντρώνεται στη διασφάλιση μιας υγιούς αγοράς μέσα από την οποία οι καταναλωτές θα δραστηριοποιούνται με ασφάλεια και εμπιστοσύνη.



Η λογική αυτή βασίζεται στο ότι, από τη στιγμή που οι καταναλωτές θα νοιώθουν άνεση και εμπιστοσύνη στην αγορά και θα ενθαρρύνεται το διασυνοριακό εμπόριο, θα αυξάνεται η ανταγωνιστικότητα και θα δίνεται στους καταναλωτές ευρύτερη επιλογή προϊόντων και υπηρεσιών σε πιο ανταγωνιστικές τιμές.

Η θέση και η άποψη ότι οι αποτελεσματικές και ευέλικτες καταναλωτικές αγορές αποτελούν θεμελιώδεις συντελεστές της ανταγωνιστικότητας και της ευημερίας των πολιτών δεν μας βρίσκει σύμφωνους. Η οικονομική κρίση αποδεικνύει ότι χρειάζεται να καθοδηγούμαστε από τις ιδιαίτερες συνθήκες κάθε κράτους και όχι από δογματική μεταφορά ενός και μόνο προτύπου, του ανόθευτου ανταγωνισμού. Εμείς θεωρούμε ότι η ανταγωνιστικότητα δεν είναι άμεσα συνυφασμένη με την ευημερία των πολιτών, γιατί πιο πολύ ευνοεί τις επιχειρήσεις, αφού αποδεδειγμένα μέχρι τώρα οι μειώσεις των τιμών συνολικά δεν ήταν προς όφελος των καταναλωτών.

Θα πρέπει να υπάρξει έλεγχος των τιμών των βασικών αγαθών προς όφελος των χαμηλότερων οικονομικά στρωμάτων και του συνόλου των πολιτών. Η μόνη πολιτική που μπορεί να θεμελιώσει και να ανεβάσει το επίπεδο προστασίας των καταναλωτών είναι αυτή που θα έχει στο επίκεντρο τον άνθρωπο και την ευημερία του και όχι την αύξηση του ανταγωνισμού.

Κατόπιν τούτων, η ύπαρξη ενός πίνακα αποτελεσμάτων που θα καταγράφει και θα αξιολογεί την ικανοποίηση των ευρωπαϊών καταναλωτών σχετικά με την εύρυθμη λειτουργία της αγοράς μάς βρίσκει μεν σύμφωνους, από την άλλη όμως δεν θα πρέπει να ξεφεύγουμε από την ουσία και το στόχο, που δεν είναι άλλος από τη λειτουργία μιας πιο ανθρωποκεντρικής εσωτερικής αγοράς, που επίκεντρό της θα είναι η ευημερία των ανθρώπων και όχι των αριθμών. Αντιλαμβανόμαστε την ύπαρξη ενός πίνακα αποτελεσμάτων για τους καταναλωτές ως ένα εργαλείο καταγραφής του δείκτη ικανοποίησης σε συγκεκριμένο πλαίσιο και χρονικό σημείο. Δεν μπορεί ωστόσο από μόνη της αυτή η αξιολόγηση και καταγραφή να επιφέρει περισσότερη ευημερία στους πολίτες απλώς και μόνο επειδή, κατά τα λεγόμενα, θα προσδώσει μεγαλύτερη αυτοπεποίθηση και ασφάλεια στους καταναλωτές.

Επιπλέον, η όποια αξιολόγηση θα πρέπει να γίνεται στη βάση κοινωνικά μετρήσιμων στόχων. Σημειώνουμε επίσης το γεγονός ότι, αφού ο πίνακας έχει ως πρώτιστο στόχο την καταγραφή των παραπόνων των καταναλωτών, θα πρέπει να δοθεί ιδιαίτερη έμφαση σε μέτρα που θα πρέπει να παρθούν ενάντια στην αισχροκέρδεια.

2-022

**Oreste Rossi, a nome del gruppo EFD.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi discutiamo tre provvedimenti relativi alla salute e alla tutela dei consumatori, sui quali ci siamo già espressi a favore in commissione e allo stesso modo ci esprimeremo anche in Aula.

Siamo dalla parte dei cittadini, troppe volte danneggiati da decisioni di organismi europei: penso alla decisione di negare la libertà di esporre il crocifisso presa dalla Corte europea dei diritti dell'uomo; all'incapacità di colpire i clandestini in modo efficace; al continuo flusso di persone provenienti dai paesi terzi che tolgono il lavoro alla nostra gente; alla paura di informare correttamente i consumatori su quello che acquistano o sul luogo di provenienza degli alimenti.

La relazione Hedh considera importante il punto di vista dei cittadini europei, che ogni giorno sperimentano pregi e difetti del mercato interno, sottolineando la bontà della nomina, avvenuta nel 2007, di un Commissario per la tutela dei consumatori. La stessa rileva la necessità di armonizzare le strutture di vigilanza e controllo dei paesi membri, anche nei confronti dei paesi terzi.

La relazione Thun Und Hohenstein critica certi atteggiamenti assunti in passato, richiamando una condivisione di responsabilità fra Stati membri e Commissione.

La relazione Buşoi si occupa del network Solvit, creato dalla Commissione europea per assistere gratuitamente cittadini e imprese nel far valere i propri diritti nei confronti dell'Unione, specialmente nei casi di controversie; contiene anche critiche su certe inefficienze del *network* e raccomanda una migliore informazione ai cittadini e alle imprese, che spesso ignorano l'esistenza di questa struttura. Noi, da legislatori, dobbiamo avere per primi il riguardo nei confronti dei cittadini e dei consumatori.

2-023

**Angelika Werthmann (NI).** – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! SOLVIT kann und soll einen wesentlichen Beitrag zu mehr Transparenz in der Durchführung und Umsetzung der Personen- und Bürgerrechte im Binnenmarkt leisten. Im Vordergrund des SOLVIT-Online-Netzwerks zur Problemlösung steht ein pragmatischer Ansatz, der sowohl Bürgerinnen und Bürgern als auch Unternehmen ohne große formelle Bürden zugute kommt.

Der Bericht von 2009 zeigt allerdings auch, dass fast 40 % der Anfragen der Bürger sich auf Aufenthaltsbestimmungen in einem anderen EU-Land bezogen haben. Hier stellt sich die Frage, ob die Durchführung der Aufenthaltsrechte noch immer nicht transparent gehandhabt wird.

2-024

**Tiziano Motti (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, oggi voteremo la relazione d'iniziativa sulla tutela dei consumatori, uno strumento molto importante per il quale, tra l'altro, devo ringraziare la relatrice Hedh e i colleghi relatori per l'ottimo clima con cui siamo riusciti a lavorare insieme.

Abbiamo avuto molti punti di totale condivisione, altri su cui spero si potrà lavorare in futuro: per questo parto proprio dal quadro europeo di valutazione dei consumatori promosso dalla Commissione europea, uno strumento molto importante che però, a mio avviso, non fornisce ancora dati omogenei tali da poter poi con serenità prendere decisioni. Se noi fossimo un'azienda e valutassimo il futuro dell'azienda su dati non ancora precisi potremmo anche farla fallire; per questo in futuro mi auguro che si possa lavorare su una base di dati che ci permetta di prendere decisioni serene.

Occorre considerare, anche in questa relazione, il grande peso che si è dato ai consumatori ma, a mio avviso e a nome del gruppo, ritengo occorra in futuro un maggiore equilibrio, perché i cittadini europei non sono solo consumatori ma anche lavoratori delle aziende che operano nel mercato interno. Occorre quindi sempre tenere in considerazione anche l'equilibrio, appunto, che occorre tra chi eroga i servizi e fornisce i prodotti e il consumatore stesso, perché è questo a cui vogliamo mirare.

Un consumatore informato è un consumatore libero – quindi ben venga qualsiasi iniziativa per fornire ulteriori informazioni – però abbiamo detto "no" ai programmi scolastici perché non dobbiamo sostituirci al consumatore nella propria libertà di scelta e riteniamo che sia il genitore il primo referente dei più piccoli per quella che deve essere l'educazione al consumo. Il genitore, tra l'altro, ha anche il controllo dei consumi del figlio, soprattutto quando è in tenera età.

Per quanto riguarda gli adulti, è vero che a volte il consumatore fa fatica a tutelarsi nelle opportune sedi legali, ragion per cui siamo favorevoli ai ricorsi extragiudiziali, ma riteniamo che si potesse fare un maggiore sforzo, soprattutto in tempo di crisi, per far funzionare ciò che già esiste, anziché cercare di aumentare il numero dei mediatori che prende le difese dei consumatori.

Concludo con i servizi forniti dalla pubblica amministrazione: mi spiace che non sia stato tenuto in debita considerazione il fatto che anche l'amministrazione pubblica, i comuni, gli enti, le province, anche gli Stati sono un referente per il consumatore. Mi auguro che in futuro si possa fare di più, perché il consumatore deve poter essere tutelato anche da quei servizi forniti dalla pubblica amministrazione che non funzionano.

2-025

**Liem Hoang Ngoc (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Présidente, je remercie Mme Thun pour le sérieux de son travail et la qualité globale de son rapport.

En tant que rapporteur fictif pour le groupe S&D, je me réjouis que le vote en commission du marché intérieur et de la protection des consommateurs ait permis l'intégration dans le rapport final d'un certain nombre d'idées que nous souhaitions voir apparaître.

La première est la nécessité d'adopter, dans le cadre de la réalisation du tableau d'affichage du marché intérieur, une approche plus qualitative permettant d'identifier les causes du déficit de transposition. Nous ne sous-estimons pas l'utilité des données chiffrées et de la pression qui résulte de la mise en avant des bons et des mauvais élèves de l'Union, mais la Commission devrait, selon nous, être plus ambitieuse et essayer de faire de ce tableau un outil destiné à comprendre les difficultés rencontrées par les États membres dans le cadre du processus de transposition. D'autant que nous savons tous que le déficit de transposition peut parfois être dû, non pas à la mauvaise volonté des États, mais à la médiocre qualité de la législation européenne à transposer.

Le deuxième élément sur lequel j'ai insisté est le besoin de renforcer, tout au long de la période de transposition, le dialogue entre la Commission et les États membres. Plus les échanges d'informations auront lieu en amont, plus il sera possible de prévenir le risque de non-transposition ou de transposition incorrecte.

Le rapport pose cependant problème sur un point: il s'agit du paragraphe 10, qui ne figurait pas initialement dans le projet de rapport de Mme Thun. Ce paragraphe propose la création d'un test de compatibilité avec le marché intérieur pour tous les nouveaux actes législatifs proposés. Nous y sommes fortement opposés car un tel test nous paraît au mieux inutile, au pire dangereux.

En effet, l'examen des obstacles éventuels au marché intérieur est déjà réalisé dans le cadre des études d'impact faites par la Commission européenne à l'occasion de chaque nouvelle proposition de législation. Nous ne voudrions pas que ce test du marché intérieur soit utilisé comme prétexte à la remise en cause d'avancées sociales ou environnementales. Nous ne saurions, dans ce cas, l'accepter.

2-026

**Jürgen Creutzmann (ALDE).** – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Barnier, Herr Kommissar Dalli! Die Tatsache, dass wir heute drei Initiativberichte zum Verbraucherschutz und zum Binnenmarkt diskutieren, zeigt, dass in diesen Bereichen trotz aller Erfolge noch vieles im Argen liegt. Sicherlich, im Durchschnitt haben sich die Mitgliedstaaten in der Umsetzung der Binnenmarktrichtlinien stark verbessert, dennoch haben sieben Mitgliedstaaten das von der Kommission gesteckte Ziel verfehlt, den Rückstand der Umsetzung von Binnenmarktrichtlinien auf 1 % zu senken.

Das Hauptproblem liegt jedoch weniger in der Umsetzung, sondern in der Anwendung des EU-Rechts. So dauert es bei Vertragsverletzungen durch Mitgliedstaaten im Schnitt 18 Monate – also immer noch viel zu lange –, bis sie das Urteil des EuGH befolgen. Dies geht aus dem aktuellen Binnenmarktanzeiger hervor und ist für die Liberalen inakzeptabel. Dieses Defizit führt zu Problemen bei Bürgern und insbesondere auch bei kleinen und mittelständischen Unternehmen, die sich auf harmonisierte Regeln im Binnenmarkt verlassen, dann aber unerwartet doch auf zeitraubende und bürokratische Hürden stoßen, wenn sie grenzüberschreitend tätig werden wollen.

Aus diesem Grund ist es wichtig, dass SOLVIT weiter ausgebaut wird. SOLVIT ist ein Online-Netzwerk zur Problemlösung, in dem die Mitgliedstaaten zusammenarbeiten, um auf pragmatische Weise Probleme zu lösen, die durch die fehlerhafte Anwendung von Binnenmarktvorschriften durch Behörden entstehen. Alle Mitgliedstaaten müssen endlich die finanziellen Mittel und genügend gut ausgebildetes Personal für die SOLVIT-Zentren bereitstellen. Die Liberalen fordern nachdrücklich, dass SOLVIT in den Mitgliedstaaten bekannter gemacht wird, um ihnen den grenzüberschreitenden Absatz ihrer Produkte und Dienstleistungen zu erleichtern. Hierzu ist die Einbindung der einschlägigen Verbände in groß angelegte Informationskampagnen ebenso erforderlich wie ein einheitliches, leicht verständliches und auffindbares Internetportal, das alle Arten von Beschwerden entgegennimmt.

2-027

**Malcolm Harbour (ECR).** – Mr President, as chairman of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection, it gives me great pleasure first of all to say how much we all appreciate the fact that Commissioner Barnier and Commissioner Dalli are both here today, as a number of my colleagues have observed, and secondly also to remark that I think this is a remarkable occasion for Parliament.

We have one committee that has put together three own-initiative reports focusing on monitoring and implementation of key legislative instruments and, as you, Commissioner Barnier, have said, part of your success will be judged not just in the number of legislative proposals you bring forward but how well they are working.

I think this is a really significant development that all committees in this Parliament need to engage with. I want particularly to thank all the coordinators on the committee who have worked with me to move forward in the work that we are doing and also to engage national parliaments, to have forums of national parliaments.

I very much hope, as both Commissioners indicated, that we would have a wider internal market forum, but we would like to have your reports brought together so this can become an annual event in Parliament for this really important subject.

I think it is significant – if we look at the EU 2020 proposal – that the completion of the single market is now relegated to a paragraph that says missing links and completing networks. Well I hope all my colleagues agree this is absolutely not acceptable. The EU 2020 initiative is calling on Member States to contribute and we have heard from the rapporteurs (whom I thank greatly for their reports) about the fact that Member States need to contribute to the completing of the single market.

This must be a flagship initiative and not relegated in the way that it is in the EU 2020 initiative, and I hope that both of you will help us to make sure that that happens over the next few weeks.

2-028

**Trevor Colman (EFD).** – Mr President, the first note of dissension this morning: these reports wholeheartedly support the implementation of EU laws on consumer protection in Member States and the monitoring of the integration process of markets, which will be reported on in an annual report.

One of the main recommendations is the establishing of a Consumer Markets Scoreboard concerning topics such as complaints, prices, satisfaction, switching and safety, plus a whole host of additional long-term indicators. The Commission intends to carry out in-depth analysis of all so-called problematic sectors identified in the Consumer Markets Scoreboard.

This bureaucratic web of interconnecting enforcements and self-perpetuating regulation will do for the small-business retail trade in Britain what the common fisheries policy has done for the British fishing industry: it will kill it.

Yet again the small-business entrepreneur is being targeted and disadvantaged by bureaucratic interference and overregulation. However well-intentioned these proposals are – and I am sure they are – yet again, this is an EU solution desperately looking for a problem.

2-029

**Andreas Schwab (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Ich möchte mich ausdrücklich dem anschließen, was die Kolleginnen und Kollegen an sinnvollen Beiträgen schon gebracht haben – den letzten ziehe ich einmal davon ab –, und ich möchte deswegen gleich zu den wichtigsten Punkten kommen.

Der Bericht von Frau Kollegin von Thun ist ein sehr gelungenes Beispiel dafür, wie wir als Parlament zeigen können, dass es uns ernst damit ist, das, was wir gemeinsam mit dem Rat beschlossen haben, auch umsetzen. Und die Umsetzung ist eine Aufgabe der Mitgliedstaaten. Da müssen wir als Parlament gemeinsam mit der Kommission in den kommenden Jahren stärker darauf achten, dass diese Umsetzung auch gelingt.

Das Zweite, was dieser Bericht auch zeigt, ist, dass eine Aufteilung, wie die Sozialisten sie offenbar haben wollen, nämlich dass sie selbst für die Wohltaten, für den Verbraucherschutz und für den Arbeitnehmerschutz zuständig sind, die Kommission aber den Binnenmarkt unter Kontrolle halten soll, nicht funktionieren wird.

Deshalb ist unser Anliegen, das der Bericht mit dem Binnenmarkttest aufnimmt, dass wir alle wesentlichen Elemente, die wir im Binnenmarkt schätzen, die die Verbraucher möchten und die die Unternehmer benötigen, zusammenführen und eine saubere Evaluierung vornehmen.

Wir wollen keine Rechte von Arbeitnehmerinnen und Arbeitnehmern zerschlagen, aber wir wollen, dass diese Arbeitnehmer auch die Produkte kaufen können, die sie schätzen. Wir wollen die sozialen Strukturen in den Mitgliedstaaten nicht in Schwierigkeiten bringen, aber wir wollen, dass diese sozialen Strukturen sich an die Zukunft anpassen. Dazu ist eine Abwägung erforderlich, die das Parlament gemeinsam mit der Kommission treffen muss. Es kann nicht sein, dass die Kommission für die Schwierigkeiten zuständig ist und das Parlament die Wohltaten verspricht.

Zweitens: Der Bericht von Frau Hedh, der wie alle Berichte, die wir hier diskutieren, auch von den Schattenberichterstattern hervorragend ergänzt wurde, zeigt, dass wir das Verbrauchervertrauen genauso wichtig gewichten müssen wie das Vertrauen der Unternehmerinnen und der Unternehmer. Das wird eine Zukunftsaufgabe sein, und die kann nur gelöst werden, wenn wir langfristig das Binnenmarktziel in den Mittelpunkt stellen, die Zersplitterung in einzelne Generaldirektionen und unterschiedliche Politikansätze beenden und den Binnenmarkt tatsächlich als das große Ziel des europäischen Projekts ansehen, das wir in den letzten Jahren ein Stück weit vernachlässigt haben.

Ich freue mich sehr, meine Herren Kommissare, dass Sie beide heute hier sind und dass Sie diesen Impetus für die nächsten fünf Jahre auch mit in die Kommission nehmen.

2-030

**Catherine Stihler (S&D).** – Mr President, I would like to thank the Commissioners and rapporteurs. I was the shadow on SOLVIT, and that is what I would like to concentrate on, on behalf of my group, the Socialist Group.

SOLVIT is a great concept and I think Commissioner Dalli summed it up by saying it is all about people. It is citizen-centred, and it tries to help those who come up against barriers and problems created by the EU and to solve the problem in 10 weeks. I know that some people would shirk from the idea that 'I am from the government and I am here to help', but SOLVIT is in essence a network across 27 Member States which is there to do exactly that: help.

I would like to put on record and pay tribute to all those who work in Member State SOLVIT centres. Just last year I met with the small-staffed team who run the SOLVIT centre in the United Kingdom. The way the SOLVIT centre works in the UK is a model of best practice because it tries and uses a SOLVIT+ model, going further in helping businesses and individuals who contact them with a problem. The team are integrated into the European Regulatory Division within the Department for Business and Industry. One of my many amendments sought to make sure that centres are suitably staffed across the EU with no exceptions.

Commissioner Barnier, in December I raised the issue of SOLVIT in the Chamber when you were present and mentioned that in the autumn in committee we were told that in your own Member State the person running the SOLVIT centre was an intern. Members of the committee were horrified. Can I ask, as I did in December, whether that situation has changed? If you are not able to provide the House with that information, can I ask you to clarify it? It is important that SOLVIT centres are well staffed.

The internal market is at the centre of what binds us. It is important that our legislation is clearer and easier for Member States to interpret so that the internal market can operate in the smoothest fashion and consumers can reap the benefits of the best price and the highest quality.

In conclusion, why is there not a SOLVIT day in the European Parliament? Why do we not have a poster in all our constituency office windows advertising SOLVIT? What can we do to inform all national politicians and their political offices of the benefits of SOLVIT? I hope we will continue to support SOLVIT and help the people we are here to represent.

2-031

**Morten Løkkegaard (ALDE).** – Hr. formand! Jeg er skyggeordfører for betænkningen om resultattavlen for det indre marked og vil derfor koncentrere mig om det, og her er det jo en glædens dag. Det er en dag, hvor vi alle sammen kan være enige om, at disse resultattavler fungerer rigtig udmærket! De er dybest set en stor succes, og derfor kan man formentlig kun være enige om, at der skulle gøres mere for at fremme dem. Jeg noterer mig også med glæde, at det ser ud til, at socialdemokraterne har fundet ud af, at det er i hvert fald ikke er en god idé at stemme imod det. Med hensyn til den berømte test, som er blevet foreslået, så tilslutter vi i den liberale gruppe os selvfølgelig dette forslag og har i øvrigt lidt svært ved at forstå, hvad den lidt defensive argumentation imod dette forslag egentlig går ud på. Men det kan vi vende tilbage til. Jeg noterer mig bare som generel betragtning, at det er dejligt, at der er bred enighed om forslagene og betænkningen i øvrigt.

Jeg skal koncentrere mig om et par af de gode ting, som jeg synes er kommet med i betænkningen. For det første er det lykkes at få sat fokus på behovet for, at der kommer større kompetencer i medlemslandenes administrationer, både nationalt, regionalt og lokalt. Jeg mener, at et af problemerne med resultattavlerne er, at der faktisk stadigvæk mangler en del kompetencer ude omkring i, hvordan tingene kan komme til at fungere. Så det er godt, at det er med i betænkningen.

En anden god ting er, at der er fokus på håndhævelsen. Der er blevet sagt mange pæne ting om SOLVIT-centrene, og det tilslutter jeg mig fuldstændig. Og som den seneste taler var inde på, så kunne man sagtens indføre en SOLVIT-dag her i Parlamentet. Jeg mener, at SOLVIT's største problem i dag er, at det ikke er kendt nok. Der er virkelig et stort behov for at sætte fokus på SOLVIT - meget mere end man gør i dag – hvilket bringer mig til mit sidste punkt, som går ud på at understrege, som det også fremgår af betænkningen, at dette er et formidlingsspørgsmål. Vi skal virkelig sørge for at slå på tromme over for pressen og over for offentligheden i øvrigt, og sørge for, at der bliver sat meget mere fokus på f.eks. SOLVIT og resultattavlerne.

Generelt vil jeg sige, at jeg er rigtig glad for på min gruppes vegne at kunne sige, at vi støtter denne betænkning helhjertet, og så håber jeg selvfølgelig, at Kommissionen – og det kan jeg forstå på ...

*(formanden afbrød taleren)*

2-032

**Edvard Kožušník (ECR).** – Pane předsedající, dámy a pánové, já bych možná na úvod chtěl říct, co tady, v tomto sále zmíněno nebylo, a to, že určitě stojí za to poděkovat paní komisařce Kunevě. Stejně jako všichni ostatní kolegové jsem rád, že tady dnes sedí oba dva komisaři, jak pan Dalli, tak pan Barnier, který před svým jmenováním seděl s námi ve výboru.

Já osobně jsem se setkal s kolegy, kteří mají na starost SOLVIT v České republice. Je potřeba říct, že je to určitě velice dobrá záležitost pro vnitřní trh, nicméně je potřeba zmínit rozdílnost přístupu v jednotlivých zemích. Důležitý je tam určitě i přeshraniční prvek a věřím, že oba komisaři přispějí k otevírání přeshraničního spotřebitelského trhu a zejména k odbourávání bariér v podobě různých národních výjimek a že se tak dosáhne úplné harmonizace spotřebního trhu.

Osobně si myslím, že otevření přeshraničního trhu přinese větší konkurenci a v konečném důsledku poslouží jako účinný nástroj v boji proti hospodářské krizi, ve které se dnes nacházíme.

2-033

**Othmar Karas (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, meine Herren Kommissare, meine Damen und Herren! Greifen wir die Erklärung von Kommissar Barnier in der Anhörung auf und machen wir uns den Binnenmarkt zum Freund! Wenn wir diesen Auftrag ernst nehmen, müssen wir den Binnenmarkt zum Heimatmarkt machen. Wenn wir den Binnenmarkt zum Heimatmarkt machen, machen wir ihn zum Lebensraum der Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Europäischen Union. Wir sind Europa! Zum Lebensraum machen, aber nicht zur Heimat, das ist ein Unterschied.

Der Binnenmarkt ist nicht fertig. In ihm liegt noch sehr viel Potenzial. Die Kommission muss alle Behinderungen aufzeigen und Maßnahmen zu deren Beseitigung vorschlagen. Der Euro und der Binnenmarkt sind unsere erfolgreichste Antwort auf die Herausforderungen der Globalisierung, nach innen wie nach außen. Die Stärken des Binnenmarktes sind die Qualifikationen der Bürgerinnen und Bürger Europas und die kleinen und mittelständischen Unternehmen, die 90 % der Wirtschaft ausmachen. Daher haben wir den *Small Business Act* in allen Mitgliedstaaten raschest umzusetzen. Machen wir ihn zum Markenzeichen des Binnenmarktes! 80 % der Wirtschaft in der Union sind aber kreditfinanziert, und nur 20 % sind kapitalmarktfinanziert. Darauf müssen wir bei der Neuregelung des Finanzmarktes achten.

Die dritte Stärke ist die wettbewerbsfähige Exportwirtschaft. Wir haben auch einige Spannungen zu bewältigen: horizontaler Ansatz versus die sektoralen Anliegen, die vier Freiheiten versus die unterschiedlichen sozialen Wirklichkeiten, die Kompetenzschieflage vor allem in den Bereichen Steuern, Bildung und Forschung, die noch nicht umgesetzte nachhaltige soziale Marktwirtschaft. Wir benötigen einen *One-Stop-Shop* für binnenmarktrelevante Unternehmens- und Verbraucherschutzinformationen.

Das Binnenmarktforum und die gemeinsame Debatte dieser drei Berichte jedes Jahr am gleichen Tag geben uns die Möglichkeit, uns all diesen Fragen zu stellen und den Binnenmarkt zum Heimatmarkt aller Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu machen.

2-034

**Bernadette Vergnaud (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, Messieurs les Commissaires, chers collègues. Je me réjouis de pouvoir évoquer à l'occasion d'un débat prioritaire ces trois rapports qui concernent le quotidien des citoyens. Je tiens d'ailleurs à féliciter nos rapporteurs pour leur travail et je voudrais plus particulièrement évoquer le réseau SOLVIT.

Le réseau a maintenant 8 ans d'existence, a résolu de nombreux problèmes de manière efficace et est, pourtant, totalement méconnu. Combien de fois ai-je dû renvoyer des interlocuteurs vers ce réseau dont ils ne soupçonnaient même pas l'existence, alors même que cet outil pourrait renforcer l'image d'une Europe protectrice des droits des citoyens.

Il faut bien avouer – et je suis très heureuse que M. Barnier soit ici – que je comprends que le gouvernement de mon pays n'en fasse pas vraiment la promotion. L'augmentation du nombre de cas serait dès lors bien délicate à gérer pour le seul stagiaire qui, actuellement en 2010, est en charge du réseau SOLVIT en France, pays, il est vrai, peuplé de seulement 60 millions d'âmes et qui n'est que le deuxième État de l'UE du point de vue du nombre de cas soumis en 2009.

Certes, le taux de résolution est miraculeusement bon mais les délais sont déplorables, avec une moyenne de 15 semaines avant traitement, soit 5 semaines au-delà du maximum prévu.

J'invite donc la Commission et les États membres à octroyer de réels moyens financiers et humains et à mener de grandes campagnes d'information, notamment à destination des entreprises, qui ne soumettent pas plus de cas en 2009 qu'en 2004.

2-035

**Olle Schmidt (ALDE).** – Herr talman, herr kommissionsledamöter! Tack till de ansvariga föredragandena för ett bra arbete. EU:s inre marknad är trots bristerna en stor framgång och Trevor Colmans kritik är svår att förstå sig på. Den inre marknaden ska ge konsumenterna ett brett urval av kvalitativa varor och tjänster till bra priser och samtidigt garantera ett gott konsumentskydd. Jag tycker därför att vi bör sträva efter en full harmonisering av konsumenternas rättigheter på en hög skyddsnivå så att konsumenterna verkligen kan dra nytta av den inre marknadens fördelar. Det här är särskilt viktigt när den gränsöverskridande handeln och e-handeln ökar.

Jag är övertygad om att grupptalan skulle vara ett effektivt sätt för att stärka Europas konsumenter, inte enligt amerikansk modell utan enligt europeisk modell. Här måste vi sluta att dröja och äntligen komma till skott. Jag är glad att kommissionsledamot John Dalli tar upp det här.

Det är inom tjänstesektorn som flest arbeten skapas i dag, det vet vi. Det är därför viktigt att EU får en sann europeisk tjänstesektor där näringsidkare och konsumenter kan agera fritt på den inre marknaden, inte bara nationellt. Vi behöver en fungerande handel med hälso- och sjukvårdstjänster. Det ger bättre vård, större valfrihet och kortare köer. I dag har vi ett närmast rättslöst läge och här litar jag på kommissionsledamot John Dalli.

Ett annat område som behöver större uppmärksamhet är finansiella tjänster, där vi vet att det fortfarande finns problem. Det behövs därför tydliga och trovärdiga regler, inte minst med tanke på den finansiella oron, och det kommer kommissionsledamot Michel Barnier att ta sig an. Balanserade, rimliga och riktiga regler är bra för konsumenterna.

2-036

**Jacek Olgiard Kurski (ECR).** – Dobrze się stało, że Parlament przygotował sprawozdanie w sprawie SOLVITu, zawierający sugestie dla Komisji Europejskiej i państw członkowskich.

Jako kontrsprawozdawca raportu z ramienia grupy Europejskich Konserwatystów i Reformatorów już na poziomie prac komisji podkreślałem znaczenie promocji SOLVITu wśród mieszkańców Unii Europejskiej, zwłaszcza możliwość dochodzenia praw przez obywateli, a w szczególności przez przedsiębiorców. Chyba wszyscy zgadzamy się, że niezbędna jest kampania informacyjna propagująca sieć SOLVIT jako alternatywny mechanizm rozstrzygania sporów. Chodzi o to, żeby informacja o istnieniu SOLVIT dotarła do zainteresowanych. Kluczowy jest tutaj Internet, dlatego dobrze by się stało, gdyby Komisja posłuchała sugestii Parlamentu i zainicjowała utworzenie wspólnego adresu internetowego dla wszystkich krajowych centrów SOLVIT pod domeną [solvit.eu](http://solvit.eu), a państwa członkowskie, które do tej pory jeszcze tego nie zrobiły, utworzyły strony internetowe w narodowych domenach powiązane z europejskim portalem SOLVIT.

Oczywiście promocja to nie wszystko. Istotne jest również podniesienie skuteczności krajowych centrów SOLVIT poprzez skierowanie do nich kompetentnych urzędników i dofinansowanie SOLVIT na szczeblu europejskim.

2-037

**Sławomir Witold Nitras (PPE).** – Szczerze gratuluję wszystkim sprawozdawcom odpowiedzialnym za te sprawozdania dlatego, że mają one dwie bardzo ważne cechy. Po pierwsze, rzeczywiście bardzo konsekwentnie bronią rynku wewnętrznego, wskazując słabości w jego upowszechnianiu, a jednocześnie bardzo konsekwentnie go bronią. Drugą

wielką wartością tych sprawozdań jest to, że są one powszechnie akceptowane. Znaczy to, że mamy do czynienia z sytuacją, w której cały Parlament Europejski, również ci z Państwa, którzy są bardziej sceptyczni wobec wolnego rynku, generalnie broni rynku wewnętrznego i tej wartości – jest to wielka wartość tych sprawozdań.

Chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na kilka szczegółowych spraw. Jeśli chodzi o SOLVIT, mamy do czynienia z paradoksalną sytuacją (mówił o tym pan Kurski), że instrument, który ma wyrównywać te różnice, sam w różnych krajach funkcjonuje na różnym poziomie i moim zdaniem to wymaga jakiejś koordynacji, to musi być spójny system funkcjonujący nie tylko dobrze, ale wszędzie tak samo. I to, co bardzo ważne w sprawozdaniu pani poseł Thun – środki, które Komisja powinna znaleźć, by docelowo opracować taki model, by wszelkie tworzone przez nas prawodawstwo nie było sprzeczne z wolnym rynkiem wewnętrznym, wydają się kluczowe w tym sprawozdaniu. Jeżeli taki mechanizm udałoby się nam zbudować, także o przyszłość nowego rynku możemy być spokojni.

2-038

**Barbara Weiler (S&D).** – Herr Präsident, sehr verehrte Kommission, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Den hohen Stellenwert, den die Binnenmarkt- und Verbraucherpolitik in Europa hat, zeigt diese gemeinsame Aussprache von heute Morgen, zeigt auch die hohe Qualität aller drei Berichte. Ich möchte allen drei Berichterstattern und den vielen Schattenberichterstattern und Kollegen danken, die diese gemeinsame Arbeit zustande gebracht haben.

Ich möchte mich auf zwei kritische Punkte konzentrieren: Das eine ist, wir, d. h. die Kommission und auch wir in diesem Hause, gehen davon aus, dass im Binnenmarkt alles relativ harmonisch abläuft, dass wir aufgeklärte Verbraucher und faire Anbieter haben. Das trifft oft zu, aber eben nicht immer. Es gibt verantwortungslose Anbieter, die nur ihren kurzfristigen Profit sehen, und darum brauchen wir eine verstärkte Marktüberwachung und eine Aufsicht. Es gibt aber auch nichtinformierte Verbraucher. Wir brauchen eine bessere Information. Es reicht nicht, dass die Beipackzettel lesbar sind. Wir brauchen kontinuierliche Information.

Es wurde eben gesagt: Wir brauchen Vertrauen. Aber Vertrauen resultiert aus Wissen. Ich habe gehört, dass in Deutschland nur jeder zweite Vierzehn- bis Vierundzwanzigjährige weiß, was unter Inflation zu verstehen ist. Ich will gar nicht fragen, wie die Umfrageergebnisse bei dem Wort „Deflation“ wären. Wir brauchen eine bessere Vernetzung in den Schulen, eine Information auch über den Widerspruch zwischen der Interessenlage der Anbieter und der der Verbraucher. Das ist in den Berichten der Kollegen ausgeführt ...

*(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)*

2-039

**Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE).** – Este un drept fundamental al cetățenilor europeni în cadrul pieței unice ca, atunci când doresc să cumpere un produs sau un serviciu, indiferent în ce stat membru se află, să beneficieze de aceleași prețuri sau comisioane, iar atunci când diferențele există, să poată fi explicate.

Cred că trebuie să ne aplecăm mai mult asupra problemelor din domeniul serviciilor bancare și financiare, deoarece astăzi în piața unică există mari diferențe în comisioanele percepute în domeniul acestor servicii. Dacă te afli, de exemplu, în România și dorești să apelezi la un serviciu bancar prestat de bănci – aceleași bănci care operează și în România, și în Franța, și în Italia, și în Austria –, în România plătești mai multe comisioane și mult mai mari. O asemenea situație nu este corectă și cred că este îndreptățită speranța cetățenilor, nu numai din România, ci și din alte state membre, ca instituțiile europene să aibă un rol mai activ în clarificarea acestor diferențe. Repet, este vorba de comisioane, și nu de dobânzi bancare.

Vă mulțumesc.

2-040

**Alan Kelly (S&D).** – Mr President, I just wish in particular to congratulate all my colleagues on the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection who worked on the future of the internal market scoreboard. It is an issue that is close to my heart as it provides an excellent communication tool for how Member States treat EU directives.

It is also close to my heart because I am constantly hearing about overzealous EU regulation, particularly in my home country, Ireland, and this needs to be digested. Well, a quick glance at the scoreboard will show you that Ireland has misapplied EU directives on no less than 67 occasions and is in danger of missing out on the 1% transposition deficit target as agreed.

This raises the question, who is at fault for this supposedly overzealous regulation? If a Member State is not transposing EU legislation correctly, or is adding more regulation onto directives, then is it the fault of the EU or the Member State? I think possibly and probably the latter.

Perhaps an idea for the scoreboard in future might be to directly address the matter of overregulation, or ‘gold plating’, as it is known. I think this would be a positive outcome.

2-041

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – Mr President, firstly I would like to compliment the person who came up with the title ‘SOLVIT’: it is simple, it is clear and, as they say, ‘it does exactly what it says on the tin’.

Since SOLVIT was established in 2002, its workload has been growing exponentially year on year. So much so that in 2008 there was an increase of 22% of cases coming before it, leading to 1 000 cases, and with an 88% resolution saving EUR 32.6 million. That is an impressive statistic. However, the downside is that the days taken to solve the problems rose on average from 53 to 69 days. That brings us to the solutions that are required.

Obviously there is a shortage of staff. That must be dealt with. They must have proper resources. There is a need for continuous training in line with the EU 2020 strategy on lifelong training, and an exchange of best practice, and it is important to meet regularly. I would also suggest that, since many of the problems are local, there could be a local aspect to this to deal with inquires at an early stage.

Consumers also need to have greater awareness. I think an online address would create that and create more confidence. I think it is important, as a previous speaker said, that what is happening in individual states in the transposition of EU regulations is looked at very closely.

Finally, a previous speaker said that this was an ‘EU solution desperately looking for a problem’; I would say that it is an EU problem successfully finding a solution.

2-042

**Συλβάνια Ράπτη (S&D).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, συγχαρητήρια και ευχαριστίες στους εισηγητές και στους σκιώδεις εισηγητές των τριών εκθέσεων. Το γεγονός ότι υπάρχει συμφωνία με κάνει να είμαι αισιόδοξη για την πορεία της εσωτερικής αγοράς.

Θέλω να επισημάνω δύο σημεία: το πρώτο σημείο έχει να κάνει με την έκθεση Thun και την παράγραφο 10. Θεωρώ βασικό, και νομίζω ότι θα ήταν το καλύτερο που θα μπορούσε να είχε συμβεί, εάν μπορούσαμε να αποσαφηνίσουμε ότι τα δικαιώματα των εργαζομένων, τα κοινωνικά δικαιώματα και η προστασία του περιβάλλοντος δεν αποτελούν εμπόδια για την πρόοδο της εσωτερικής αγοράς.

Το δεύτερο σημείο αφορά το SOLVIT. Είναι ένας εξαιρετικός μηχανισμός που χρειάζεται όμως ακόμη πάρα πολλή βοήθεια. Και πρέπει να σας μιλήσω ειλικρινά και να σας πω ότι σκεφτόμουν να πιέσω τη δική μου κυβέρνηση, στην Ελλάδα, να κάνει κάτι γι' αυτό, γιατί διαθέτουμε μόνο δύο υπαλλήλους. Όταν όμως άκουσα ότι στη Γαλλία υπάρχει μόνον ένας ασκούμενος, σκέφτομαι να περιμένω πρώτα να πιέσει την κυβέρνησή του ο κύριος Barnier.

2-043

**Pascale Gruny (PPE).** – Monsieur le Président, Messieurs les Commissaires, mes chers collègues, le nouveau réseau de résolution de problèmes en ligne concernant les cas de mauvaise application de la législation sur le marché intérieur, dit SOLVIT, est un système très efficace dans la mesure où il permet d'obtenir réparation sans procédure formelle dans un délai approximatif de 10 semaines.

Ce réseau créé en 2002 a vu sa charge de travail augmenter de 22% en 2008. Même si le taux de résolution des différends reste assez élevé, 83%, le nombre d'affaires résolues est en baisse. Il serait temps, huit années après sa création, de songer à renforcer cette institution en lui donnant les moyens de fonctionner efficacement.

Ces nouvelles mesures permettraient d'aider les citoyens européens et les entreprises à faire valoir leurs droits, notamment dans la reconnaissance des qualifications, de leurs droits sociaux et de séjour.

Je soutiens donc l'idée que non seulement le personnel de SOLVIT doit être plus important dans les États membres mais aussi que des mesures d'accompagnement et des formations doivent être mises en place pour que ce personnel puisse fonctionner de la manière la plus efficace possible.

Il m'apparaît fondamental que les gouvernements et nous-mêmes, en qualité d'élus de nos circonscriptions respectives, fassions la promotion du réseau SOLVIT, qui a permis d'économiser 32,6 millions d'euros en 2008. De plus, faire valoir ce nouvel instrument limiterait les recours excessifs au système judiciaire. J'appelle donc les États membres à transposer l'ensemble des directives européennes et à sensibiliser les citoyens et les entreprises à leurs droits au sein du marché intérieur via des supports médiatiques et des campagnes d'information nationales.

Pour conclure, au nom de mon groupe politique au sein de la commission des pétitions, je souhaiterais que la coopération entre SOLVIT et notre commission parlementaire se renforce afin de faciliter le travail de ces deux derniers.

2-044

**Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Gratuluję sprawozdawcom bardzo dobrych sprawozdań. W ostatnim czasie dużo mówimy o potrzebie ożywienia rynku wewnętrznego. Mówił o tym także pan komisarz podczas



przesłuchania przed komisją IMCO. Dotyczyć tego też będzie oczekiwany przez nas raport profesora Montiego. Moim zdaniem, trochę za mało z samego rynku wewnętrznego znalazło się w strategii Unii Europejskiej 2020. Rynek wewnętrzny jest nam potrzebny, ale potrzebny jest nam rynek wewnętrzny nie z samej nazwy, ale rynek wewnętrzny realnie funkcjonujący. Nie można powiedzieć, że z taką sytuacją mamy do czynienia obecnie. Zbyt liczne bariery w swobodnym przepływie 4 swobód hamują jego potencjał, a polityki protekcjonistyczne państw członkowskich są sprzeczne z zasadami rynku wewnętrznego. Z jednej strony potrzebujemy prawidłowej implementacji prawa przez państwa członkowskie, potrzebujemy dobrze działających instrumentów wsparcia, jak choćby SOLVIT, ale potrzebujemy też głębszego (...).

*(Przewodniczący odebrał postance głos)*

2-045

**Marc Tarabella (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, je ne peux que partager les conclusions du rapport de notre collègue, Anna Hedh, notamment en ce qui concerne la nécessité d'une politique de la consommation active, en particulier dans la protection des consommateurs vulnérables et à faibles revenus.

Par ailleurs, je voudrais mettre l'accent sur quelques autres points essentiels de cette politique. Le tableau de bord des marchés de consommation est un instrument statistique intéressant, certes, mais tout à fait insuffisant car il se concentre exclusivement sur le fonctionnement du secteur de la consommation, mais sans chercher à résoudre les problèmes du citoyen consommateur à l'intérieur de ce marché.

Le tableau de bord des consommateurs ne devrait pas se limiter à observer la demande du marché ainsi que les consommateurs comme destinataires passifs en fin de chaîne. Il est de plus en plus évident que le consommateur doit désormais remplir un rôle responsable et actif en consommant durable, éthique, social et écologique. Il faut donc réorienter le tableau et y intégrer les indicateurs sur les aspects sociaux et environnementaux de ces choix, qui deviennent de plus en plus importants.

Il faudrait enfin intégrer dans l'examen de l'acquis des législations concernant la consommation d'énergie, les transports, l'environnement, le numérique, etc.

*(Le Président retire la parole à l'orateur)*

2-046

**Franz Obermayr (NI).** – Herr Präsident! Ich nehme Bezug auf Vorschläge zum Verbraucherschutz und möchte natürlich gleich eingangs die positiven Ansätze erwähnen: Der Weg zum mündigen Konsumenten durch eine stärkere Aufklärung auf allen Ebenen, vom kommunalen, lokalen und regionalen Bereich bis hin zum EU-grenzüberschreitenden Verkehr, die Förderung der Verbraucher – wie bei uns in Österreich im Kartellrecht vorgesehen – und natürlich auch härtere Strafen für schlampige Banken bei unüberlegter Kreditvergabe. Auch ein einheitliches Formular bei Krediten ist durchaus positiv.

Ich möchte aber auch problematische Sachen anschnitten, und zwar den gravierenden Nachteil im Gewährleistungsrecht und missbräuchliche Vertragsklauseln, die z. B. bei uns in Österreich strenger geahndet werden. Ich möchte vorschlagen, dass man das Günstigkeitsprinzip anwendet, sodass dort, wo nationale Regeln den Verbraucher besser schützen, diese auch dementsprechend angewandt werden sollten.

2-047

**Mairead McGuinness (PPE).** – Mr President, consumer protection: we are all in favour of it. The difficulty is that some Member States pay lip service to the SOLVIT mechanism, as other speakers have addressed. That needs to be looked at so that there is proper staffing.

But can I tell you about some practical examples of consumer problems that come to my office. Just this morning I had one relating to property transactions across the European Union. I know the EU does not have competence in this area, but could I ask Member States, where there are problems, to deal with citizens as they would with their own, and I do think there is an issue here that we need to take action on.

The second one relates to business directories. European City Guides has caused us enormous headaches in Parliament and they continue to operate because they receive some level of protection within the Member State where they are based. This needs to be addressed because the attitude of citizens to the internal market is affected by their experience in these areas, even if there is not competence for the EU in them.

2-048

**Christel Schaldemose (S&D).** – Hr. formand! Tak for en god debat her i dag. Jeg er glad for, at hr. Barnier og hr. Dalli har støttet så meget op omkring behovet for at tænke på forbrugerne på det indre marked. Men jeg vil gerne henlede opmærksomheden på et særligt punkt i fru Hedh's betænkning, nemlig punkt nr. 40, hvor vi foreslår etablering af et europæisk forbrugeragentur. Jeg kunne godt tænke mig at høre, om det er noget, I vil arbejde for. Et sådant agentur kan være med til at samle data ind, det kan være med til at lave studier om forbrugeradfærd, og det kan selvfølgelig også

fungere som vagthund over for Kommissionens arbejde og over for Parlamentets arbejde omkring forbrugerspørgsmål. Derfor vil jeg gerne høre, hvad I synes om den idé, om I vil arbejde for det – og for min skyld kunne vi sagtens placere sådan et agentur enten på Malta eller i Frankrig, hvis det kan hjælpe processen.

2-049

**Michel Barnier**, *membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Madame Schaldemose a souligné à l'instant la qualité de ce débat, notamment sur le point précis de l'agence des consommateurs, qui existe, sauf erreur de ma part, déjà au Canada, John Dalli dira ce qu'il en est aujourd'hui. Je suis d'accord avec cette appréciation sur la qualité du débat et la qualité de toutes les interventions ou propositions critiques constructives qui ont été faites sur la mise en œuvre et l'évaluation, sur le suivi de ces 1 500 – je le répète pour tous ceux qui nous écoutent – 1 500 directives ou textes qui organisent ce grand marché européen. Je ne sais pas d'ailleurs si je ne préfère pas parler du grand marché européen plutôt que du marché unique, ce serait plus clair pour les citoyens et les consommateurs.

Je voudrais, sous le contrôle du président Malcom Harbour, qui m'a entendu dire cela au sein de la commission du marché intérieur et de la protection des consommateurs, et en écho à l'intervention de M. Triantaphyllides, rappeler quel est le fil bleu de l'action qui sera la mienne au sein de la Commission pendant les cinq ans qui viennent.

Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, mon intention, jour après jour, législation après législation, c'est de remettre le marché européen au service des hommes et des femmes qui habitent sur notre continent. J'ai une deuxième intention, c'est de remettre les marchés – puisque j'ai cette responsabilité aussi de la régulation et de la supervision – de remettre les marchés financiers, dont on parle beaucoup depuis quelques mois, au service de l'économie réelle, au service des hommes et des femmes.

Je veux que les citoyens, les consommateurs, les petites entreprises se réapproprient ce marché. Voilà ce qui guidera l'action que j'aurai l'honneur de conduire au sein du collège. C'est une question de confiance pour reprendre le mot que M. Rochefort ou Mme Rhüle ont utilisé tout à l'heure, de confiance réciproque. Et voilà pourquoi je remercie à nouveau Róza von Thun und Hohenstein de la qualité de son rapport sur le tableau d'affichage qu'a publié la Commission européenne.

Il y a beaucoup d'idées, dans ce rapport et dans tout ce que j'ai entendu, qui méritent d'être retenues ou étudiées. M. Bielan a soutenu l'idée des indicateurs sur l'application des règles que comporte le rapport de Mme von Thun. Mme Gebhardt a évoqué aussi l'évaluation économique et sociale des directives et des études d'impact. Peut-être, à ce stade, puis-je faire écho à la critique constructive du président Malcolm Harbour à propos de la stratégie 2020. Et j'ai entendu aussi Mme Handzlik dire qu'on ne parlait pas assez du marché intérieur.

Franchement, quand vous lisez précisément la stratégie 2020 que la Commission a publiée la semaine dernière, le marché intérieur est au cœur de cette approche et il est partout: croissance intelligente avec les brevets et d'autres outils, croissance verte avec le bon usage des marchés publics, croissance inclusive ou équitable ou juste. Le marché intérieur est partout, il doit être partout mais, Monsieur le Président Harbour, le texte de 2020 n'a pas la vocation de parler de tout. Par exemple, il ne parle pas de politique étrangère et de défense, il n'a pas non plus l'intention de dispenser la Commission de son travail, qui est la bonne application, la vigilance, le suivi de la bonne mise en œuvre de l'ensemble des textes. Je vous prie de croire que je ne me sens pas dispensé de vérifier, d'agir, y compris quelquefois par des procédures d'infraction, pour assurer la bonne application du marché intérieur. Mais je privilégierai toujours, je le répète, le contrat, la confiance, l'explication, par rapport à la contrainte.

Il y a dans le rapport de Mme von Thun und Hohenstein, d'autres bonnes idées: le partenariat avec les États membres et la création de ce forum du marché intérieur que je soutiens. Peut-être pourrions-nous d'ailleurs, ce jour-là, rassembler d'autres initiatives autour des mêmes sujets que nous traitons avec John Dalli, comme la mise en œuvre ou la mise en exécution, la mise en valeur du réseau SOLVIT, et faire les choses en même temps.

J'ai dit attacher autant d'importance à l'effet de suivi qu'aux effets d'annonce. C'est ma manière de faire de la politique et, de ce point de vue-là, je pense que le tableau d'affichage, l'évaluation, doit nous permettre de faire non seulement une évaluation quantitative – combien de directives sont transposées – mais également qualitative.

Je crois que, avec beaucoup de lucidité d'ailleurs, M. Hoang Ngoc a évoqué la qualité de la mise en œuvre des lois, la qualité de la transposition et, avez-vous dit, la qualité aussi des lois elles-mêmes, ce qui, pour un législateur ou pour un commissaire, est un bon exercice de lucidité. En tout cas, toutes ces idées sont utiles, comme l'ont soutenu M. Schwab ou Mme Roithová tout à l'heure.

Sur SOLVIT, pour terminer par quelques appréciations télégraphiques, je retiens l'idée qui a été évoquée d'un site Internet de SOLVIT.EU, qui est une bonne idée. Il diffusera l'information ou renverra vers les sites nationaux. Nous travaillerons avec mes services très rapidement sur ce site SOLVIT.EU en liaison avec un autre projet qui concerne le site Votre

Europe. Mais comme l'a dit Seán Kelly, au moins le mot SOLVIT est un mot clair et simple, avez-vous dit, et je retiens cette appréciation positive.

SOLVIT fonctionne bien; il pourrait fonctionner mieux. Il y a trop de citoyens et d'entreprises qui ignorent encore leurs droits et les moyens de les faire valoir, et je retiens l'observation de Mme Werthmann, appelant à davantage de transparence. Je pense aussi que plusieurs d'entre vous, Mme Vergnaud, M. Rossi, Mme Stihler, Mme Rapti, ont évoqué l'insuffisance des moyens mis au service de SOLVIT, pas seulement d'ailleurs en France, même si j'ai bien entendu votre interpellation. Ce n'est pas un ministre français qui s'adresse à vous, même si c'est un ancien ministre français, et je vous prie de croire que je vais regarder de très près ce qui se passe dans ce pays qui reste le mien pour que cela fonctionne bien, comme dans tous les autres pays.

Effectivement, il faut les moyens adéquats et nécessaires et je vais vérifier cela à l'occasion de toutes mes visites sur le terrain. Encore une fois, ces outils sont nécessaires pour bien vérifier comment fonctionne le marché intérieur, qui, je le dis à mon tour, n'est pas terminé. Nous devons le relancer, l'approfondir – plusieurs l'ont indiqué, M. Stolojan, Mme Gebhardt, M. Karas, M. Kožušník – sur le plan transfrontalier ou même à l'intérieur de chacun des pays. Nous devons lever les obstacles et c'est pour cela, Monsieur le Président Harbour, qu'il importe de déterminer où se trouvent les chaînons manquants, ce qui est peut-être insuffisamment mis en exergue, mais qui est tout de même fixé dans la stratégie 2020. Je vais m'y attacher avec mes 12 ou 15 collègues au sein du collège qui sont en charge, d'une manière ou d'une autre, de l'application des directives sur le marché intérieur.

Je conclus, Monsieur le Président, sur trois points précis. Oui à une coopération étroite, c'est M. Busuttil qui a évoqué cette question, entre SOLVIT, l'ombudsman et le travail de la commission des pétitions. Je vais aller dans ce sens.

Je remercie Mme Rühle et les autres membres de la commission du budget, pour leur volonté de soutenir le budget de SOLVIT. Je retiens l'idée de Mme Gruny d'organiser des concertations, des séminaires. Nous en avons déjà un ou deux par an – mais je vais vérifier que cela suffit – entre tous les agents dans les États membres, parfois même dans les régions, qui sont en charge du projet SOLVIT.

Et enfin, sur la question qui a été critiquée par plusieurs membres du groupe socialiste sur le test du marché intérieur, pour ne pas dramatiser cette question, je veux rappeler que toute proposition législative, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, doit respecter le traité. C'est ce que veut dire le rapporteur, c'est-à-dire passer un test de compatibilité avec les principes du marché intérieur. C'est une chose, et moi je vais également veiller, comme je m'y suis engagé à ce que toute législation soit évaluée préalablement, au regard d'un certain nombre de critères sociaux, environnementaux et économiques.

Voilà les engagements en amont et en aval de toute législation pour essayer de bâtir le meilleur corpus législatif au service des citoyens, des consommateurs et des entreprises qui travaillent et qui vivent sur le territoire européen.

2-050

**PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: PAN LIBOR ROUČEK**  
*Mistopředseda*

2-051

**John Dalli**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, like my colleague, Michel Barnier, I find it very heartening to be part of such a lively debate and to hear such expert views relating to consumer issues. This augurs well for our working together in a true spirit of partnership and achieving our objective to put consumers first.

If I may, I will repeat one point I made in my initial address. In addition to the economic arguments for a strong, effective and properly enforced consumer policy, we should keep our sights firmly on the central role this can play in reconnecting Europe with its citizens – perhaps the biggest prize of all. I know that one of my main tasks is to coordinate this effort in the Commission, and your vigilance will be most welcome and comforting.

The consumer scoreboard is a tool which enables us to detect failures in the market and allows us to move to a further study on how to address such failures. I believe that it is a crucial mechanism that serves a very real purpose, and we can usefully benefit from its further development and strengthening.

The scoreboard will be our eyes and ears alerting us to problem hotspots. A better reflection of the consumer angle across EU policies and our joint commitment to effective enforcement will result in a stronger EU consumer, and the economic benefits that will follow.

Following a public consultation last year, the Commission is evaluating the comments about collective redress and intends to find a solution that meets European consumers' needs without importing US practices. Alternative dispute resolution is going to be our key mover in this regard.

My friend, Michel Barnier, has already explained the central position that the internal market has in the EU 2020 strategy. If you look closely at the text, there is a clear understanding also that consumers must remain at the heart of the single market. Consumers are positioned as drivers of the single market and we intend to continue to consolidate the centrality of consumers.

I see the issue of consumer education as a key issue for consumer empowerment. We are indeed looking at how our Dolcetta programme can be further enhanced to cover new areas.

On the last point raised about a European consumer agency, it must be emphasised that enforcement is the exclusive obligation of the Member States and they need to provide adequate resources for its proper functioning. However, the Treaty does provide a legal basis for the Union to support and complement their efforts. It has to be carefully evaluated in what areas the EU can complement national public enforcement and what is the right institutional structure for that. The Commission will carefully evaluate the different options.

I very much look forward to making serious and sustained progress with you over the time I am responsible for this sector.

2-052

**Róza, Gräfin von Thun Und Hohenstein, sprawozdawca.** – Przede wszystkim dziękuję bardzo za tę fascynującą debatę, za żywe reakcje, za poważne refleksje, a obecność i wypowiedzi obu panów komisarzy oraz licznie zgromadzonych pracowników Komisji pokazują, że ten nowy Parlament i ta nowa Komisja będą dobrze i blisko współpracować w sprawie dalszego rozwoju wspólnego rynku.

Wspólny rynek to jedno z największych osiągnięć Unii Europejskiej i dziękuję bardzo za pozytywne reakcje na propozycje, które zawarłam w moim sprawozdaniu. A koleżankom i kolegom socjalistom, którzy obawiają się ustępu 10. *Single Market Test* – testu rynku wewnętrznego – chciałabym przypomnieć, że po pierwsze to nie jest nic nowego, ta propozycja została już przyjęta przez komisję IMCO w 2003 r. i jest częścią strategii rynku wewnętrznego. Nie obawiamy się go. Ow test nie niszczy niczego, co Unia Europejska osiągnęła z dorobku społecznego. Przecież słyszeliśmy tu przed chwilą od pana komisarza, że Komisja Europejska ocenia nowe dyrektywy pod kątem kryteriów socjalnych, ekonomicznych i ekologicznych, więc bez paniki, spokojnie. Przecież wszystkim nam chodzi o to, żeby wspólny rynek dalej się rozwijał i chodzi nam również o to, żeby protekcjonizm nie wkraadał się do Komisji Europejskiej.

Integracja Europejska będzie się rozwijać tylko wtedy, kiedy obywatele będą świadomi, aktywni, instytucje publiczne kompetentne, skuteczne i przyjazne obywatelom. W tym sprawozdaniu proponuję szereg rozwiązań zmierzających ku temu, żebyście państwo – koleżanki i koledzy – mogli dobrze i skutecznie angażować swoich wyborców w proces integracji Europejskiej, a w tym wypadku – poprzez właśnie wzmacnianie wspólnego rynku – zwiększyć ich udział we wspólnym rynku, tym wielkim osiągnięciu Unii Europejskiej. Musimy dalej rozwijać instrumenty pomagające w rozwoju wspólnego rynku. Wspólna publikacja czterech sprawozdań to jest bardzo ważny element, lepsza koordynacja, lepsze wdrażanie prawodawstwa. Nie reagujmy alergicznie na słowo „rynek”. W tej części świata, z której ja pochodzę akurat z tego rynku korzystać nie mogliśmy przez wiele dziesiątków lat i wiemy, do czego to doprowadziło.

Na zakończenie przypominamy obywatelom, że sercem wspólnego rynku są właśnie cztery swobody i to podkreślamy w moim sprawozdaniu i niezwykle ważne jest, aby nie ograniczać swobód tego rynku, pomagać obywatelom coraz pełniej z nich korzystać, rozwijać, niczego z dorobku nie niszczyć.

2-053

**Anna Hedh, föredragande.** – Herr talman! Det har varit intressant att lyssna på alla kloka och intressanta inlägg. Jag är också väldigt glad att de båda ansvariga kommissionsledamöterna lovar att gemensamt arbeta för att EU:s konsumentpolitik ska förbättras och utvecklas. Jag skulle vilja tillägga några få saker.

Konsumentorganisationerna har en väldigt viktig roll att spela för att uppmärksamma myndigheterna på konsumenternas vardagsproblem. Därför bör de instrument som står till konsumentorganisationernas förfogande förbättras, så att det blir lättare för dem att agera effektivt på EU-nivå och nationell nivå.

Dessutom måste vi uppmana medlemsstaterna att i så stor utsträckning som möjligt rådfråga konsumentorganisationerna i alla skeden av det beslutsfattande som rör konsumentpolitik. Det gläder mig också att kommissionsledamot John Dalli tog upp frågan om vikten av att medlemsstaterna ser till att det finns tillräcklig finansiering och personal till förfogande för vidareutveckling av resultatavlan.

Slutligen bör resultatavlan inte bara användas för att få till stånd en bättre konsumentpolitik, utan den ska påverka alla politikerområden som är viktiga för konsumenterna och se till att konsumentfrågorna i större utsträckning integreras i all EU-politik. Dessutom bör resultatavlan stimulera en mer allmän diskussion om konsumentpolitiska frågor, både på EU-nivå och nationell nivå. Jag skulle verkligen se fram emot att om ett år återigen ha en debatt här i kammaren om den inre marknaden och konsumentskyddet.

2-054

**Cristian Silviu Buşoi**, *Raportor*. – Îi mulțumesc domnului comisar Barnier și colegilor care au făcut aprecieri pozitive despre primul meu raport, dar și despre rețeaua SOLVIT în sine. Cred că SOLVIT este o soluție practică pentru consumatori și, de aceea, cred că ea trebuie îmbunătățită și promovată de către noi și de către statele membre, pentru ca un număr cât mai mare de cetățeni europeni să știe despre existența SOLVIT și să își poată apăra drepturile recurgând la asistența SOLVIT.

Cred că rezultatul la care am ajuns, atât în Comisia pentru piața internă și protecția consumatorilor, cât și în Comisia pentru petiții, este unul satisfăcător. SOLVIT este deja o rețea care funcționează bine, însă avem nevoie de soluții pentru câteva dificultăți pe care le întâlnesc atât cei care apelează la SOLVIT, cât și personalul acestuia. În raport se regăsesc o parte dintre aceste soluții, altele au fost puse în discuție în această dezbatere.

Mai mult decât faptul că trebuie o creștere a personalului în unele centre SOLVIT, pentru eficiența SOLVIT, personalul trebuie să fie unul calificat corespunzător și să beneficieze de formare privind normele pieței interne. Tot la fel de important este ca personalul SOLVIT să poată beneficia de asistență juridică, atât din partea funcționarilor din administrațiile publice, cât și din partea Comisiei Europene, dat fiind gradul de complexitate al cazurilor care ajung la cunoștința SOLVIT. Uneori Comisia Europeană răspunde cu întârziere solicitărilor de asistență juridică venite din partea personalului SOLVIT, ceea ce duce la unele întârzieri pentru întreaga procedură de soluționare a cazurilor.

Îi mulțumesc domnului comisar Barnier că s-a angajat în fața Parlamentului European că în cel mai scurt timp va face posibilă existența site-ului [www.solvit.eu](http://www.solvit.eu).

Cred cu tărie, dragi colegi, că acest raport este un pas important spre ameliorarea funcționării SOLVIT și, de aceea, rog toate grupurile să voteze în favoarea acestui raport.

Vă mulțumesc.

2-055

**President**. – The joint debate is closed.

The vote will take place shortly.

#### *Written statements (Rule 149)*

2-056

**John Attard-Montalto (S&D)**, *in writing*. – It is unbelievable that, in two essential areas such as health and consumer protection, in Malta and Gozo the official structures are completely passive in spite of blatant transgressions.

In the Maltese Islands, medicines are much more expensive than in another EU country, namely Belgium. I will give the following examples:

Galvus 50 mg (diabetic pills)

Price in Malta for a box of 28: EUR 27.84

Price in Brussels for a box of 180: EUR 135.13

For 180 pills, the price in Malta is EUR 178.97 as compared to EUR 135.13 in Brussels.

Tegretol 200 mg

Price in Malta for a box of 50: EUR 17.00

Price in Brussels for a box of 50: EUR 7.08

Zocor 20 mg

Price in Malta for a box of 28: EUR 34.94

Price in Brussels for a box of 84: EUR 21.71

For 84 pills, the price in Malta is EUR 104.82 as compared to EUR 21.71 in Brussels.

These are only a few examples of a situation which is contributing to the hardship being suffered by the majority of Maltese families. The EU prides itself on health and consumer protection but in the Maltese Islands the price of medications has spiralled for no justifiable reason.

2-057

**Robert Dušek (S&D)**, *v písemné formě*. – Účinně fungující vnitřní trh je podmínkou pro adekvátní zaručení smluvně daných práv volného pohybu osob, služeb, zboží a kapitálu uvnitř Společenství. V době krize může pomoci opět vytvořit stabilní a prosperující hospodářské prostředí. Vnitřní trh však nemůže plnit svoji funkci bez správného provádění, uplatňování a vymáhání právních předpisů. Členské státy jsou povinny provádět právní předpisy včas, pokud se k tomu smluvně zavázaly. Deficit provádění 1 % se může zdát malý, přepočtem na počet pozdě či dosud neprovedených směrnic

je ale pro řádné fungování vnitřního trhu výrazný. Pochybení se u některých členských států opakují. Podporuji poskytování podrobnějších informací o směrnících, které nebyly dosud provedeny, na webových stránkách Komise. Tyto informace by mohly přispět ke zvýšení informovanosti široké veřejnosti a ústavních orgánů v členských zemích. Vítám výzvu směřovanou členským státům přijmout nezbytná opatření včetně přidělení zdrojů s cílem zajistit fungování přeshraničních sítí elektronických informačních systémů včasné výměny informací, zejména pro nebezpečné nepotravinářské výrobky (RAPEX), pro potraviny a krmiva (RASFF) či sítě pro spolupráci v oblasti ochrany spotřebitele (CPC). Tyto systémy dodnes řádně nefungují a není na ně ve všech členských státech spolehnutí. Pozornost je třeba také věnovat správnému uplatňování směrnic. Toho lze dosáhnout účinnou spoluprací mezi orgány na celostátní, regionální a místní úrovni.

2-057-500

**Louis Grech (S&D), in writing.** – Serious consideration has to be taken as regards existing Union-wide redress mechanisms such as SOLVIT, this alternative avenue for redress is underused due to lack of knowledge of its existence on the part of citizens, consumers and businesses, as well as because of the inadequate resources in place at national level. SOLVIT centres that are currently present in each Member State (as well as in Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein) are understaffed and underfunded - training for staff and funding to improve the administrative capacity of the centres must be stepped up. I call upon the Commission to complete the Single Market Assistance Services (SMAS) project as a matter of priority. I propose that the Commission consider including in the Consumer Market Scoreboard a detailed account of the progress, achievements and shortcomings of SOLVIT. Furthermore, in an attempt to raise awareness, Member State must promote SOLVIT as an expedient and accessible alternative dispute resolution mechanism, in the form of a nation-wide information campaign. Finally, there needs to be marked improvement on the part of the Commission and the Member States to raise awareness of the opportunities that the Single Market offers for citizens, consumers and businesses.

2-058

**Danuta Jazłowiecka (PPE), na piśmie.** – Społeczeństwo swobodnie wykorzystujące możliwości, które daje jednolity rynek, jest podstawą powodzenia procesu integracji europejskiej. Nie zbudujemy prawdziwej, zjednoczonej Unii, bez przekonania ludzi, iż cała Europa jest ich domem. I temu przede wszystkim może służyć SOLVIT. Można śmiało powiedzieć, iż powołanie systemu SOLVIT w 2002 r. było jednym z tych wydarzeń w historii zjednoczonej Europy, które z pozoru wydają się być niepozorne, ale z czasem przynoszą nieoczekiwane skutki. Idea tego systemu odwołuje się wprost do źródeł integracji europejskiej, czyli tego, że ma ona służyć przede wszystkim obywatelom Unii, a nie poszczególnym państwom, czy rządowi.

Czy może być coś lepszego, niż dáníe zvyklým lidem prostého instrumentu umožňujícího řešení problémů, které omeňují jejich svobodu funkcionování v rámci jednotného trhu? Došvědčení blízko dekadu pokazaly jednak, iż istnieją liczne bariery uniemożliwujące pełne wykorzystanie możliwości, które daje ten system. Dlatego należy zgodzić się z postulatami sprawozdania przygotowanego przez Komisję Rynku Wewnętrznego i Ochrony Konsumentów. Przede wszystkim należy się skupić na wypromowaniu SOLVITu wśród obywateli państw członkowskich, ponieważ wiedza o nim jest nikła. Przyznanie większych zasobów finansowych i kadrowych, dodatkowe szkolenia pracowników, czy stworzenie instytucji oficera łącznikowego, nie będą miały sensu, jeżeli ludzie nie będą wiedzieli, iż mają taki instrument do swojej dyspozycji. Od tego więc moim zdaniem należy zacząć wszelkie działania, nie rezygnując jednak z pozostałych.

2-059

**Ramona Nicole Mănescu (ALDE), în scris.** – Domnule Președinte, Stimați colegi, Buna funcționare a pieței interne trebuie să rămână o prioritate pentru Parlamentul European iar serviciul precum SOLVIT sunt esențiale pentru asigurarea acesteia. Raportul evidențiază acest lucru și atrage atenția asupra problemelor cu care se confruntă acest serviciu. Chiar dacă știm cu toții că aspecte precum comunicarea și mediatizarea serviciului SOLVIT sunt extrem de importante, constatăm totuși că acestea rămân unele din problemele recurente cu care serviciul s-a confruntat încă din primii ani. Statele membre și Comisia Europeană trebuie să se asigure că cetățenii europeni, mediul de afaceri și în special întreprinderile mici și mijlocii, care au nevoie de sprijin pentru a putea beneficia pe deplin de facilitățile pieței interne, au acces la mijloacele de informare și soluționare rapidă. Mai mult decât atât, centrele SOLVIT au nevoie de resurse suplimentare, și mă refer aici la personal calificat și implicit cursuri de formare continuă pentru acesta. Statele Membre trebuie să înțeleagă importanța acestor centre, atât de necesare pentru o implementare corectă a normelor pieței interne. Consider că avantajele pe care acest serviciu le poate oferi, atât cetățenilor cât și mediului de afaceri, sunt departe de a fi pe deplin utilizate.

2-060

**Andreas Mølzer (NI), schriftlich.** – Der Verbraucherschutz in der Europäischen Union muss so gestaltet sein, dass die Bürger im Rahmen des Binnenmarktes ein großes Angebot an hochwertigen Erzeugnissen und Dienstleistungen nutzen können, gleichzeitig aber auch darauf vertrauen können, dass ihre Rechte als Verbraucher gewahrt werden und sie diese im Fall des Falles wirksam nutzen können. Selbstverständlich ist dafür auch entsprechendes Wissen der Verbraucher über ihre Rechte und Pflichten im Rahmen des geltenden Rechts Voraussetzung. Die im Bericht erwähnten Initiativen zur Aufklärung und Information der EU-Bürger sind daher wichtig und müssen rasch umgesetzt werden. Ein großes Problem stellt die zunehmende Komplexität vor allem des Dienstleistungssektor dar, der es dem Verbraucher immer schwieriger macht, beim Kauf von Waren oder Dienstleistungen eine sachkundige Wahl zu treffen. Die Erkenntnisse sowie die

Bedürfnisse der Verbraucher, die ja auch im Wege des Verbraucherbarometers erhoben werden, müssen von den EU-Institutionen im Rahmen ihrer Politik bzw. der Rechtsetzung berücksichtigt werden. Eine zunehmende Harmonisierung der Verbraucherschutzvorschriften – und damit ist eine Anpassung nach oben gemeint – ist aufgrund der steigenden grenzüberschreitenden Nutzung von Dienstleistungen anzustreben. Bei allen Verbesserungsbemühungen, die den Binnenmarkt betreffen, dürfen wir aber nicht die zahlreichen Importe aus Drittländern vergessen. Hier muss es zu einer verstärkten Zusammenarbeit der Zoll- und Verbraucherschutzbehörden aus den Mitgliedstaaten kommen, um den Verbraucher vor unsicheren Importprodukten zu schützen.

2-061

**Siiri Oviir (ALDE), kirjalikult.** – ELi tarbijakaitsepoliitika reguleerimisala on aastatega laienenud, kajastades muudatusi inimeste vajadustes ja ootustes. Ligi 500 miljoni tarbijaga ELi siseturul on tähtis roll Lissaboni tegevuskava eesmärkide (majanduskasvu, tööhõive ja konkurentsivõime suurendamise) saavutamisel, tarbijate kulutused annavad poole ELi rikkusest. Ennekõike e-kaubanduse kiire arengu tõttu on ELis oluliselt kasvanud tarbijaturgude piiriülene mõõde, mistõttu on veelgi tähtsamaks muutunud kõrgetasemelise tarbijakaitse olemasolu. Kahjuks aga ei ole mitte kõigis liikmesriikides täna tagatud ELi tarbijakaitse-eeskirjade ühesugune rakendamine ja jõustamine. Olen seisukohal, et tugevdatud turujärelevalve ja jõustamismehhanismid ning nende tulemuslik ja laialdane rakendamine tarbija usalduse tõstmiseks on hädavajalikud. Sellest lähtuvalt toetan raportööri ettepanekut, et Euroopa Komisjonil tuleb teraselt jälgida liikmesriikides ELi tarbijaõigustiku ülevõtmist ja rakendamist ning neid selles ka igati aidata. Leian, et Euroopa Komisjonil tuleks kaaluda ka Euroopa tarbijakaitseameti loomise mõttekust, mis võiks koordineeriva keskasutusena tegeleda just piiriüleste juhtumite lahendamise, toetamise ja täiendamise vastavaid liikmesriikide tarbijakaitseameteid ELi tarbijakaitse-eeskirjade rakendamisel ja jõustamisel. Leian, et ELi tarbijakaitse-eeskirjadest ei ole palju kasu, kui nad jäävad riiklikul tasandil nõuetekohaselt üle võtmata, rakendamata ja jõustamata.

2-062

## 5 - Movement of persons with a long-stay visa (debate)

2-063

**President.** – The next item is the report by Carlos Coelho, on behalf of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement and Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 as regards movement of persons with a long-stay visa (COM(2009)0091 – C6-0076/2009 – 2009/0028(COD)) (A7-0015/2010).

2-064

**Carlos Coelho, relator.** – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, caras e caros Colegas, falamos hoje de situações absurdas, como a de um estudante que obtém um visto para vir tirar um curso na Bélgica. Não estando abrangido no âmbito da Directiva 2004/114/CE, ele não pode ir à Holanda recolher informação numa biblioteca especializada para poder escrever a sua tese nem aproveitar um fim-de-semana para ir conhecer Barcelona porque está preso no país que emitiu o visto.

A Convenção de Schengen prevê que os titulares de um visto de longa duração podem apenas residir no território do Estado-Membro que emitiu o visto. Não podem viajar para outros Estados-Membros nem transitar para outros Estados-Membros em regresso ao seu país de origem.

Schengen significa liberdade de circulação. Qualquer pessoa que resida legalmente num Estado-Membro deve poder circular livremente nesse espaço onde não existem fronteiras internas. A solução ideal seria que os Estados-Membros cumprissem a sua obrigação de atribuir um título de residência aos nacionais de países terceiros detentores desse visto. Porém, não é isso que está a acontecer na grande maioria dos Estados-Membros.

Transitoriamente, os Estados-Membros tornaram essa situação, emitindo os vistos D+C, permitindo aos titulares de um visto de longa duração circular livremente no Espaço Schengen durante os primeiros três meses. Estes vistos serão abolidos a partir de Abril de 2010 com a entrada em vigor do Código Comunitário de Vistos, o que torna mais urgente encontrar uma solução para este problema.

As alterações que propus e que tiveram o apoio da maioria dos membros da Comissão LIBE contribuem para a resolução deste problema sem diminuir o nível de segurança no Espaço Schengen.

A obrigação de consultar o Serviço de Informação de Schengen aquando do tratamento dos pedidos de visto de longa duração é um procedimento idêntico ao que já existe para os nacionais de países terceiros detentores de autorizações de residência. Assim, respondemos aos receios do aumento da insegurança.

A verdade é que diversos Estados-Membros têm emitido vistos de longa duração e, posteriormente, títulos de residência, sem procederem a uma prévia consulta do SIS, nomeadamente as indicações do artigo 96.º para efeitos de recusa de admissão.

Esta prática fragiliza a segurança do Espaço Schengen e cria problemas nas fronteiras externas, quando pessoas com visto válido estão sinalizadas no SIS. Isso cria situações complicadas e desnecessárias para as pessoas e para os guardas das fronteiras, que terão de tentar descobrir se os vistos são falsificados ou se a indicação no SIS está incorrecta e deveria ser eliminada ou se esses vistos nunca deveriam ter sido emitidos.

A iniciativa que vamos votar irá permitir que os detentores de vistos de longa duração possam circular livremente durante um período de três meses em cada seis meses, idêntico ao aplicável aos detentores das autorizações de residência, ao mesmo tempo que vincula os Estados-Membros à obrigação de emitirem autorizações de residência no caso de autorizarem a estadia por mais do que um ano.

É igualmente reconhecida a necessidade de reforçar o nível de protecção de dados existente na Convenção de Schengen, recomendando-se à Comissão Europeia que apresente as iniciativas necessárias se o SIS II não começar a ser aplicado até 2012.

Com a entrada em vigor do Tratado de Lisboa, as duas propostas iniciais foram fundidas e foi atribuída uma nova base jurídica. O texto que iremos votar neste plenário é o resultado das negociações mantidas com as presidências sueca e espanhola. Traduz-se num acordo em primeira leitura, permitindo assim que este regulamento possa ser adoptado antes da entrada em vigor do Código de Vistos.

Sr. Presidente, eu teria desejado convidar a Presidência espanhola, que está ausente deste debate, a garantir a este Parlamento que o regulamento possa entrar em vigor até 5 de Abril de 2010. É essencial que esse objectivo possa ser obtido de forma a evitar um vazio jurídico.

Felicito a Comissão Europeia pela oportuna iniciativa. Agradeço a leal colaboração do Conselho, em especial das presidências sueca e espanhola, e a cooperação dos relatores sombra, que permitiram um alargado consenso na Comissão LIBE. Com esta medida resolvemos um problema delicado a milhares de cidadãos de países terceiros e fazemo-lo bem, reforçando a liberdade e a segurança.

2-065

**Cecilia Malmström, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, as the rapporteur pointed out, the aim of this proposal is to facilitate movement within the Schengen area for third-country nationals, who are legally residing in one of the Member States on the basis of a long-stay or 'D' visa. According to the current Schengen *acquis*, third-country nationals who hold a residence permit can travel freely within the Schengen area because the residence permit is equivalent to a visa.

However, there has been a recent trend in Member States not to convert long-stay visas into residence permits upon arrival. That is why we are having this discussion here today; obviously the Commission, the Council and the Parliament had to find a solution to the problem. The legal and practical situation has considerable negative consequences for third-country nationals legally staying in our Member States on the basis of a D visa. These persons can neither legally travel to another country nor can they transit through the territory of another country when they want to return to their country of origin. The absurdity of this situation was illustrated by the example that the rapporteur, Mr Coelho, raised.

The best solution would, of course, be that all Member States issue the necessary residence permits and that they do this in time. Unfortunately this is not the situation today, and therefore we have the present proposal which aims at extending the principle of equivalence between a residence permit and short-stay visas to long-stay D visas. A third-country national holding a long-stay D visa issued by a Member State will thereby be able to travel to the other Member States for three months in any half year under the same conditions as the holder of a residence permit. This would restore the basic philosophy underlying the creation of an area without internal borders, namely that the person can travel around in the Schengen area for short stays with the documents based on which he or she is legally present in a Member State.

I was very pleased to learn that Mr Carlos Coelho had expressed his support for this proposal from the very beginning and the rapporteur, together with the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs and the Committee on Legal Affairs, has understood that action needs to be taken in order to facilitate the life of third-country nationals, because we want to encourage people legally residing in our area. I want to thank the rapporteur for his constructive approach to this.

I do not need to remind you that we have to find a solution quickly, especially due to the visa code which will be applicable from the 5 April this year and will abolish the so-called D+C visas which were intended to partly remedy the situation of D visa holders. I believe that the final text on the draft regulation satisfied all the parties since the compromise text was agreed between all the institutions. In order to tackle some of the concerns expressed by the European Parliament and the Member States – for instance concerning security – several amendments have been made to the initial text.

To give a few examples, the proposal shortens the period of validity for long-stay visas. They should have a period of validity of no more than one year. After this one year the proposal established the obligation for Member States to issue a residence permit.



The requirement of systematic checks in the Schengen Information System (SIS) is also reinforced. Where a Member State considers issuing a residence permit or a D visa, the responsible authority should systematically carry out a search in the Schengen Information System in order to avoid a situation where we have an alert at the same time as a long-stay visa.

In order to give a response to the security concerns regarding biometrics – and this is of course a major issue for many Member States – a political declaration has, as you know, been attached to the draft regulation in which the Commission is invited to study the possibility of the use of biometric identifiers with respect to long-stay visas and to present the results in the study to this plenary and the Council by 21 July 2011. The Commission also accepts that a reporting obligation has been included in the draft regulation on the application.

To conclude, in order to find a compromise response to the major concern of the European Parliament concerning the guarantee for high-level data protection in cases where an alert has been issued in the SIS, a joint declaration has been agreed. The Commission is invited by the Council and the European Parliament to present the necessary legislative proposals amending the relevant data-protection provision for the Schengen Convention if there are further substantial delays in implementing the SIS II that go beyond 2012. I believe that, with these changes, we have reached a reasonable, well-balanced solution that will considerably facilitate the lives of the third-country nationals that are residing legally in our countries. It will also very much correspond to the philosophy of a Europe without internal borders.

I want to thank once again the LIBE Committee, the JURI Committee and the rapporteur for their very constructive approach to this.

2-066

**Cecilia Wikström, föredragande av yttrande från utskottet för rättsliga frågor.** – Herr talman! EU-samarbetet bygger på värderingar, och den mest grundläggande värderingen handlar om frihet. Det vi diskuterar i dag är människors möjlighet att röra sig fritt. I mitt EU finns inga begränsningar för detta. Just här ser jag EU:s storhet. Den fria rörligheten är till för alla oss som lever här, men den ska också gälla för alla dem som kommer hit för att vistas här under en längre tid.

Enligt Schengen-konventionen får en innehavare av en visering för längre tid i dag inte tillgång till den fria rörligheten, utan han eller hon får, som Carlos Coelho har påpekat, bara vistas i den medlemsstat som utfärdat viseringen. Det har t.ex. kommit att innebära att en gästprofessor från Indien som lever och verkar i min hemstad Uppsala i Sverige inte kan åka till Paris på en konferens utan att ansöka om visum till Frankrike, eller att en student från Kina inte kan åka till Tyskland för att hälsa på en vän under helgen utan att ansöka om visum dit.

Den typen av hinder för den fria rörligheten ska inte finnas inom EU. Nu ändrar vi på det. Syftet med det förslag som vi nu har att fatta beslut om är att säkra den fria rörligheten i hela Schengenområdet för tredjelandsmedborgare som är bosatta i en medlemsstat under en längre tid.

Jag vill tacka Carlos Coelho som har gjort ett alldeles fantastiskt fint arbete med detta som föredragande, och som har tagit hänsyn till de åsikter som jag har fört fram i mitt yttrande från JURI-utskottet och också andra skuggföredragandes åsikter. Resultatet har vi framför oss nu: Det är ett positivt förslag som utgör ännu en länk för att säkerställa den fria rörligheten i EU, också för tredjelandsmedborgare. Det utvecklar, och det är det EU som jag är stolt över att leva i och verka för.

2-067

**Kinga Gál, a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében.** – Elnök úr, képviselőtársaim, biztos asszony! Üdvözlendőnek tartom, hogy egy olyan kérdésben foglalunk állást most a Parlamentben, amelyik megkönnyítheti a jogszerűen tartózkodó harmadik országok állampolgárainak utazását az Unió területén, és gratulálok Coelho kollégámnak a kitűnő munkához, amit itt végzett a Parlamentben ebben a kérdésben. Jelen javaslat elősegíti, hogy az egyik tagállamban hosszas tartózkodásra jogosító – úgynevezett D vízummal rendelkező – harmadik országbeli állampolgárok számára az Unión belül az utazás megkönnyebbüljön, és ez kézzelfoghatóvá váljon. Ez megoldás lesz ugyanis azokra a helyzetekre, amikor egyes tagállamok különböző okokból nem képesek, nem akarnak kellő időben tartózkodási engedélyt kiadni a területükön tartózkodó harmadik országbeli állampolgárnak. Tehát nem használják megfelelően a schengeni szabályozás adta kereteket. És örülök, hogy akkor ebben a kérdésben tudunk továbblépni.

A célunk az, hogy az Európai Unió területére érkező harmadik országbeli állampolgárok ne úgy éljék ezt meg, hogy egy bevehetetlen erődítménybe lépnek be. Az integrált határigazgatás és a vízumpolitika e célokat kell szolgálja. Magyar képviselőként szorgalmazom, hogy az Unió külső határai átjárhatóak legyenek a jöhízemű beutazók számára. Ne korlátozzák a határok két oldalán élő emberek közötti kapcsolattartást. Az Unió szomszédságában élő harmadik országok polgárainak – közöttük a magyar kisebbségek tagjainak – elementáris érdekük, hogy lehetőségük legyen bürokratikus, adminisztratív terhek nélkül a jogszerű tartózkodásra az Unió tagállamainak területén. Ennek érdekében azonban egyaránt szükség van közösségi és tagállami szinten megfelelő jogszabályokra, de olyanokra, amelyek egymás határfokát nem korlátozzák, hanem egymás célkitűzéseit erősítik.

Azt remélem, hogy az új közösségi jogszabály nemcsak elvben lesz hangzatos, de gyakorlatban jelent majd könnyebbéget elsősorban a tagállamokban tanulni kívánó fiataloknak, egyetemi hallgatóknak. Ők kell legyenek a rendelet elsősorbanú hasznélvezői. És ebben az összefüggésben csak egyet tudok érteni azzal, hogy a Bizottság, legkésőbb 2012. áprilisáig jelentést nyújtson be a rendelet végrehajtásáról, és szükség esetén tegyen javaslatot a rendelet módosítására annak érdekében, hogy a kitűzött célok teljesüljenek.

2-068

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė, S&D frakcijos vardu.** – Sveikinu pranešėją C. Coelho už šio pranešimo parengimą ir taip pat pritariu, kad svarbu kuo greičiau užtikrinti trečiųjų šalių piliečiams, su ilgalaikė viza teisėtai esantiems valstybėje narėje, laisvą judėjimą Šengeno erdvėje. Remiantis dabartine valstybių narių praktika, trečiųjų šalių piliečiams ilgalaikės vizos pakeitimas leidimu gyventi dėl įvairių priežasčių užtrunka ganėtinai ilgi. Galėčiau pasiremti ne vienu pavyzdžiu iš Europos Sąjungos šalių, taip pat ir iš savo šalies, Lietuvos, kai, pavyzdžiui, D vizą gavęs tolimųjų pervežimų vairuotojas negali vykdyti savo tiesioginių funkcijų. Dabar susiklosčiusi praktika šioje srityje pažeidžia trečiųjų šalių piliečių, atvykusių į Europos Sąjungą dirbti ar mokytis, teisėtus lūkesčius. Taip pat valstybės narės turėtų imtis atitinkamų priemonių supaprastinti vizų išdavimo tvarką. Ilgalaikė viza turėtų turėti tokį patį poveikį asmenų judėjimui Šengeno erdvėje be vidaus sienų kaip ir leidimas gyventi. Svarbiausia čia yra ne laiko trukmė, kada D kategorijos vizos turėtojas gali vykti į kitą valstybę narę, o pati galimybė geriau tenkinti savo poreikius Šengeno erdvėje. Todėl pritariu siūlymui, kad trečiosios šalies pilietis, turintis valstybės narės išduotą ilgalaikę vizą, galėtų vykti į kitą valstybę narę 3 mėnesiams per bet kurį 6 mėnesių laikotarpį tokiomis pačiomis sąlygomis kaip ir leidimo gyventi turėtojas. Tuo pačiu labai svarbu užtikrinti, kad supaprastintas trečiųjų šalių piliečių judėjimas Šengeno erdvėje nesukeltų papildomos grėsmės valstybių narių saugumui. Taigi raginu priimti šį iš dalies pakeistą reglamentą nedelsiant.

2-069

**Nathalie Griesbeck, au nom du groupe ALDE.** – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, dans un océan de difficultés, il est des étapes qui prennent forme. C'est le cas à travers ce texte qui vient d'être très bien expliqué par l'ensemble des collègues, quels que soient les bancs sur lesquels ils siègent, et qui concerne tous les ressortissants de pays tiers qui résident légalement – je le rappelle – sur le territoire européen.

Il est en effet grand temps que ce texte soit adopté, grand temps que la liberté de circulation des ressortissants de pays tiers soit consacrée au sein de l'Union et je suis heureuse qu'on arrive à ce moment qui consiste à poser une nouvelle pierre dans la construction de l'Europe des libertés, dans un espace que l'on veut de plus en plus sécurisé.

C'est à la fois une évidence et une avancée. Une évidence, on l'a rappelé: il n'y a au fond pas de controverse majeure sur ce texte et le peu d'amendements explique que nous avons tous envie de construire une Europe où personne ne soit coincé dans un État sans pouvoir découvrir le reste de l'espace européen. Et puis une belle avancée, parce que cela représente des droits pour les personnes ressortissantes de pays tiers, étudiants, chercheurs ou autres, qui vivent sur le territoire de l'Union.

Enfin, pour conclure, cela favorisera évidemment la perception extérieure de l'Europe espace unique, l'Europe unie, espace commun, et cela forgera la culture et l'identité européennes au-delà de nos frontières.

2-070

**Rui Tavares, em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL.** – Senhor Presidente, em primeiro lugar quero agradecer ao relator, Carlos Coelho, cuja proposta apoio, tal como aos outros relatores sombra da Comissão LIBE.

Já tive oportunidade de dizer aqui que Carlos Coelho presta um bom serviço à liberdade de movimentos dentro da União Europeia, aos direitos dos cidadãos – seja dos cidadãos europeus, seja dos cidadãos de países estrangeiros – e à democracia europeia no seu conjunto, entendida não só como o conjunto dos seus cidadãos, mas contando também com o contributo de milhares e milhares de cidadãos ou milhões de cidadãos de países terceiros que passam pelo espaço europeu, que aqui residem, que aqui vêm por períodos mais ou menos longos para trabalhar e estudar.

Carlos Coelho trabalhou com o contributo dos relatores sombra num excelente ambiente de informação e de cooperação. Acima de tudo fê-lo a tempo, e o tempo aqui é crucial, uma vez que estamos a tratar da vida concreta de pessoas.

Tal como outros intervenientes antes de mim, eu poderia dar alguns exemplos de estudantes, de investigadores, de cientistas, que chegam à Europa porque se reconhece que o trabalho deles é de qualidade, mas depois não podem passar as nossas fronteiras, que, aliás, em alguns casos, para quem vem de outros continentes, são curtas, são estreitas. Em duas horas um investigador sai de Portugal para Espanha, para a fronteira de outro Estado-Membro – ou melhor, não sai, se tiver, como em alguns casos, um visto para realizar um mestrado em dois anos e não puder sair do país para prestar o seu contributo, para realizar uma investigação noutro Estado-Membro.

Esses casos, em algumas ocasiões, já tivemos nós que nos confrontar com eles quando, por exemplo, queremos contar com o contributo de alguém num debate em Bruxelas, por exemplo.

E notemos que isto não é apenas um fardo desnecessário e injusto para o cidadão de um país terceiro de que estamos a falar. É um desperdício para nós que contávamos com o seu contributo. É um desperdício para a nossa competitividade, quando comparamos, por exemplo, a mobilidade deste tipo de cidadãos estrangeiros nos Estados Unidos, por exemplo, ou na China, ou na Índia, ou no Brasil, e depois vemos os entraves à sua mobilidade na União Europeia. É um desperdício para a mobilidade da nossa força de trabalho, da nossa comunidade científica – quando notamos que isso é muito importante, essa mobilidade acrescida, em períodos de crise como aquele que atravessamos, e é um desperdício também para a sociedade do conhecimento.

É então tempo que o Conselho implemente estas propostas antes de, em Abril, o Código de Vistos causar mais entraves desnecessários à mobilidade destas pessoas. Resta-me, portanto, dizer que, do lado do nosso grupo, apoiamos a proposta do relator e votaremos em conformidade.

2-071

**Gerard Batten, on behalf of the EFD Group.** – Mr President, the report proposes that Member States may issue long-stay visas for up to 12 months for third-country nationals which will be recognised by other states within the Schengen group.

Britain is not a member of the Schengen group, so would not appear to be directly affected. However, the proposals would make it easier for the citizens of non-EU countries who enter one Member State to travel to other EU states.

Britain has a massive problem with illegal immigration. There are at least one million illegal immigrants in Britain. Under these proposals, people who wish to migrate to Britain illegally may come to another EU state perfectly legally, obtain a long-stay visa that gets them to France, for example, from where they may gain illegal entry into Britain.

The UK Independence Party MEPs will therefore vote against this report in the interests of protecting our borders against further illegal immigration.

2-072

**Frank Vanhecke (NI).** – Voorzitter, in het verslag lees ik een toch wel heel merkwaardig voorbeeld van de redenen waarom wij per se deze versoepeling moeten doorvoeren, namelijk het voorbeeld van een buitenlandse student die een visum krijgt om in België te studeren en die door de nieuwe regeling nu opzoekingen kan gaan verrichten in een Nederlandse bibliotheek, om daarna door te reizen naar Barcelona. Leuk voor die student!

Maar daarover gaat het natuurlijk niet. Schengen en het hele Europese visumbeleid betekenen in de praktijk iets helemaal anders dan vrij reizen voor studenten. Het betekent een volledige afbraak van onze grenzen, waardoor georganiseerde misdaad en illegale immigratie vrij spel krijgen zonder dat daar waterdichte buitengrenzen tegenover staan, wat nochtans de steunpilaar van het hele stelsel moest zijn. Een rechtstreeks gevolg van Schengen is bijvoorbeeld dat de massa's geregulariseerde Spaanse illegalen ongehinderd naar de andere lidstaten mogen trekken.

Ik denk dat dit Parlement zich beter eens zou bezinnen over de gevolgen van deze beslissingen voor de gewone Europeanen, in plaats van te denken aan de dagelijkse praktische besommeringen van buitenlandse studenten.

2-073

**Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE).** – Señor Presidente, empiezo felicitando a Carlos Coelho por el excelente trabajo y, sobre todo, por el alto nivel de consenso conseguido con el Consejo, con la Comisión y con los diferentes grupos de esta Cámara. Aquí vamos a encontrarnos, gracias a su trabajo, con pocas discrepancias.

En la Unión Europea existe el mayor espacio de libertad conocido. Deben eliminarse todos aquellos obstáculos que impidan la libre circulación tanto a los ciudadanos europeos como a aquellos nacionales de terceros países que residen de forma legal en un Estado miembro. Las absurdas situaciones a las que, con frecuencia, deben enfrentarse los titulares de visados de larga duración de tipo «D» deben, definitivamente, terminar.

Como saben, los visados de larga duración autorizan a sus titulares a residir en un Estado miembro que lo haya expedido. Sin embargo, los titulares de dichos visados no pueden transitar libremente por la Unión, excepto para dirigirse al Estado emisor de dicho documento. Paradójicamente se dan con mucha frecuencia las situaciones que ya han sido descritas como ejemplo. Yo diré una más: el estudiante que prepara su tesis doctoral en Lisboa sobre Historia de América y no puede ir a consultar los legajos y documentos en el Archivo de Indias de Sevilla, que está a una hora de avión.

En definitiva, lo que se pretende con la propuesta es que los visados de larga duración tengan los mismos efectos que los derivados de un permiso de residencia. Se trata de facilitar, señoras y señores diputados, en definitiva, el principio de movilidad: movilidad a efectos fundamentalmente laborales y movilidad a efectos científicos y de estudios.

Finalizaré pidiendo a todos mis estimados colegas el apoyo al informe del señor Coelho –petición absolutamente innecesaria por lo que se está viendo–, no solo por su extraordinaria calidad sino también porque él es una garantía más en

favor del gran espacio de libertad de tránsito que defendemos. Apoyo igualmente, querido Carlos, el calendario que has propuesto.

2-074

**Iliana Malinova Iotova (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, tout d'abord, je voudrais remercier le rapporteur, M. Coelho, pour le travail qu'il a fait, et saluer la coopération qui s'est établie entre le Parlement, le Conseil et la Commission pendant la consolidation des deux rapports, et la première lecture, qui devrait aussi être la dernière.

Il était crucial que ce rapport soit adopté avant la fin avril 2010 pour qu'il soit mis en œuvre en même temps que le code des visas. Il est d'une grande importance que toute personne résidant dans l'Union européenne puisse voyager dans tous les pays membres. De cette façon, nous pouvons résoudre le problème cumulé de l'application des visas "D+C", et des règles pour les permis de résidence.

Grâce à ce rapport, toute personne provenant d'un pays tiers ayant un visa de long séjour aura le droit de voyager n'importe où en Europe six mois par an. Toute personne concernée devra recevoir toute l'information nécessaire lorsqu'elle recevra son visa et surtout, elle devra être informée que ce visa deviendra automatiquement un permis de résidence avant l'expiration de la première année.

Enfin, il est important d'insister sur le fait que, pour des raisons de sécurité, chaque personne qui présente sa candidature pour un visa D devra faire l'objet d'une enquête mais ne devra pas être inscrite dans le SIS. La partie contractante devra prendre dûment en compte toute information déjà incluse dans SIS par une autre partie contractante.

De plus, si SIS II n'est pas mis en œuvre dès la fin de 2012, nous engageons la Commission et le Conseil à présenter la législation nécessaire pour assurer un même niveau de protection des données identique à celui établi par SIS II.

2-075

**Mario Borghesio (EFD).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, queste proposte intendono facilitare per i cittadini dei paesi terzi residenti legalmente nello Stato membro la possibilità di circolare nello spazio Schengen, grazie a un visto per soggiorni di lunga durata di tipo D.

In sostanza si vuole estendere – e questo ci preoccupa – al visto per soggiorni di lunga durata, il principio vigente dell'equivalenza fra permesso di soggiorno e visto per soggiorni di breve durata di tipo C. Di conseguenza, il visto per soggiorni di lunga durata avrà la stessa efficacia del permesso di soggiorno per quanto riguarda la circolazione nello spazio Schengen. In altre parole, si vuole consentire a chiunque possieda un documento attestante la sua residenza legale in un solo Stato membro di circolare liberamente nello spazio Schengen per brevi periodi non superiori a tre mesi per ogni semestre.

Noi segnaliamo alla Commissione e al Consiglio i problemi di sicurezza che possono derivare da questa libera circolazione. È già molto difficile effettuare controlli in uno Stato membro: rendiamoci conto dei rischi che si corrono con l'applicazione nuda e cruda di questo principio.

2-076

**Franz Obermayr (NI).** – Herr Präsident! Vor wenigen Monaten war hier nicht nur Weihnachtsstimmung, es herrschte auch Freudestimmung bei den meisten hier im Saal, weil die Visabestimmungen für manche Länder in Europa vereinfacht wurden.

Nun, was ist die Realität? Mit der Aufhebung der Visapflicht für Bürger aus Montenegro, Mazedonien und Serbien im Dezember 2009 schwappte eine Einreisewelle aus dem Balkan über Österreich nach Mitteleuropa bis nach Skandinavien. Eine wahre Völkerwanderung! In nur sieben Wochen haben laut Innenministerium circa 150 000 Mazedonier diese neue Reisefreiheit genutzt. Zwei Drittel davon treten die Heimreise nicht an. In manchen Dörfern, vor allem albanisch-mazedonischen Dörfern, starten täglich fünf Busse nach Mittel- bzw. Westeuropa, mit Touristenvisum ausgestattet, das allerdings die Erwerbstätigkeit ausdrücklich untersagt. Das heißt also, nach Ablauf von 90 Tagen wird untergetaucht, und diese sogenannten Touristen finden sich dann auf dem Billiarbeitsmarkt zu Dumpingpreisen wieder. Das ist also der Unterschied zwischen der Realität und dem Wunschtraum, so wie er hier in diesem Plenum gelebt wird.

Auszubaden haben das unsere Heimatländer. Die müssen ausbaden, was die Mehrheit hier in diesem Saal beschließt. Auszubaden sind eine kaum kontrollierbare illegale Einwanderung und Illegalität und damit verbunden auch die Schwarzarbeit.

2-077

**Simon Busuttil (PPE).** – Nixtieq jien ukoll nifraħ lill-kollega tiegħi Carlos Coelho għar-rapport tiegħu għal din l-inizjattiva li qiegħda tagħti lil ċittadini ta' pajjiżi terzi l-possibilità li jiċċaqalqu b'libertà akbar fiż-żona Ewropea ta' libertà. Nixtieq però, naċċenna Sur President, fuq ironija illi hawn f'dan id-dibattitu, li hija din: Filwaqt li ahna qegħdin nagħtu iktar drittijiet lil ċittadini ta' pajjiżi terzi, proprju bħalissa, l-Unjoni Ewropea u ċ-ċittadini tagħha qiegħda tiffaċċja problemi serji bl-ivvjagġar ta' ċittadini tal-Unjoni Ewropea lejn pajjiż bħalma huwa l-Libja, perezempju. Hemm problema għaddejja

bhalissa bejn l-Isvizzera u l-Libja illi r-riżultat tagħha hu li l-Libja żammet l-ivvjaġġar ta' ċittadini tal-Unjoni Ewropea kollha u mhux tal-Isvizzera biss. Mela ahna qegħdin nagħtu aktar drittijiet lil ċittadini ta' pajjiżi terzi u ċittadini tagħna stess, qed ikollhom inqas drittijiet biex jivvjaġġaw lejn pajjiżi terzi bħalma hija l-Libja. X'inhuma l-konsegwenzi? Il-konsegwenzi huma serji u gravi ħafna. Għandek haddiema li ma jistgħux imorru jaħdmu lejn il-Libja, għandek kumpaniji li ma jistgħux jibagħtu l-haddiema tagħhom bħala investituri fil-Libja, għandek ukoll haddiema li qegħdin fil-Libja u jkollhom jibqgħu fil-Libja sakemm jintbagħtu sostituti tagħhom. Din hija sitwazzjoni prekarja u jiena nappella illi l-Kummissarju Malmström għandha tidhol f'din il-kwistjoni b'urgenza. Nifhem illi hija kwistjoni diplomatika bejn żewġ pajjiżi li lanqas biss huma membri tal-Unjoni Ewropea iżda li għandha konsegwenzi gravi fuq ċittadini tal-Unjoni Ewropea illi għandhom interess li jivvjaġġaw lejn dan il-pajjiż biex jaqalgħu l-hobża ta' kuljum tagħhom.

2-078

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D).** – Správa kolegu Coelha, ako aj predmetný návrh nariadenia sa týkajú slobody pohybu osôb, ktorý je esenciálnou zložkou demokracie v Európskej únii, a je preto neprípustné, aby držiteľia dlhodobých víz v jednej členskej krajine Európskej únie nemohli cestovať naprieč Európskou úniou.

Je viacero dôvodov pre podporu spomenutých iniciatív. V prvom rade je to rešpekt a dodržiavanie základných ľudských práv, medzi ktoré sloboda pohybu bezpochyby patrí. Ak jeden členský štát zlegalizuje pobyt štátneho príslušníka tretej krajiny, nie je dôvod, prečo by sa ten nemohol voľne pohybovať po schengenskom priestore. Samozrejme, treba dopracovať detaily v zmysle nezníženia úrovne bezpečnosti v schengenskom priestore.

Hovorilo sa tu aj o študentoch a vedcoch, ktorí nemajú možnosť vycestovať do iného členského štátu. Ja by som túto skupinu rozšírila ešte aj o podnikateľov, pretože ak im toto neumožníme, znižujeme tak konkurencieschopnosť Európskej únie. A preto verím, že tento návrh nájde podporu a spravodajcovi gratulujem.

2-079

**Piotr Borys (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Chciałbym ogromnie podziękować panu Coelho. Moja opinia weszła w skład tego rozporządzenia. Miałem okazję także pracować nad częścią merytoryczną. Chciałem powiedzieć, że sprawozdanie pana Coelho ma charakter nie tylko pilny i ważny, ale również symboliczny. Dzisiaj jako przedstawiciel nowego kraju mogę z dumą powiedzieć, że możemy zmieniać przepisy ułatwiające swobodne przemieszczanie się po strefie Schengen, gdzie jeszcze do niedawna niektóre z obecnych krajów Unii Europejskiej napotykały podobne utrudnienia. Myślę, że symboliczny charakter tych zmian jest dzisiaj nie do przecenienia i mam nadzieję, że ten konsensus osiągnięty na sali będzie ogromnym sukcesem nas wszystkich.

Po drugie, chciałem powiedzieć, że faktycznie dzisiejsza likwidacja wiz C+D oraz brak możliwości wydawania dokumentów pobytowych przez państwa członkowskie zmuszają nas do bardzo pilnego działania. Podam tylko kilka przykładów, które się dzisiaj przewijały na tej sali. Para studentów ukraińskich, która przejeżdżała z Wrocławia do Berlina, została w ubiegłym roku zatrzymana właśnie w trakcie przekraczania granicy, z uwagi głównie na niewiedzę młodych ludzi, którzy chcieli korzystać z dorobku intelektualnego. Myślę, że dzisiejsze głosowania będą bardzo dla nas wszystkich istotne i ważne.

Chciałem tylko wskazać na ostatni element – kwestię bezpieczeństwa. Dzisiaj powinniśmy dobrze wymieniać informacje zgromadzone w Schengen, dzisiaj powinniśmy z całą pewnością pracować nad systemami SIS II i VIS oraz przede wszystkim dokonywać być może jeszcze częstszych przeglądów i sprawozdań. Tutaj mój gorący apel do pani komisarz, aby koordynacja pomiędzy państwami członkowskimi w zakresie bezpieczeństwa była równie dobra jak do tej pory i ogromnie jeszcze raz dziękuję panu Coelho za wspaniałe sprawozdanie.

2-080

**Kinga Göncz (S&D).** – Elnök úr! Szeretném elmondani, hogy egyetérték, és támogatom a jelentéstevőt és Malmström asszonyt is abban, hogy olyan megoldást találjunk ebben a kérdésben, amely megfelel a jogállamiságnak, az emberi jogok tiszteletben tartásának, az adatvédelmi és természetesen a biztonsági szempontoknak is. Nagyon sok minden elhangzott. Én néhány dolgot szeretnék hangsúlyozni. Ahhoz, hogy működőképes legyen ez a rendelet, először is tanulmányoznunk kell, és többet kell tudnunk az egyes tagállamok gyakorlatáról. Tudjuk, hogy néhány tagállam ki tudja adni határidőre a tartózkodási engedélyeket. Ezek a jó gyakorlatok sokat jelenthetnek számunkra. Össze kell hangolnunk a tagállamok gyakorlatait, ez nyilván bizalomnövelő hatású. Mindenképpen használnia kell minden országnak a SIS rendszert – tudjuk, hogy ma nem minden ország használja –, és mindenképp sürgető az, hogy a SIS II-t mihamarabb be tudjuk vezetni és a VIS rendszer működjön, hisz ez lesz a garancia hosszútávon. Európai érdek, hogy a harmadik országokból itt tartózkodók – diákok, üzletemberek, kutatók – valóban szabadon mozoghassanak.

2-081

**Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα κατ' αρχάς να ευχαριστήσω και εγώ τον κύριο Coelho για την εξαιρετική δουλειά που έχει κάνει γι' αυτή την έκθεση και να πω τα εξής: Πρώτα απ' όλα, το κεκτημένο της Συνθήκης Σένγκεν συνιστά ακριβώς αυτό· την ελεύθερη κυκλοφορία εντός των ορίων της περιοχής Σένγκεν. Επομένως στη συζήτηση αυτή πρέπει να βγάλουμε το πρώτο βασικό και απλό συμπέρασμα, ότι είναι πολύ σημαντικό να προχωρήσει αυτός ο κανονισμός. Το παράδειγμα του φοιτητή είναι χαρακτηριστικό· όποιος έχει θεώρηση μακράς διαμονής να έχει το δικαίωμα της ελεύθερης κυκλοφορίας.

Τίθεται η προβληματική –και σ' αυτό θέλω να δώσω ιδιαίτερη έμφαση– κατά πόσο θα διευκολυνθεί, έστω και με τρόπο έμμεσο, η παράνομη μετανάστευση, αν θα υπάρξει πρόβλημα ασφάλειας ή κατά πόσο κάποιος, εφαρμόζοντας αυτό το δικαίωμα, δεν θα μπορεί να έχει παράλληλα και τα μέσα για να κινηθεί, πράγμα που τα κράτη μέλη θα πρέπει να λαμβάνουν υπόψη.

Είναι δεδομένο ότι κάθε κράτος μέλος, όταν εκδίδει τις θεωρήσεις, πρέπει πάντα να είναι πολύ προσεκτικό. Και στο σημείο αυτό τίθεται μια πολύ σημαντική παράμετρος, όπως ορίζεται στην έκθεση, που είναι η πλέον καθοριστική: ότι στο σύστημα πληροφοριών Σένγκεν θα είναι πλέον υποχρεωτική η επεξεργασία των δεδομένων πριν τη θεώρηση μακράς διαμονής. Άρα, τελικά, όχι μόνο διασφαλίζουμε το κεκτημένο της Συνθήκης Σένγκεν αλλά ενισχύουμε και την ασφάλεια σε ό,τι αφορά αυτό ακριβώς το δεδομένο.

Ως εκ τούτου, όλοι πρέπει να είμαστε θετικοί στην προοπτική αυτή και πρέπει βεβαίως, σε κάθε περίπτωση, να προχωρήσει γρήγορα το σύστημα SIS II, που είναι απαραίτητο. Τέλος πρέπει, σε συνεργασία με τα κράτη μέλη και τις υπηρεσίες των κρατών μελών, όχι μόνο να διευκολύνουμε το κεκτημένο Σένγκεν και να το ενισχύσουμε αλλά να ενισχύσουμε παράλληλα και την ασφάλεια, που είναι απαραίτητο στοιχείο για κάθε κράτος μέλος, για όλους μας, για το κεκτημένο της Συνθήκης αυτής.

*(Χειροκροτήματα)*

2-082

**Tanja Fajon (S&D).** – Med najpomembnejšimi dejavniki evropskega povezovanja sta odprava notranjih meja in svoboda gibanja. Državljanom tretjih držav, ki zakonito prebivajo v državi članici, moramo olajšati gibanje na schengenskem območju. Nesprejemljivo je, da zaradi birokracije omejujemo gibanje študentom, znanstvenikom in podjetjem v Evropi.

Prav tako moramo svobodo gibanja čim prej omogočiti državljanom Bosne in Hercegovine in Albanije in ljudem na Kosovu, ki imajo danes, paradoksalno, manj pravic do svobodnega potovanja, kot so jih imeli pred leti. Seveda morajo biti na to pripravljeni in ne nasedajmo zavajajočim podatkom o množičnem nezakonitem priseljevanju.

Vizumski režim je predolgo izoliral ljudi zahodnega Balkana, ki morajo krepiti stike s sogovorniki v Uniji, pa jim pogosto zavračanje prošelj za vizume to preprečuje. Ne tvegajmo še večjega občutka izolacije in diskriminacije, posebej med mladimi, ki morda še nikoli niso imeli priložnosti odkriti Unije. Zato ne zgublajmo časa, ko bosta Bosna in Hercegovina in Albanija, ena ali druga, izpolnili merila za liberalizacijo vizumskega režima.

Vsakršno olajšanje potovanj na schengenskem območju je korak naprej in v interesu Evropske unije.

2-083

**Zbigniew Ziobro (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Dyskutowany wniosek dotyczy jednej z podstawowych zasad funkcjonowania Unii Europejskiej – zniesienia granic wewnętrznych oraz swobody przepływu osób. Z tego powodu należy mu się szczególna uwaga. Niezrozumiała, w konsekwencji nie do zaakceptowania, jest sytuacja, w której posiadacze wiz długoterminowych mają mniejszą swobodę przemieszczania się w strefie Schengen niż osoby dysponujące wizami krótkoterminowymi. Z tego powodu jestem przychylny wobec propozycji Komisji Europejskiej. Uważam jednak, że do projektu należy wprowadzić poprawki zapewniające bezpieczeństwo. Popieram więc propozycję Komisji Wolności Obywatelskich, tak aby istniał pomiędzy państwami członkowskimi przepływ informacji o osobach niepożądanych w ramach Systemu Informacyjnego Schengen. Należy także zobowiązać Komisję Europejską do przedstawienia sprawozdania dotyczącego stosowania rozporządzenia nie później niż do 5 kwietnia 2012 roku. Zmiany przygotowane zasługują na poważną refleksję i w większości – na poparcie.

2-084

**Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Na ułatwienie przepływu osób z krajów trzecich w obrębie strefy Schengen oczekują nie tylko obywatele z tych krajów, ale również my – mieszkańcy Unii Europejskiej. Dzisiaj istnieje paradoks, że posiadacz wizy krótkoterminowej ma większą swobodę przemieszczania się, niż posiadacz wizy długoterminowej, a osoba z kraju trzeciego, która posiada legalne pozwolenie na pobyt długoterminowy, np. w Polsce, nie może pojechać do Niemiec czy Francji. Swoboda przemieszczania powinna dotyczyć nie tylko mieszkańców Unii Europejskiej. Naukowcy, studenci, uczniowie czy przedsiębiorcy z krajów trzecich powinni mieć możliwość swobodnego przemieszczania się, odwiedzania znajomych, poznawania tradycji, zwyczajów i kultury innych krajów. Oni będą dobrymi ambasadorami idei Unii Europejskiej, a my mieszkańcy Unii Europejskiej zrobimy krok w kierunku realizacji idei „Unia bez granic”.

2-085

**Andreas Mølzer (NI).** – Herr Präsident! Das Visasystem der Schengen-Länder ist anscheinend so kompliziert, dass sich die Konsulatsmitarbeiter nicht mehr auskennen und rechtschaffene Visumreisende in die Visumfalle tappen lassen. Dass Konsularbedienstete die Visakategorien „D“ und „C“ nicht kennen, mutet schon seltsam an. Geradezu fahrlässig ist es, wenn man sich die Arbeit erleichtert und sich eine Konsultation des SIS-Systems erspart. Dass daraus unzählige und unnötige Probleme an den Außengrenzen resultieren, ist klar und gehört dringend geändert. In diesem Zusammenhang

über nationale Visawarndateien zu diskutieren, macht wenig Sinn, wenn nicht einmal das EU-Warnsystem und die EU-Warnbestimmungen konsequent angewandt werden.

Die Visaliberalisierung für Balkanländer geht Hand in Hand mit einer Zunahme der aussichtslosen Asylgesuche aus jenen Ländern. Gerade jetzt, wo seit der Lockerung der Visabestimmungen für den Balkan eine wahre Einwanderungswelle droht, wo binnen sieben Wochen fast 150 000 Mazedonier die neue Reisefreiheit genutzt haben und Schätzungen zufolge fast zwei Drittel davon die Heimreise nicht antreten dürften, gilt es, die Durchführung der Visabestimmungen auf Vordermann zu bringen.

2-086

**Krisztina Morvai (NI).** – Mi, magyar képviselők sajátos helyzetben vagyunk, amikor szavazatainkkal arról kell döntenünk, hogy lehetővé tegyük-e az Európai Uniót kívüli országok polgárainak az EU-n belüli szabadabb mozgást vagy pedig ellenkezőleg ezt akadályozni próbáljuk. Magyarország a trianoni tragédia következtében területeinek igen nagy részét elveszítette, és igen nagy számban élnek magyar testvéreink Magyarország jelenlegi határain túl és így az Európai Unió jelenlegi határain túl, Délvidéken, illetőleg Kárpátalján. Rendkívül megalázó helyzetekbe kerülnek ezek a testvéreink akkor, amikor a jelenlegi csonka Magyarország területén tanulmányokat folytatnak, kutatóként vagy más munkakörben munkavállalóként élnek tulajdonképpen hazájukban és nem mozdulhatnak ki Magyarország területéről. Ez egy rendkívül rossz és türelhetlen helyzet, ami ellen fel kell lépünk, ezért mi, magyar érzelmű, magyar képviselők igennel fogunk szavazni, hogy segítsük ennek a képtelen helyzetnek a felszámolását.

2-087

**Andrew Henry William Brons (NI).** – Mr President, this proposal is based on the assumption that all persons from third countries entering the EU are persons of good faith and that, if they say they are coming here to study, they really are. The EU is rich in bogus colleges, and even genuine colleges frequently have students on their books who never appear in a lecture room. If their movement to other states is facilitated, it will be much more difficult to check the genuineness of their status and more difficult to locate them when their status is found not to be true.

Although the UK is not in the Schengen area, the EU has a track record of regularising illegal immigrants. Today's holder of a long-stay visa or a residence permit might be tomorrow's illegal migrant, and the day after an EU citizen with complete freedom of movement.

2-088

**Cecilia Malmström, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, two questions were raised, not particularly related to this issue, but I would like to take the opportunity to briefly touch upon them anyway.

Mr Busuttil raised the issue of Libya. I can assure him that it is a very complicated issue, but we are involved actively in dialogue with Libya, with Switzerland, with the Member States, in order to find a solution to this very complicated problem before it escalates even further. So I hope to be able to come back to you soon on developments on this.

To Ms Fajon, I want to tell you that, of course the situation of Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina is another track and we are right now finalising a mission there to evaluate how these two countries are doing according to the criteria. The Commission will very soon, after consultation with Member States and experts, make a report on that and the assessment of that report will be shared with members of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs before we put a possible proposal on the agenda.

On this proposal, I can assure Members and the rapporteur that the Commission is extremely dedicated to making this work, and we will do our utmost to make sure that the regulation is implemented. It might sound like a technical problem, but it is not. It concerns individual citizens and we want to encourage people to come here legally with all their papers in order, whether students, researchers, experts or scientists. It is good for them and it is good for us. It is also within the philosophy of the European Union to have an area of no internal borders. Therefore, we should avoid making life unnecessarily complicated for these people.

I think, within this proposal, we have found a good balance. We have been able to take the security considerations into consideration in a satisfactory manner and we can congratulate ourselves. This is the Union working at its best with three institutions trying to identify a problem and trying to find a concrete solution to the benefit of the citizen.

So, thank you very much for your work, Mr Coelho, and thank you for a good debate in this plenary.

2-089

**Carlos Coelho, relator.** – Senhor Presidente, quatro notas finais. A primeira para lamentar a cadeira vazia do Conselho durante este debate. A segunda para agradecer à Comissária Malmström as suas referências simpáticas e para lhe pedir que ajude junto do Conselho para garantir a entrada em vigor deste regulamento no dia 5 de Abril. De outra forma teremos um vazio legal, com consequências para pessoas concretas.

Em terceiro lugar, para lamentar que os colegas que aqui participaram no debate, chamando a atenção para os problemas da segurança, não tivessem tido a capacidade de reconhecer as melhorias que este Parlamento introduziu neste regulamento, designadamente a obrigação da consulta prévia ao Sistema de Informação de Schengen.

Como eu tive ocasião de sublinhar na minha intervenção inicial, creio que o Parlamento fez bem o seu trabalho, porque reforça a liberdade de circulação, mas reforça também a segurança. Não o reconhecer é querer apenas olhar um lado da verdade, e não a verdade toda.

E, finalmente, Sr. Presidente, para agradecer a todos aqueles que colaboraram para este objectivo. Aqueles que permitiram, designadamente a Comissão e o Conselho, que tivéssemos um acordo em primeira leitura, mas também todos aqueles grupos políticos na Comissão LIBE e na Comissão Jurídica que permitiram este consenso alargado. Creio que, quando partilhamos uma solução desta forma, estamos também a fazer o nosso trabalho da melhor maneira.

2-090

**President.** – The debate is closed.

The vote will take place shortly.

#### *Written statements (Rule 149)*

2-091

**Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE), în scris.** – Susțin eforturile depuse în cadrul acestui raport pentru a obține extinderea libertății de mișcare pentru posesorii vizelor de lungă ședere, întocmai cu cele ale posesorilor de permise și vize de scurtă ședere. Acordurile existente în prezent au generat numeroase inconveniente resortisanților din țările terțe, rezidenți legali ai unuia din statele membre, care doresc să călătorească din diferite motive pe întreg teritoriul Uniunii Europene. Există discrepanțe între statele membre în ceea ce privește timpul, metodologia și criteriile de acordare a vizelor. În practică s-a observat faptul că solicitanții de viză respinși de un stat își încearcă „norocul” în alte state membre. Acest lucru se datorează faptului că unele state sunt mai exigente, iar altele sunt mai permissive când vine vorba de acordarea vizelor și a permiselor de ședere. Pentru a evita crearea unui aflux de cereri de viză prin intermediul anumitor state care adoptă o politică de acordare mai liberală, propun uniformizarea controalelor și a modului de aprobare a solicitărilor de viză între toate statele membre. Prin acesta metodă se va asigura o abordare unitară a tuturor aplicațiilor, înlăturându-se astfel riscul de apariție a unor „porți de acces” în Spațiul Schengen.

2-092

*(The sitting was suspended at 11.50 and resumed at 12.00.)*

2-093

**IN THE CHAIR: Diana WALLIS**  
*Vice-President*

2-094

## **6 - Voting time**

2-095

**President.** – The next item is the vote.

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

2-096

### **6.1 - Allocation of FISIM for the establishment of GNI (A7-0022/2010, Jean-Luc Dehaene) (vote)**

2-097

### **6.2 - Mobilisation of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund: Germany - redundancies (A7-0020/2010, Reimer Böge) (vote)**

2-098

### **6.3 - Mobilisation of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund: Lithuania - redundancies (A7-0021/2010, Reimer Böge) (vote)**

2-099

### **6.4 - Mobilisation of the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund: Lithuania - construction of buildings (A7-0019/2010, Reimer Böge) (vote)**

2-100



## 6.5 - Additional Protocol to the Cooperation Agreement for the Protection of the Coasts and Waters of the North-East Atlantic against Pollution (A7-0009/2010) (vote)

2-100-500

- Before the vote:

2-101

**Anna Rosbach, ordfører.** – Fru formand! Jeg har bedt om ordet, da tidsrammen for denne vigtige tillægsprotokol ikke har givet mulighed for debat – hverken i udvalget eller i plenarsalen. Emnet, vi i dag står med en tillægsprotokol til, gør det muligt for EU-landene at føre en fælles kamp om forurening af Atlanterhavet. Aftalen udgør en del af et netværk af regionale havaftaler, som EU har indgået med en række enkelte medlemsstater og nabolandene. Hver af disse aftaler omfatter forskellige dele af havet rundt om EU-landene og sigter imod individuel og/eller kollektiv indgriben fra overenskomstparterne side i tilfælde af forurening eller trussel om forurening af havene eller kysterne. Jeg vil ikke skjule, at det er mit store håb, at denne tillægsprotokol vil gøre det muligt at bekæmpe en lang række former for forurening af Atlanterhavet. Det er nemlig samtidig en protokol, der har været alt for længe undervejs. Tyve år har det taget på grund af divergenser mellem Marokko og Spanien om Vestsahara. Det er tyve tabte år. De år får havmiljøet ikke tilbage, men det understreger blot vigtigheden af, at vi ikke her i huset må forlænge processen yderligere. Jeg håber derfor på, at der (ligesom da vi behandlede sagen i udvalget) vil være en bred opbakning blandt medlemmerne her i salen og takker mange gange for jeres støtte.

2-102

## 6.6 - Consumer protection (A7-0024/2010, Anna Hedh) (vote)

2-103

## 6.7 - SOLVIT (A7-0027/2010, Cristian Silviu Buşoi) (vote)

2-104

## 6.8 - Animal health requirements applicable to the non-commercial movement of pet animals (A7-0082/2009, Bairbre de Brún) (vote)

2-105

## 6.9 - Movement of persons with a long-stay visa (A7-0015/2010, Carlos Coelho) (vote)

2-106

- Before the vote:

2-107

**Carlos Coelho, relator.** – Senhor Presidente, é uma curta declaração para recordar que o Código Comunitário de Vistos entra em vigor no dia 5 de Abril, já no próximo mês, e, portanto, é essencial que este novo regulamento entre em vigor até essa data.

Na ausência do Conselho, quero que fique registado na acta que esse é o desejo do Parlamento Europeu, se viabilizar o meu relatório, como espero.

2-108

**President.** – The absence of the Council is noted and is unfortunate.

2-109

## 6.10 - Report on Competition Policy 2008 (A7-0025/2010, Sophia in 't Veld) (vote)

2-110

## 6.11 - Internal Market Scoreboard (A7-0084/2009, Róza, Gräfin von Thun Und Hohenstein) (vote)

2-111

## 7 - Explanations of vote

2-112

### Oral explanations of vote

2-113

**Report: Anna Hedh (A7-0024/2010)**

2-114

**Siiri Oviir (ALDE).** – Euroopa Liidu tarbijakaitsepoliitika reguleerimisala on aastatega väga palju laienenud, kajastades muudatusi inimeste vajadustes ja ootustes. Ennekõike e-kaubanduse kiire arengu tõttu on Euroopa Liidus oluliselt kasvanud tarbijaturgude piiriülene mõõde, mistõttu on veelgi tähtsamaks muutunud tarbijakaitse ja just selle kõrgetasemeline olemasolu.

Olen seisukohal, et tugevdatud turujärelevalve ja jõustamismehhanismid ning nende tulemuslik ja laialdane rakendamine tarbijausalduse tõstmiseks on hädavajalikud. Seetõttu toetasin raporti vastuvõtmist, toetasin selle muudatusettepanekuid.

2-115

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D).** – Madam President, I supported this report. Effective consumer enforcement policy is central to the functioning of the single market.

We need to have a real and well-functioning internal market with a high level of consumer protection, which, unfortunately, is not the case today. We have the legislation in place, but it is not enforced properly in the Member States. Most importantly, our consumers do not feel safe because they do not know the rules and, in many cases, the compensation mechanisms are not working in the way they should.

The Commission should increase its efforts, ensuring that Member States apply directives correctly and that citizens are informed about their rights and, most importantly, that they are able to exercise those rights in practice.

2-116

**Report: Cristian Silviu Buşoi (A7-0027/2010)**

2-117

**Viktor Uspaskich (ALDE).** – Gerbiamas pranešėjau, gerbiami kolegos, pritariu gerai iniciatyvai. Ypatingai pritariu SOLVIT tinklų stiprinimui ir jų veiklos išplėtimui. Neturi būti pagailėta lėšų, kad per nacionalinės *media* priemonės, titulinuose puslapiuose ar žiūrimiausiose laidose būtų platinama informacija apie šios europinės struktūros veiklą bei galimybes. Kol kas galiu tvirtai jus visus patikinti, kad egzistuoja dvigubi standartai, nevienodas teisės aktų taikymas ir net už tą pačią veiklą nevienodas baudos. Ačiū, aš būtent tai ir norėjau pabrėžti.

2-118

**Alfredo Antonozzi (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho votato a favore della relazione Buşoi perché ritengo che il servizio fornito da Solvit sia di fondamentale importanza nell'ottica di un chiaro e trasparente rapporto tra le istituzioni, i cittadini, le imprese, che è uno dei fondamenti dell'Unione europea.

Solvit si è dimostrato un utile strumento per risolvere i problemi dei cittadini e delle imprese che vogliono sfruttare appieno le potenzialità offerte dal mercato interno. Molti paesi dell'Unione europea presentano ancora barriere nelle proprie legislazioni nazionali, che devono essere rimosse. Ritengo quindi che debba essere sostenuta l'allocazione di ulteriori fondi, il reclutamento di altro personale specializzato e il miglioramento della visibilità di questo servizio, anche a livello di enti locali, dove potrebbe essere molto utile.

2-119

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE).** – Jako stínová zpravodajka chci poděkovat všem kolegům, že naši zprávu o síti SOLVIT přijal Parlament tak absolutní většinou. Je to jasný signál pro Radu a Komisi, aby vzaly vážně naše doporučení, která by měla zajistit lepší využívání tohoto užitečného nástroje pro občany a podnikatele. Jen je třeba, aby o tom nástroji podnikatelé a občané skutečně věděli. Chci věřit, že příští rok předloží Komise Parlamentu plnohodnotnou výroční zprávu, kde se veřejnost dozví o stížnostech na upírání práv, která jim jinak má zaručit evropská legislativa.

2-120

**Report: Bairbre de Brún (A7-0082/2009)**

2-121

**Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Chciałbym uzasadnić sposób swojego głosowania na temat sprawozdania pani de Brún. Bardzo dziękuję za przygotowanie tego dokumentu. Wymogi dotyczące transportu zwierząt to nie tylko ich ochrona, ale przede wszystkim troska o bezpieczeństwo i zdrowie ludzi. Chciałbym wyrazić poparcie dla działań zmierzających do przedłużenia terminu wygaśnięcia procedur przejściowych, a w rezultacie do likwidacji problemu wścieklizny w Unii Europejskiej. Oczywiście powinniśmy zachować ostrożność i rozsądek w kwestii swobodnego przepływu zwierząt domowych na terenie Unii, jednocześnie uwzględniając opinię ekspertów instytucji badawczych.

2-122

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE).** – Hlasovala jsem pro prodloužení přechodného období, během kterého mohou některé státy uplatnit výjimky, protože tyto státy se zavázaly, že napříště již nebudou žádat o další prodloužení výjimek pro veterinární podmínky. Mám pochopení pro obavy Irska, Malty, Švédska a Spojeného království, jelikož mají vyšší požadavky na dokumentaci pro domácí zvířata, která cestují se svými majiteli do jejich zemí. Hlavními riziky jsou vzteklna, echinokokóza a nemoci přenášené klíšťaty. Ovšem je potřeba říci, že tuto nejednotnost, kterou umožňují přechodná období pro některé státy, musíme do budoucna odstranit a že je naprosto nutné, abychom postupovali společně a měli harmonizovanou legislativu.

2-123

**Peter Jahr (PPE).** – Frau Präsidentin! Ich kann einerseits das Interesse der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten nachvollziehen, die auf eine Verlängerung der Sonderregelung bei der Einfuhr von Haustieren drängen. Andererseits müssen wir immer aufpassen, dass der Aufwand und der Nutzen in einem angemessenen Verhältnis zueinander stehen. Das ist in diesem Fall nur ungenügend gewährleistet. Deshalb habe ich mich der Stimme enthalten. Was wir ganz besonders brauchen, ist einerseits ein angemessener effektiver Außenschutz, wenn es um Einfuhren innerhalb der Europäischen Union geht, andererseits aber zunehmend auch eine Harmonisierung innerhalb der Europäischen Union, weil das auch im Sinne des Verbrauchers ist, der letztendlich irgendwann den Überblick verliert, wenn bei der Einfuhr in Land A andere Bedingungen herrschen als bei der Einfuhr in Land B.

2-124

**Nicole Sinclair (NI).** – Madam President, I voted against the proposal, mainly because I come from the United Kingdom. I think we have good laws in place to deal with this already and we do not want the threat of rabies hitting our island.

I am also rather perplexed as to why this proposal only refers to dogs, cats and ferrets, and I would also make the observation that a certain Screaming Lord Sutch proposed this 25 years ago and he must be looking down very pleased today.

But then, many of my electors in the West Midlands of the United Kingdom will think that many of the policies coming from this House are Monster Raving Loony policies.

2-125

**Daniel Hannan (ECR).** – Madam President, it is a pleasure to see you back in the chair.

We occasionally get these messages coming out of the Commission that the EU is doing enough. It should do less, but do it better, concentrate on the really big things.

And then we have all these motions on things like what pets we are allowed to take where. I think there is an issue of proportionality here is there not? Countries have different national conditions. Our country is an island without land borders and we are perfectly capable of reaching sensible proportionate bilateral or multilateral agreements with each other.

Do we really think that we would be better off creating a new administrative bureaucracy in the hands of the same geniuses who brought us the common agricultural policy, the common fisheries policy, the unaudited budgets and all of the rest of the apparatus of acquired EU law? Surely this is something that could be left to the Member States.

2-126

**Report: Carlos Coelho (A7-0015/2010)**

2-127

**Siiri Oviir (ALDE).** – Schengeni ala eesmärk on ju liikumisvabadus. On vastuoluline, et paljudel pikaajalise viisa omanikel on Schengeni alal märksa vähem liikumisvabadust kui neil, kellel on lühiajaline viisa. Ühenduse viisaeeskiri peaks jõustuma kuu aja pärast, kuid nagu näitas senine liikmesriikide tegevuse analüüs pikaajaliste viisade ja elamislubade andmise valdkonnas, esineb erinevaid tõlgendusi ja rakendusi, millega kaasnevad kodanike põhiõiguste rikkumised.

Komisjoni ettepanekute abil kõrvaldatakse elamislubade väljaandmisel tekkivad praktilised probleemsed olukorrad ja viivitused, mida – nagu ma ütlesin – on seni täheldatud paljudes liikmesriikides. Teema on väga kiireloomuline, kohe-kohe peaks jõustuma viisakoodeks, ja ma toetasin raportis esitatut.

2-128

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE).** – Podpořila jsem nařizení, kterým se zlepšuje pohyb osob s dlouhodobým vízem v schengenském prostoru. Je logické, že studenti, badatelé, podnikatelé ze třetích zemí by měli mít právo pohybovat se po celé Unii, pokud získají vízum v kterémkoli členském státě.

Chci však opět apelovat na solidaritu zemí s Českou republikou, která marně bojuje proti zavedení vízové povinnosti ze strany Kanady. Jde o bezprecedentní nerovnost občanů Evropské unie. Kanada nyní zvažuje zavedení víz pro další země, např. Maďarsko, a to si přece nesmíme nechat líbit. Na vině jsou příliš štědré, a tudíž lákavé podmínky pro žadatele o azyl. Doslova provokují ke svému zneužívání. Kanada slíbila, že je změní, nic však nedělá. Omlouvám, se že jsem využila příležitosti znova na tuto skutečnost upozornit.

2-129

**Kinga Gál (PPE).** – A jelen javaslat, mint ahogy a vitában is elhangzott, elősegíti az egyik tagállamban hosszas tartózkodásra jogosító, úgynevezett D vízummal rendelkező harmadik országbeli állampolgárok számára az Unión belüli utazást. Azért volt erre szükség, mert egyes tagállamok különböző okokból nem képesek kellő időben tartózkodási engedélyt kiadni, illetve nem használják megfelelően a schengeni szabályozás adta kereteket. A magyar fideszes delegáció azért tartózkodott ennek a jogszabálynak a végszavazásánál, mert Magyarország eddig is helyesen ültette át a jogszabályt,

nem okozott ez problémát és a Schengen adta lehetőségek megfelelő kihasználásával hatékonyabban tudtuk ezt biztosítani. Ugyanakkor hangsúlyozni szeretnénk, hogy az Unió szomszédságában élő harmadik országok polgárainak, a magyar kisebbségek tagjainak elementáris érdekük, hogy lehetőségük legyen bürokratikus terhek nélkül a jogszerű tartózkodásra az Unió tagállamainak területén, de ehhez arra van szükség, hogy olyan jogszabályaink legyenek mind tagállami, mind a közösségi szinten, amelyek egymás hatásfokát nem korlátozzák, hanem célkitűzésinket erősítik.

2-130

**Report: Sophia in't Veld (A7-0025/2010)**

2-131

**Marian Harkin (ALDE).** – Madam President, there are a lot of good things in this report but I simply cannot support paragraph 35 which calls for the introduction of a common consolidated corporate tax base (CCCTB).

One of the things we are told about CCCTB is that it will be more efficient and that it will simplify matters. But, given that, as it now stands, companies can opt in or opt out, we would end up with 28 tax bases instead of the current 27, and that is hardly simplification.

Also, as it is currently proposed, CCCTB would mean the redistribution of European profits across the EU, so a country like my own, Ireland, which exports a lot of what it produces, would be penalised because the profits, of course, would be at the point of sale. It does seem a little bit strange since at the core of the EU we have the free movement of goods, so therefore we would end up, if we use CCCTB, by penalising exporting countries.

Finally, I also believe that its introduction would damage Europe's capacity to attract foreign direct investment, because the rules as such would not apply to the Member State in which it was located but would be by some reference to a complicated formula which can only be calculated in retrospect, so I believe that would certainly damage our capacity to attract foreign direct investment.

2-132

**Report: Róza, Gräfin von Thun Und Hohenstein (A7-0084/2009)**

2-133

**Jaroslav Kalinowski (PPE).** – Pani Przewodnicząca! Na początek chciałbym podziękować koleżance za przygotowanie tego istotnego dla wzrostu gospodarczego sprawozdania. Całkowicie popieram spostrzeżenia i uwagi autorki odnośnie wprowadzenia i egzekwowania prawa wspólnoty w państwach członkowskich. Sprawnie funkcjonujący jednolity rynek wewnętrzny jest nieodzownym elementem stabilnej gospodarki, tak potrzebnej w czasach kryzysu. Efektywne wykorzystanie potencjału tego rynku zależy od skutecznej współpracy pomiędzy instytucjami na szczeblu krajowym i europejskim. Zmniejszenie ciężaru administracyjnego, wydajna komunikacja pomiędzy właściwymi urzędami wraz z uproszczeniem procedur i harmonizacją przepisów zaowocują szybkim i skutecznym wdrażaniem dyrektyw w państwach członkowskich. Publikacja natomiast aktualnych danych oraz skuteczne informowanie obywateli i przedsiębiorców o ich prawach i sytuacji na rynku wpłynię na poprawę jego funkcjonowania i poprawi przejrzystość zasad zapewniając równą konkurencję.

2-134

**Viktor Uspaskich (ALDE).** – Gerbiama pirmininke, gerbiamas pranešėjau, kolegos, pritariu gerai iniciatyvai, tikiu, kad tai gali padėti žmonėms, veikiančioms įmonėms nacionaliniame lygmenyje. Tačiau be aiškaus griežtai reglamentuoto vidaus rinkos bei teisinės sistemos situacijos monitoringo abejoju, ar bus įmanoma efektyviai pagelbėti šios rinkos žaidėjams, nepriklausomai nuo jos dydžio ir paslaugų vartojimo. Būtina nustatyti griežtas sankcijas, jeigu po atliktos analizės matomi akivaizdūs pažeidimai. Būtinai reikia naudoti praktiką nagrinėjant skundus tarptautiniame lygįje, taip pat nustatyti kriterijus. Deja, liūdna statistika mano valstybėje rodo, kad iš 10 atvejų aštuoniuose tarptautiniuose, jau nagrinėjamuose, pripažinti pažeidimai įvykdyti valstybės institucijose ar teismuose. Todėl aš galvoju, kad be aiškaus nuobaudų reglamentavimo pasiekti norimą rezultatą nebus įmanoma. Norėčiau, kad būtų atkreiptas dėmesys.

2-135

**Siiri Oviir (ALDE).** – Et luua stabiilne ja innovaatile majanduskeskkond, on tulemuslikult toimiv siseturg äärmiselt vajalik. Siseturg ei saa aga korralikult toimida ilma selle toimimist mõjutavate ühenduse eeskirjade ülevõtmiseta kõikide tema liikmesriikide poolt. Ülevõtmise saab omakorda aga olla edukam, kui õigusaktide ülevõtmise protsessi on kaasatud liikmesriikide parlamendid. Ka parlamentaarse järelevalve seisukohalt on nende kaasatus oluline. Kuna need positsioonid olid kajastatud ka raportis, toetasin ma kahel käel raporti vastuvõtmist.

2-136

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE).** – Parlament podle očekávání schválil všechny tři zprávy o fungování vnitřního trhu. Ale u zprávy kolegyně von Thun Und Hohenstein socialisté a Zelení zvedli zbraň proti návrhu, aby se prováděly pravidelné testy fungování vnitřního trhu. Argumentují, že by to nabouralo dohodnuté sociální a environmentální standardy. Vždyť ale víme, že nás tyto standardy něco stojí, a víme také, že umožňují vyšší kvalitu života v Evropské unii. V rozpravě dnes levice nevyšvětlila, proč se tak bojí objektivizace této hodnoty. Já jsem vše svým hlasováním podpořila.

2-137

**Written explanations of vote**

2-137-500

**Report: Jean-Luc Dehaene (A7-0022/2010)**

2-137-750

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A proposta da Comissão diz respeito aos procedimentos de repartição dos SIFIM com vista à determinação do RNB dos Estados-Membros utilizado para efeitos do orçamento da União e dos seus recursos próprios.

Os SIFIM – *serviços de intermediação financeira indirectamente medidos* – representam uma parte da produção das instituições financeiras que não é realizada sob a forma de vendas directas de serviços a um preço fixo, mas sim através da cobrança de uma taxa de juro (mais elevada do que a aplicada aos depósitos) sobre os empréstimos.

A Comissão propõe a realização da repartição dos SIFIM para a determinação do RNB e considera que essa repartição deve ser efectuada retroactivamente, a partir de 1 de Janeiro de 2005, data de entrada em vigor do Regulamento (CE) n.º 1889/2002. Porém, a aplicação retroactiva proposta, a partir de 1 de Janeiro de 2005, coloca problemas sobre a extensão exacta da retroactividade da decisão.

Assim, concorda-se com a posição do relator, defendendo-se que a repartição dos SIFIM para a determinação do RNB comece apenas em 1 de Janeiro de 2010. Desta forma, assegura-se que a repartição dos SIFIM é adequadamente realizada a partir de 2010, obtendo-se um cálculo mais preciso do RNB.

2-137-875

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A repartição dos serviços de intermediação financeira indirectamente medidos (SIFIM) com vista à determinação do rendimento nacional bruto (RNB) dos Estados Membros utilizado para efeitos do orçamento da União e dos seus recursos próprios, é uma preocupação antiga e que já devia ter sido implementada em 2005. No entanto a necessidade de o testar para avaliar a precisão deste método, de forma a aferir se proporcionava efectivamente resultados fiáveis para a quantificação correcta da actividade económica em causa, atrasou a sua implementação. Concordo que a implementação deste método não tenha efeitos retroactivos, para evitar conflitos entre os Estados membros, bem como eventuais recursos judiciais.

2-138

**Report: Reimer Böge (A7-0020/2010)**

2-139

**Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – L'utilizzo del Fondo di adeguamento alla globalizzazione come strumento utile a fronteggiare anche le conseguenze della crisi economica e finanziaria è un'iniziativa molto valida che dà una risposta concreta in termini di aiuto finanziario. È importante ricordare che la mobilitazione di questo fondo deve essere un incentivo alla ricollocazione dei lavoratori in esubero.

Mi auguro che siano sostenute anche le richieste di altri Paesi, come l'Italia, che hanno bisogno di chiedere l'intervento di questo fondo speciale per sostenere i dipendenti di quelle aziende che stanno pagando le conseguenze della crisi e che sono costrette a operare dei tagli. A tale riguardo, vorrei tuttavia chiedere alla Commissione maggiore flessibilità nella valutazione dei criteri di ammissibilità al fondo, che andrebbe attivato anche nel caso di difficoltà strutturali di distretti industriali locali di piccole e medie dimensioni.

2-140

**Carlos Coelho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização foi criado para prestar assistência adicional aos trabalhadores afectados pelas consequências de mudanças importantes na estrutura do comércio internacional. O âmbito de aplicação do FEG foi alargado para as candidaturas apresentadas a partir de 1 de Maio de 2009, passando, e bem, a incluir o apoio a trabalhadores despedidos em consequência directa da crise financeira e económica global.

Apoio a presente proposta para a mobilização de um montante de 6 199 341 euros a favor da Alemanha, dando resposta a um pedido feito por esta em 13 de Agosto de 2009, a fim de cobrir a assistência a trabalhadores despedidos no Grupo Karmann – indústria automóvel.

Em 2008, as 3 instituições confirmaram a importância de garantir um procedimento rápido para a aprovação de decisões de mobilização do Fundo, de forma a poder ajudar as pessoas em tempo útil. Foram necessários 7 meses para aprovar esta Decisão. Espero que o procedimento para activar o Fundo de Solidariedade possa ser realizado com outra rapidez, de forma a poder fazer face a situações de calamidade que requerem uma resposta imediata, como é o caso da recente tragédia na Madeira.

2-141

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O grupo alemão Karmann, outrora próspero e competitivo, viu-se a braços com a crise que assola o sector automóvel e entrou em processo de falência, tendo recentemente sido objecto de uma compra parcial por parte da Volkswagen. É requerida a mobilização de 6 199 341 euros do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização de modo a apoiar e assistir 1 793 trabalhadores despedidos daquele grupo.

No entender da Comissão, encontram-se preenchidos os critérios de elegibilidade para a mobilização deste fundo, pelo que se justifica plenamente que a União Europeia acorra a auxiliar os trabalhadores em dificuldade.

Faço votos de que este momento menos bom na vida dos trabalhadores despedidos permita, ainda assim, que possam ver melhoradas as suas competências e qualificações, e de que esta melhoria se traduza num rápido reingresso no mercado de trabalho.

2-141-500

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização foi criado para prestar assistência adicional aos trabalhadores despedidos como consequência de mudanças relevantes na estrutura do comércio internacional. Desta forma, procuram-se soluções para a sua reintegração no mercado de trabalho.

O Acordo Interinstitucional de 17 de Maio de 2006 permite a mobilização do FEG dentro de um limite máximo anual de 500 milhões de euros. A presente proposta diz respeito à mobilização de um montante total de 6 199 341 euros do FEG a favor da Alemanha, a fim de cobrir a assistência a trabalhadores despedidos numa empresa, o Grupo Karmann (indústria automóvel).

Nos termos do artigo 6.º do Regulamento FEG, deverá garantir-se que este Fundo apoie individualmente a reintegração dos trabalhadores despedidos em novos empregos. O FEG não substitui as acções que são da responsabilidade das empresas por força da legislação nacional ou de convenções colectivas, nem financia a reestruturação de empresas ou de sectores.

Volta-se a sublinhar que, no contexto da mobilização do FEG, a Comissão não deve transferir sistematicamente dotações para pagamentos a partir do Fundo Social Europeu, uma vez que o FEG foi criado enquanto instrumento específico separado, com objectivos e prazos que lhe são próprios.

2-142

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Sucodem-se os pedidos de accionamento deste Fundo. Neste caso, tratou-se de dar resposta a um pedido de assistência da Alemanha para casos de despedimento no sector da indústria automóvel, no Grupo Karmann.

Importa antes de mais dizer que este Fundo, atendendo às restrições orçamentais impostas (que o limita a 500 milhões de euros anuais) e aos critérios de elegibilidade restritivos que apresenta, só em parte atenua algumas das consequências da grave crise económica e financeira. Já há muito que o número de trabalhadores despedidos, em resultado das chamadas *reestruturações*, ultrapassou largamente as estimativas iniciais da Comissão quanto ao número de trabalhadores que poderiam vir a beneficiar do Fundo.

O que se impõe é uma clara ruptura com as políticas neoliberais que estão a provocar o visível desastre económico e social nos países da União Europeia. Muito mais do que meros paliativos deste desastre, naturalmente também necessários. Não podemos também deixar de assinalar a injustiça de um regulamento que beneficia mais os países com melhores rendimentos, designadamente com salários e subsídios de desemprego mais elevados.

Insistimos na necessidade urgente de um verdadeiro plano de apoio à produção e à criação de empregos com direitos nos países da União Europeia.

2-143

**Peter Jahr (PPE)**, *schriftlich*. – Ich freue mich sehr darüber, dass das Europäische Parlament heute beschlossen hat, EU-Hilfen in Höhe von 6,2 Mio. Euro für entlassene Mitarbeiter des Autozulieferers Karmann zu genehmigen. Von den insgesamt zur Verfügung stehenden 9 Mio. € trägt die Europäische Union nun 65 % bei. Diese Mittel sollen dafür verwendet werden, rund 1800 Menschen zusätzliche Umschulungen und Trainingsmaßnahmen anzubieten, damit sie möglichst schnell wieder Arbeit finden. Dies ist ein konkreter Beitrag der Europäischen Union, um den Menschen in der Krise beizustehen. Die EU zeigt damit deutlich, dass sie willens und in der Lage ist, auch den Einzelnen in Notsituationen zu unterstützen. Wichtig ist nun, dass das Geld reibungslos und unverzüglich verfügbar ist, damit die Menschen schnell wieder auf den ersten Arbeitsmarkt zurückkehren können. Neben diesen individuellen Hilfen für betroffene Arbeitnehmer muss die Europäische Union aber auch zusätzliche Maßnahmen ergreifen, um die Auswirkungen der Finanzkrise zu bewältigen. Die Globalisierung im Sinne der internationalen Arbeitsteilung (Wohlstandsteilung) ist sinnvoll und wichtig. Allerdings müssen sich sowohl die Kommission, das Europäische Parlament als auch die Mitgliedstaaten zukünftig verstärkt für faire Wettbewerbsbedingungen in den internationalen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen einsetzen, um Benachteiligungen einzelner Länder oder Branchen zu vermeiden.

2-143-500

**Alan Kelly (S&D)**, *in writing*. – This proposal on behalf of the mobilisation of EGAF for German workers - as well as the proposal from the Lithuanian refrigeration sector - was to be among the first beneficiaries of the fund in 2010. Both are worthy applications. I welcome the new Commission's commitment to continuing this fund which provides people with a "hand up" as opposed to a "hand out" following redundancy. My own constituency has benefitted from this fund and I hope it continues to do so in future. The global downturn has severely reduced the demand for luxury items and even though this makes the current troubles of the motor car industry understandable, it makes it no less saddening. The situation in Germany is particularly difficult due to sheer numbers; 2476 redundancies are concentrated in the same area, around the same industry. It is my hope that the 6.199 million Euro will help produce a successful way out of the crisis for the workers, their families, and the area.

2-143-750

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A UE é um espaço de solidariedade, enquadrando-se nesse particular o Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização.

Esses apoios são fundamentais para o auxílio aos desempregados e às vítimas das deslocalizações que se verificam num contexto globalizado. É cada vez maior o número de empresas que se deslocalizam, aproveitando os reduzidos preços do factor trabalho que são praticados em vários países, nomeadamente a China e a Índia, com efeitos nocivos para os países que respeitam os direitos dos trabalhadores.

O FEG destina-se a ajudar os trabalhadores vítimas da deslocalização de empresas e é fundamental para ajudá-los, para que no futuro voltem a ter acesso a um novo emprego. O FEG já foi, no passado, utilizado por outros países da UE, nomeadamente Portugal e Espanha, cabendo agora dar esse auxílio à Alemanha.

2-144

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Dem Bericht über die Inanspruchnahme des Europäischen Fonds für die Anpassung an die Globalisierung habe ich zugestimmt. Deutschland hatte hier um Unterstützung im Zusammenhang mit Entlassungen in der Automobilindustrie – konkret ging es um die Karmann-Gruppe – ersucht. In diesem Zusammenhang ist es wichtig zu erwähnen, dass das Geld aus dem Fonds für die Wiedereingliederung der einzelnen entlassenen Arbeitnehmer in das Arbeitsleben aufgewendet wird und nicht dazu dient, etwaige notwendige Maßnahmen zur Umstrukturierung von Unternehmen oder Sektoren zu kompensieren. Aus Solidarität mit unserem Nachbarland und mit den Arbeitnehmern sind die Geldmittel, die aufgrund der fortschreitenden Globalisierung und der durch Spekulanten dies- und jenseits des Atlantiks verursachten Wirtschafts- und Finanzkrise leider notwendig sind, meiner Meinung nach unverzüglich bereitzustellen.

2-144-500

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Am votat pentru Rezoluția Parlamentului European privind mobilizarea FEG pentru a-i sprijini pe cei 2 476 de disponibilizați din sectorul de automobile din Germania. Perioadele de șomaj vor fi utilizate de autoritățile germane pentru a ridica nivelul general de competențe, nu doar pentru formarea profesională și învățământul superior, ci și pentru a permite lucrătorilor migranți sau slab calificați să obțină competențe de bază pentru reintegrarea pe piața muncii.

La nivel european, în domeniul industriei constructoare de mașini ne confruntăm cu astfel de situații în Suedia, unde au fost disponibilizați 2 258 de muncitori, în Austria s-au efectuat 744 de disponibilizări în întreprinderi producătoare de autovehicule, remorci și semiremorci, iar în Belgia industria de profil a disponibilizat peste 2 500 de angajați. În Europa se vor pierde peste 8.000 de locuri de muncă din cauza restructurării industriei constructoare de mașini.

Asistența financiară oferită lucrătorilor concediați ar trebui să fie pusă la dispoziție cât mai rapid și mai eficient posibil, însă aceasta reprezintă o măsură pe termen scurt, care nu rezolvă problema dispariției locurilor de muncă. UE are nevoie de o politică industrială puternică și în domeniul industriei constructoare de mașini, pentru a păstra locurile de muncă existente și chiar a crea unele noi.

2-145

**Report: Reimer Böge (A7-0021/2010)**

2-145-500

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Šiandien balsavome dėl 3 paraiškų dėl paramos iš Europos Globalizacijos Fondo. Palaikiau visas tris paraiškas, nes manau, kad šio fondo teikiama parama mūsų žmonėms šiuo metu ypač reikalinga. Europos Komisija 2009 m. gegužės mėn. išimtinėmis sąlygomis leido nukrypti nuo reglamento nuostatų ir atsižvelgiant į ekonominės ir finansinės krizės metu susiklosčiusią situaciją leido taikyti paramą be darbo likusiems žmonėms.

Labai gaila, kad kai kurios valstybės narės, kuriose bedarbystė itin didelė, o skurdo lygis labai aukštas, nesugeba laiku prašyti paramos bei išnaudoti šio fondo teikiamas galimybes ir laiku suteikti pagalbą bedarbiams. Manau, kad Europos Komisija taip pat turėtų aiškintis, ar efektyviai panaudojama iš fondo teikiama parama ir ar žmonėms, kuriems ji skirta, ši parama atneša realią pridėtinę vertę.

2-146

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu.** – Aš balsavau už šį pranešimą, nes Europos prisitaikymo prie globalizacijos padarinių fondo (EGF) finansinė pagalba padės atleistiems darbuotojams vėl sugrįžti ir integruotis į darbo rinką. Finansinės ir ekonominės krizės metu per 12 mėnesių Lietuvoje nedarbo lygis žymiai išaugo, todėl būtina prisitaikyti prie krizės padarinių ir užtikrinti bent jau laikiną finansinę pagalbą, siekiant suteikti darbo vietas atleistiems bendrovės "Snaigė" darbuotojams. Šiuo atveju kalbama ne apie kelis atleistus įmonės darbuotojus, bet apie didžiulį skaičių žmonių, t. y. apie 651 darbuotoją, kurie sudaro 25–54 metų amžiaus grupę. Džiaugiuosi, kad šiandien įvyko taip lauktas balsavimas dėl laikinos finansinės pagalbos skyrimo, kadangi šis jautrus Lietuvos bendrovei ir jos atleistiems darbuotojams klausimas buvo uždelstas, nes kai kurie minėtos bendrovės darbuotojai darbą prarado jau 2008 m. lapkričio mėnesį. Tikiuosi, kad šios dienos balsavimu priimtos lėšos bus paskirstytos tikslingai ir veiksmingai.

2-147

**Diogo Feio (PPE), por escrito.** – Uma das características do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização é a de procurar *promover o espírito empresarial*. Esta promoção deve ser entendida pelas instituições europeias e pelos governos nacionais como um elemento crucial para fazer face aos desafios que se apresentam ao tecido produtivo europeu.

Entendo que a actuação pública deve verificar-se não só através da referida promoção, mas também, e sobretudo, pela remoção de obstáculos artificiais e burocráticos à actividade empresarial. E muito há ainda a fazer neste tocante.

Se são certas as medidas que visam prover, recolocar e requalificar aqueles que se vêm lançados no desemprego devido à globalização – como é o caso dos trabalhadores do sector lituano de fabrico de frigoríficos, em particular na sociedade AB Snaigė e em duas suas fornecedoras –, não serão menos certas aquelas que, preservando a justiça e a sã concorrência, procurem fortalecer as empresas e os seus quadros no contexto de uma economia aberta e crescentemente competitiva.

2-147-500

**Nuno Melo (PPE), por escrito.** – A UE é um espaço de solidariedade, enquadrando-se nesse particular o Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização.

Esses apoios são fundamentais para o auxílio aos desempregados e às vítimas das deslocalizações que se verificam num contexto globalizado. É cada vez maior o número de empresas que se deslocalizam, aproveitando os reduzidos preços do factor trabalho que são praticados em vários países, nomeadamente a China e a Índia, com efeitos nocivos para os países que respeitam os direitos dos trabalhadores.

O FEG destina-se a ajudar os trabalhadores vítimas da deslocalização de empresas e é fundamental para ajudá-los, para que no futuro voltem a ter acesso a um novo emprego. O FEG já foi, no passado, utilizado por outros países da UE, nomeadamente Portugal e Espanha, cabendo agora dar esse auxílio à Lituânia.

2-148

**Vilja Savisaar (ALDE), kirjalikult.** – Tānane otsus, et Euroopa Parlament toetab Globaliseerumisega Kohanemise Euroopa Fondi kasutusele võtmist kolme raportiga, millest kaks puudutavad Leedut ja üks Saksamaad, on igati tervitatav ja näitab konkreetselt, et Euroopa Liit saab otseselt leevendada koondatud inimeste olukorda ja aidata kaasa nende ümberõppele. Eestis on ehitussektoriga seoses viimase pooleteise aastaga kaotanud töö üle 30 tuhande inimese ning siinkohal kutsuksin üles Eesti valitsust ja sotsiaalministeeriumi julgemalt abi küsima ka Euroopa Liidu fondidest, mis sellisteks puhkudeks on ette nähtud. Märkimist väärib asjaolu, et kuigi täna said toetust Saksamaa ja Leedu, siis Eurostati andmetel on tööpuudus kõige suurem Hispaanias, Lätis ja Eestis, kes samuti võiksid mõelda, kuidas Euroopa Liit neid otseselt aidata saaks.

2-149

**Viktor Uspaskich (ALDE), raštu.** – Gerbiamas pranešėjau, kolegos, sveikinu šią iniciatyvą – palaikyti įmonės nukentėjusius darbuotojus nuo globalizacijos proceso. Visiškai palaikau ir džiaugiuosi, kad šiuo atveju pagalbą gaus Lietuvos žmonės. Apskritai manau, kad šio fondo bendra suma turėtų būti padidinta netgi keletą kartų, sumažinus asignavimus kitur. Esu įsitikinęs, kad toks fondas turi aprėpti ir įmonių savininkus. Dažniausiai jie nukentčia taip, kad vėliau nesugeba atsitiesti, sukurti naujo verslo. Nemažai pasitaiko atvejų, kai įmonių savininkai nukentčia daugiau negu darbuotojai: rizikuodami darant verslą, kurdami darbo vietas, mokėdami mokesčius, jie užstatinėja ne tik savo akcijas, bet ir asmeninį turtą. Todėl visiškai būtų naudinga, kad kaip ir dabar – nagrinėjant kiekvieną atvejį – panagrinėti galimybe teikti pagalbą ir įmonių savininkams, nukentėjusiems nuo globalizacijos ir pasaulinės ekonominės krizės.

2-150

**Report: Reimer Böge (A7-0019/2010)**

2-151

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu.** – Džiaugiuosi, kad šiandien įvyko balsavimas dėl lėšų paskirstymo iš Europos prisitaikymo prie globalizacijos padarinių fondo (EGF), siekiant skirti 1 118 893 eurų finansinę paramą atleistiems darbuotojams Lietuvoje iš 128-ių statybos sektoriaus įmonių. Statybų sektorius Lietuvoje išgyvena sunkius laikus, kadangi dėl finansinės ir ekonominės krizės labai smuko statybų paklausa, nes nuosmukio metu Lietuvos piliečiams yra labai sunku gauti finansinius kreditus būstui statyti ar įsigyti. Aš balsavau už šį pranešimą, nes ši ES finansinė parama padės



susirasti darbą ir grįžti į darbo rinką globalizacijos įkaitais tapusiems žmonėms bei padės jiems išsivaduoti iš sunkmečio gniaužtų. Taigi, šioje situacijoje būtina parodyti solidarumą su darbuotojais, kurie yra atleisti būtent dėl pasaulio ekonomikos pokyčių bei dėl finansinės krizės sukulto darbų vietų mažėjimo tam tikrose sektoriuose.

2-152

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A circunstância de cada vez mais países europeus solicitarem a mobilização do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização (FEG) torna evidente que os efeitos deste fenómeno se têm repercutido por toda a parte, confirmando, assim, o nome que lhe é dado.

Se a globalização se tem revelado globalmente benéfica, há, no entanto, que atender às circunstâncias em que, por sua causa, os sectores menos competitivos são afectados. Tal é o caso do sector da construção de edifícios na Lituânia.

A circunstância de esta ser uma assistência pontual, individual e limitada no tempo convoca todos os decisores políticos, os empresários e os trabalhadores a equacionarem novas formas de recuperar a competitividade perdida e o acesso a novos mercados. A não se verificarem estes, apoios como o do FEG terão um cariz meramente paliativo e acabarão por se revelar insuficientes.

2-152-500

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização foi criado para prestar assistência adicional aos trabalhadores despedidos como consequência de mudanças relevantes na estrutura do comércio internacional. Desta forma, procuram-se soluções para a sua reintegração no mercado de trabalho.

A União Europeia deve utilizar todos os seus meios para reagir às consequências da crise económica e financeira global e, neste contexto, o FEG pode desempenhar um papel crucial a favor da reintegração dos trabalhadores desempregados.

O Acordo Interinstitucional de 17 de Maio de 2006 permite a mobilização do FEG dentro de um limite máximo anual de 500 milhões de euros. A presente proposta diz respeito à mobilização de um montante global de 1 118 893 euros do Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização (FEG) a favor da Lituânia, a fim de prestar assistência a trabalhadores despedidos em 128 empresas que operam no sector da construção civil.

Volta-se a sublinhar que, no contexto da mobilização do FEG, a Comissão não deve transferir sistematicamente dotações para pagamentos a partir do Fundo Social Europeu, uma vez que o FEG foi criado enquanto instrumento específico separado, com objectivos e prazos que lhe são próprios.

2-153

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Sucodem-se os pedidos de accionamento deste Fundo. Neste caso, tratou-se de dar resposta a um pedido de assistência da Lituânia, em virtude de casos de despedimentos que ocorreram em 128 empresas activas no sector da construção civil.

Importa antes de mais dizer que este Fundo, atendendo às restrições orçamentais impostas (que o limita a 500 milhões de euros anuais) e aos critérios de elegibilidade restritivos que apresenta, só em parte atenua algumas das consequências da grave crise económica e financeira. Já há muito que o número de trabalhadores despedidos, em resultado das chamadas *reestruturações*, ultrapassou largamente as estimativas iniciais da Comissão quanto ao número de trabalhadores que poderiam vir a beneficiar do Fundo.

O que se impõe é uma clara ruptura com as políticas neoliberais que estão a provocar o visível desastre económico e social nos países da União Europeia. Muito mais do que meros paliativos deste desastre, naturalmente também necessários. Não podemos também deixar de assinalar a injustiça de um regulamento que beneficia mais os países com melhores rendimentos, designadamente com salários e subsídios de desemprego mais elevados.

Insistimos na necessidade urgente de um verdadeiro plano de apoio à produção e à criação de empregos com direitos nos países da União Europeia.

2-153-500

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A UE é um espaço de solidariedade, enquadrando-se nesse particular o Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização.

Esses apoios são fundamentais para o auxílio aos desempregados e às vítimas das deslocalizações que se verificam num contexto globalizado. Neste caso concreto, o objectivo é apoiar os desempregados de mais de 120 empresas do sector da construção civil que se viram obrigadas a fechar as portas face à grande crise que afecta o sector.

O FEG destina-se a ajudar todos os afectados pelas consequências de mudanças estruturais importantes nos padrões do comércio mundial e para ajudar à sua reintegração no mercado de trabalho. O FEG já foi, no passado, utilizado por outros países da UE, nomeadamente Portugal e Espanha, cabendo agora dar esse auxílio à Lituânia.

2-154

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D)**, *în scris*. – În septembrie 2009, Lituania a depus o cerere de asistență pentru utilizarea Fondului European de ajustare la Globalizare (FEG) referitoare la concedierile care au avut loc în 128 de întreprinderi din sectorul construcției de clădiri. Am votat pentru Rezoluția Parlamentului European privind mobilizarea FEG în ceea ce privește construcția de clădiri în Lituania.

Consider că economia eco-eficientă și construcția de clădiri eficiente energetic poate contribui la relansarea economică a UE. Se estimează că aceste sectoare pot crea, la nivel european, aproximativ 2 milioane de locuri de muncă până în 2020.

În 2006, sectorul construcțiilor avea aproximativ 2,9 milioane de întreprinderi care generau 510 miliarde de Euro și care asigurau locuri de muncă pentru 14,1 milioane de persoane la nivelul UE-27. Ca urmare a crizei economice și financiare, în Lituania, la începutul anului 2009, volumul activității în domeniul construcțiilor a scăzut cu 42,81% și respectiv 48,04% comparativ cu prima parte a anului 2008. Acest lucru are un impact negativ asupra Lituaniei, în condițiile în care aceasta are una dintre cele mai mari rate a șomajului din UE. Sectorul construcțiilor a fost în mod special afectat, pierzând, doar în 2008, aproape 10% din locurile de muncă din Lituania.

2-155

**Viktor Uspaskich (ALDE)**, *raštu*. – Visiškaį palaikau šią iniciatyvą ir balsuoju už pagalbą statybinių bendrovių darbuotojams, nukentėjusiems nuo dabartinės pasaulinės krizės ir globalizacijos proceso. Esu tikras – mes visi kartu esame nemažai kalti dėl to, kad nesugebėjome sustabdyti nekilnojamo turto ir statybų organizacijų pučiamo burbulio. Buvo aišku, kad tai atves į krizę. Politikų pareiga – tarnauti žmonėms ir stabdyti negeroves. Todėl balsuodamas už šią projektą, siūlyčiau ir prašyčiau didinti finansinę pagalbą, nes šimtams nukentėjusių įmonių, kuriose dirba dešimtys tūkstančių darbuotojų, vienas milijonas eurų – tai tik lašas jūroje. Kalbėdamas su žmonėmis, dirbančiais būtent tokiose įmonėse, girdžiu, kad žmonės nebetiki nei savo valstybe, nei Europos Sąjunga. Todėl padidinus tokio pobūdžio skiriamą paramą, pagerintume pačios Europos Sąjungos įvaizdį bei sustiprintume pasitikėjimą nacionalinėmis valstybėmis.

2-156

**Report: Reimer Böge (A7-0021/2010), (A7-0019/2010)**

2-157

**Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE)**, *in writing*. – I fully support the two reports by Reimer Böge that have been adopted by Parliament on financial support for redundant workers in Lithuania from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund, and I am grateful to other colleagues who supported them. Unfortunately, I was late for this vote because on my way to the plenary chamber the lift was not working.

Both reports – on the situation in the construction sector and on the company Snaigė – represent the most acute unemployment cases in Lithuania. The EU financial support will alleviate the hardships Lithuanian workers are facing.

The construction sector is one of the hardest hit in Lithuania. Now more than a hundred companies have been forced into bankruptcy. The EUR 1.1 million will target almost 1 000 workers in this highly sensitive and hard-hit sector.

The situation is very similar with Snaigė – the support of EUR 258 000 from the EGF would target 650 redundancies in a city that has one of the highest unemployment rates – nearing 20% now.

Even though this might be only the tip of the iceberg of the unemployment problem in Lithuania, the financial support will help those in most need.

2-158

**Reports: Reimer Böge (A7-0020/2010), (A7-0021/2010), (A7-0019/2010)**

2-159

**Regina Bastos (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O Fundo Europeu de Ajustamento à Globalização (FEG) foi criado em 2006 para prestar assistência adicional aos trabalhadores afectados pelas consequências de mudanças importantes na estrutura do comércio internacional e para ajudar à sua reintegração no mercado de trabalho.

Desde 1 de Maio de 2009, o âmbito de aplicação do FEG foi alargado passando a incluir o apoio a trabalhadores despedidos em consequência directa da crise económica e financeira. Nesta altura em que nos vemos confrontados com esta grave crise económica e financeira, de que se destaca o aumento do desemprego como uma das principais consequências, a UE deverá utilizar todos os meios ao seu alcance para reagir às consequências desta crise, nomeadamente no que se refere aos apoios a prestar às pessoas que se viram confrontadas, de um dia para o outro, com a realidade do desemprego.

Assim votei a favor da presente proposta que diz respeito à mobilização do FEG a favor da Lituânia, com o objectivo de apoiar os trabalhadores despedidos nas 128 empresas que operam no sector da construção civil.

2-160

**Andrew Henry William Brons (NI)**, *in writing*. – Whilst we are opposed to EU membership and therefore EU funding, the money in this Fund has already been allocated and is not therefore ‘new’ money.

We would prefer help for redundant workers to be funded by national governments. However, for as long as the EU is the competent authority, help for redundant workers must, apparently, come from this Fund.

There will be critics in the UK of this money being paid to German and Lithuanian workers. However, if it were to be proposed to provide funds for (say) our steelworkers from Corus, we could not oppose such a contribution. Therefore, we cannot logically oppose these contributions.

2-161

**Bruno Gollnisch (NI)**, *par écrit*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, nous avons voté en faveur des rapports de M. Böge sur la mobilisation du Fonds européen d'ajustement à la mondialisation en pensant avant tout aux salariés qui perdent leur emploi. Mais aussi avec un certain malaise. Car à vrai dire, ce fonds est un emplâtre sur une jambe de bois face à l'ampleur des conséquences sociales de votre politique irresponsable d'ultra-échangisme.

Il donne parfois l'impression, bien que vous vous en défendiez, de financer avec l'argent du contribuable européen les politiques de délocalisations ou de restructuration des grandes entreprises, en même temps qu'il permet à bon compte à l'Europe de Bruxelles de se dire "solidaire" des chômeurs qu'elle fabrique. Autre raison de notre malaise: les seuils requis pour bénéficier de ce fonds, notamment en termes de nombre de licenciements. Car ce sont avant tout et à nouveau, sauf cas exceptionnel, les très grandes entreprises qui en bénéficient. Comme si les salariés des moyennes, petites et très petites entreprises, les petits patrons qui mettent la clef sous la porte, étaient une fois de plus les grands oubliés des politiques économiques et sociales.

2-162

**Report: Anna Rosbach (A7-0009/2010)**

2-162-500

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Votamos a favor desta resolução, a fim de garantir a sustentabilidade ambiental das regiões do Atlântico, nomeadamente as ilhas da União que constituem um elemento essencial na sua dimensão marítima e que se vêem confrontadas com problemas e necessidades específicos, sendo exemplos os problemas ambientais.

É de referir o caso dos Açores, que possuem a maior Zona Económica Exclusiva da União Europeia, sendo necessária no âmbito da presente discussão a garantia da vigilância ambiental dos mares do Atlântico, pois a vida das populações destas ilhas depende do bom estado ambiental das suas águas marinhas, sendo importante definir claramente objectivos mínimos de qualidade ambiental e, simultaneamente, programas de vigilância que assegurem este mesmo bom estado ambiental.

Existe ainda a necessidade de abordar os casos referidos pelo relator, como os acidentes de navegação ou a *bolsa de plástico*, que podem vir a ter consequências devastadoras para a sustentabilidade económica, social e ambiental das regiões do Atlântico, o que obriga à execução de medidas específicas adequadas à realidade ambiental e socioeconómica dos ecossistemas marinhos que o Atlântico abriga.

Conclui-se, assim, a importância da celebração destes acordos para o desenvolvimento sustentável das populações que dependem do Atlântico.

2-162-750

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Congratulo-me com a celebração deste Protocolo Adicional que vem resolver um conflito político impediu Espanha e Marrocos de ratificarem o Acordo de Cooperação para a Protecção das Costas e das Águas do Atlântico Nordeste contra a Poluição (Acordo de Lisboa). A protecção das costas e das águas é de uma importância estratégica para o bem-estar socioeconómico das comunidades costeiras, o desenvolvimento local, o emprego, a preservação e criação de actividades económicas. É necessário assegurar a manutenção de um bom estado ambiental em todas as águas marinhas da União Europeia, no sentido de garantir um desenvolvimento sustentável O presente protocolo está directamente ligado a questões como a defesa do ambiente, as alterações climáticas, a segurança, a saúde pública, o desenvolvimento regional, as relações com os países terceiros e a cooperação para o desenvolvimento. Este protocolo, que irá permitir combater uma variedade de formas de poluição do Atlântico, é fundamental garantir a luta contra a contaminação ou risco de poluição dos mares ou costas, através de um mecanismo destinado a garantir a cooperação entre as Partes Contratantes em caso de acidente de poluição e as obriga a estabelecer e aplicar as suas próprias estruturas e planos de emergência.

2-163

**Diane Dodds (NI)**, *in writing*. – I voted no to this report and in doing so was mindful of a good news story in respect of our marine environment. The rapporteur mentions the ‘plastic soup’, the drifting mass of plastic and rubber in the Pacific Ocean, and notes what is described as an increasing problem in the Atlantic Ocean of lost fishing nets. In this respect, it is worth mentioning the work of KIMO International and their ‘Fishing for Litter’ Project. Originally started in March 2000

by the Dutch Government and Dutch fishermen, the project was aimed at clearing the North Sea of litter, using fishing nets. KIMO International has since expanded this project to harbours in the UK, Sweden and Denmark, with EU financial assistance.

Since 2001 EU fishermen have removed hundreds of tonnes of rubbish from our seas and returned it to land where it is collected and disposed of responsibly. All of the EU fishermen involved in this project need to be applauded for their dedication, which removes waste permanently from the sea, benefiting the fishing industry, wildlife and the environment.

2-164

**Robert Dušek (S&D)**, *v písemné formě*. – EU uzavřela s jednotlivými členskými zeměmi a sousedními třetími zeměmi soubor dohod týkajících se moří, který tvoří Helsinská úmluva, Bonnská dohoda, Barcelonská úmluva a tzv. Lisabonská dohoda. Cílem těchto dohod je zajištění individuálních a kolektivních opatření v případě hrozby nebo již probíhajícího znečištění moří či pobřeží. Ač byla Lisabonská dohoda podepsána v roce 1990, nevstoupila z důvodu územního sporu mezi Španělskem a Marokem nikdy v platnost. Dodatečný protokol řešící tento spor byl všemi smluvními stranami podepsán již v roce 2008, přijetí Lisabonské dohody by tak nemělo nic bránit. Zpravodajka ve zprávě poukázala na dva trvalé a narůstající problémy znečištění moří a pobřeží, a to na obrovskou plovoucí masu plastových a gumových předmětů v Tichém oceánu, jejíž rozměr je 34násobně větší, než je rozloha středně velkého členského státu Nizozemska. Druhým trvalým problémem, který Anna Rosbach uvádí a pro který žádá řešení, je množství starých, vyražených a ztracených rybářských sítí. Tato zpráva je příkladem konstruktivní práce s cílem řešení hlavních problémů v oblasti znečištění moří a pobřeží, a proto ji podpořím svým hlasováním.

2-165

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Vinte anos após a sua assinatura, o Acordo de Cooperação para a Protecção das Costas e das Águas do Atlântico Nordeste contra a Poluição, celebrado entre Portugal, Espanha, França, Marrocos e UE, encontra-se agora em condições de entrar em vigor, após a sua ratificação por todas as Partes Contratantes. O Conselho propõe, agora, a conclusão, em nome da Comunidade Europeia, do Protocolo Adicional, o que permitirá, por fim, a entrada em vigor do Acordo.

Sendo este Acordo da máxima importância para Portugal, tendo em conta a dimensão da sua costa e a importância do mar para a economia nacional, e não esquecendo os desastres Erika e Prestige, congratulo o Conselho e os Estados pela conclusão deste Protocolo Adicional e espero a rápida e eficaz entrada em vigor do Acordo, que permitirá maior segurança para as nossas costas contra acidentes ecológicos como alguns que, infelizmente, marcaram o passado recente das nossas costas.

2-165-500

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Regozijo-me com a adopção deste relatório que vem permitir a entrada em vigor de uma rede de acordos regionais sobre poluição marinha concluídos entre a UE e alguns Estados-Membros e países terceiros vizinhos.

No presente caso, temos o Acordo de Lisboa, que foi assinado em Outubro de 1990, mas nunca entrou em vigor devido a uma disputa territorial entre Espanha e Marrocos, duas das Partes Contratantes, sobre o *limite sul* (Sara Ocidental) visado na alínea c) do artigo 3.º do Acordo.

O Protocolo Adicional, através do qual foi encontrada uma solução para o conflito e uma redacção adequada para a alínea c) do artigo 3.º, foi assinado apenas em Maio de 2008 por Portugal, Espanha, França e Marrocos.

Com a conclusão do presente Protocolo Adicional, o Acordo de Lisboa pode entrar em vigor, 20 anos após a sua assinatura. Além da dimensão da segurança, este Protocolo visa a protecção ambiental. Todos temos presentes os desastres ecológicos que ameaçaram as costas dos nossos países nos últimos anos. Espera-se que estas normas ajudem a evitar acidentes como o Erika e o Prestige, porque o mar não conhece fronteiras físicas e políticas e requer uma partilha de esforços e uma acção concertada.

2-165-750

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A Comunidade Europeia tem participado em diferentes acordos regionais sobre poluição marítima que facilitam a assistência mútua e a cooperação entre os Estados-membros. Desta rede de acordos consta o Acordo de Cooperação para a Protecção das Costas e das Águas do Atlântico Nordeste (Acordo de Lisboa), promovido por Portugal, que devido a uma disputa territorial entre Espanha e Marrocos não chegou a entrar em vigor. Sou da opinião que, em nome das normas ambientais promovidas pela UE, e uma vez que foi alcançado um acordo sobre o Protocolo Adicional, o Acordo de Lisboa possa finalmente ser posto em prática.

2-166

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Das Zusatzprotokoll zum Übereinkommen über die Zusammenarbeit beim Schutz der Küsten und Gewässer des Nordostatlantiks gegen Verschmutzung ist Teil eines Netzes von regionalen Übereinkommen über den Schutz der Meeresumwelt, die die EU mit einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten und benachbarten Drittstaaten geschlossen hat. Der Schutz der Meere, die ja als Nahrungsgrundlage für Millionen von Europäern fungieren, stellt auch eine

bedeutende Aufgabe der EU dar, weshalb ich dem vorliegenden Bericht ohne Vorbehalt zugestimmt habe. Erwähnt werden muss in diesem Zusammenhang, dass neben dem hier behandelten Übereinkommen von Lissabon das Übereinkommen von Helsinki, das Übereinkommen von Bonn und das Übereinkommen von Barcelona bestehen.

Jedes dieser Übereinkommen erstreckt sich auf verschiedene Teile der die EU-Staaten umgebenden Meere und soll das individuelle oder kollektive Eingreifen der Vertragsparteien im Fall der unfallbedingten Verschmutzung oder drohenden Verschmutzung der Gewässer oder Küsten ermöglichen. Das Übereinkommen von Lissabon wurde im Oktober 1990 unterzeichnet, trat jedoch wegen eines Gebietskonflikts zwischen zwei der Vertragsparteien, Spanien und Marokko, um die „südliche Grenze“ (Westsahara) nie in Kraft. Erst im Mai 2008 wurde das Zusatzprotokoll, in dem der Streit beigelegt und eine angemessene Formulierung gefunden wurde, von Portugal, Spanien, Frankreich und Marokko und am 25. März 2009 schließlich auch von der Europäischen Gemeinschaft unterzeichnet.

2-166-500

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Na União europeia, quase 50% da população europeia vive em regiões costeiras, o que por si só, exige redobrada atenção para a preservação e gestão integrada destas regiões. Nesse sentido, assume-se como fundamental garantir na UE, uma Gestão Integrada das Zonas Costeiras, já preconizada aliás pela Comissão Europeia numa Comunicação que publicou a este respeito.

É importante também salientar que 80% do lixo e poluição que existe no mar tem origem em terra, razão pela qual se impõe uma estratégia concertada que implique também um combate terrestre a este flagelo.

A poluição oceânica e degradação do litoral europeu constituem, para além de uma questão ambiental, um problema económico, já que nalguns países, como é o caso de Portugal, as práticas de turismo dirigido a actividades marítimas, como o whale watching, mergulho e outras, constituem já uma receita importante para algumas regiões, nomeadamente Açores, da Madeira e Algarve."

Á semelhança do que sucede com a sobrepesca, também a poluição das águas tem contribuído de forma significativa para o actual estado de depauperação de alguns stocks de espécies que constituem recursos haliêuticos importantes, exigindo-se portanto uma plena aplicação da Directiva para o Meio Marinho, pilar ambiental da Estratégia para a Política Marítima Integrada.

Os oceanos e as zonas costeiras deverão ser uma prioridade estratégica para a Europa, razão pela qual apoio por inteiro este relatório do Parlamento Europeu.

2-167

**Rovana Plumb (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Am votat acest raport pentru a contribui la intrarea în vigoare a Protocolului adițional la Acordul de la Lisabona. Acest acord creează un mecanism în vederea asigurării cooperării dintre părțile contractante în cazul unor accidente cu efecte de poluare și le obligă să își stabilească și să implementeze propriile structuri și planuri de urgență.

Prezentul acord face parte dintr-o rețea de acorduri maritime regionale pe care UE le-a încheiat cu anumite state membre individuale și țări terțe vecine. Rețeaua este alcătuită din Convenția de la Helsinki, Acordul de la Bonn, Convenția de la Barcelona și, în acest caz, Acordul de la Lisabona, fiecare dintre acestea acoperind părți diferite ale mării din jurul țărilor UE și vizând intervenția la nivel individual sau colectiv a părților contractante în caz de poluare sau de amenințare cu poluarea mărilor sau coastelor, pentru protejarea mediului și a sănătății cetățenilor.

2-168

**Report: Anna Hedh (A7-0024/2010)**

2-169

**Regina Bastos (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A política de protecção dos consumidores tem como finalidade promover a saúde, a segurança, os interesses económicos e jurídicos e o direito à informação dos consumidores. A protecção dos consumidores é uma política horizontal e fundamental da União Europeia, centrando-se na garantia de mercados saudáveis, que permitam aos consumidores actuar com segurança e confiança, encorajando a inovação e o comércio transfronteiriço.

Votei favoravelmente o presente relatório por considerar ser essencial reforçar a política europeia de defesa dos consumidores e torná-la mais eficaz e concreta para os cidadãos. Consumidores confiantes, bem informados e com capacidade de escolha são indispensáveis para o bom funcionamento do mercado interno, que deverá ter como objectivo proporcionar aos consumidores uma vasta escolha de produtos e serviços de alta qualidade a preços competitivos, oferecendo-lhes, ao mesmo tempo, um nível de protecção elevado, desempenhando assim um papel importante para tornar a UE competitiva, dinâmica e inovadora a nível global.

2-170

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Piața internă a Uniunii Europene s-a extins substanțial în ultimii ani și are acum un număr de aproape 500.000.000 de consumatori în 27 de state. O uniformizare a principiilor și regulilor de

protecție a consumatorilor la nivelul Uniunii Europene și o îmbunătățire a mecanismelor de aplicare a acestora este un obiectiv realizabil, fără a avea pretenția că oferta de produse și servicii în toate cele 27 de state va atinge aceeași calitate pe termen scurt sau mediu.

Actuala situație economică dificilă prin care trece toată Europa se manifestă printr-o reducere a veniturilor și o creștere a șomajului, ceea ce se traduce, la nivel comunitar, prin nevoia reală de o mai bună administrare a coșului zilnic. Atitudinea consumatorului european, care resimte direct efectele recesiunii economice, se manifestă în special în legătură cu bunurile și serviciile pe care le cumpără și pe care le vrea la o calitate bună astfel încât să se folosească cât mai mult de ele. Devin, deci, din ce în ce mai importante acțiunile pentru protecția consumatorului. Consolidarea structurilor de supraveghere a pieței în toate statele membre pentru ca produsele puse în circulație să îndeplinească cele mai înalte standarde de siguranță este o soluție la actuala stare a lucrurilor.

2-170-500

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), *por escrito*.** – Os consumidores da UE têm um papel fundamental no aumento do crescimento, do emprego e da competitividade e os seus interesses constituem uma prioridade fundamental na definição de políticas chave como a saúde, as empresas e a indústria, o ambiente, a energia e os transportes, entre outras. Ao nível da energia, o mercado interno não pode funcionar adequadamente e de forma competitiva devido à existência das chamadas «ilhas energéticas», como a região do Báltico, energeticamente isolada do resto da Europa e dependente de um único fornecedor externo. A existência de uma rede eléctrica e de uma rede de gasodutos que cubram todo o território europeu dever ser uma prioridade, pois a Europa é altamente dependente da importação de energia. Também o mercado da electricidade deve adoptar um conjunto de medidas tendo em vista a abertura total em benefício do consumidor europeu. Devem ser criadas as condições favoráveis a uma concorrência real e equitativa e à criação de um verdadeiro mercado único. Os Estados-Membros devem adoptar as disposições necessárias à realização de objectivos bem concretos, nomeadamente a protecção dos consumidores vulneráveis, a protecção dos direitos fundamentais dos consumidores e a coesão económica e social.

2-171

**Carlos Coelho (PPE), *por escrito*.** – A promoção dos direitos e bem-estar dos consumidores é um ponto basilar da União Europeia. Apoio todos os esforços envidados neste domínio que restituam aos cidadãos a confiança nos mercados. A protecção do consumidor torna-se tão ou mais importante neste contexto de crise económica que aumenta a pressão sobre os grupos de consumidores de baixos rendimentos mais desprotegidos. É necessário estabelecer uma abordagem coordenada que permita aos consumidores actuarem com confiança no exercício dos seus direitos. Neste sentido, realço a necessidade de: - por um lado, promover políticas de sensibilização e educação dos consumidores (pela UE e Estados-Membros) através de campanhas, pontos de informação, aumento de recursos dos Centros Europeus do Consumidor; - por outro lado, a eficaz aplicação das regras já existentes, reforço da fiscalização do mercado e mecanismos coercitivos, pressão sobre os Estados-Membros na transposição correcta do acervo comunitário.

Ressalvo que só assim os consumidores podem fazer escolhas bem fundamentadas sem serem sujeitos a condicionamentos de todos os níveis por parte dos produtores e reforçar a sua confiança no mercado, geradora de uma maior concorrência e aumento da qualidade dos produtos e serviços e de um aumento do consumo (importante factor de recuperação económica).

2-172

**Lara Comi (PPE), *per iscritto*.** – La protezione dei consumatori è strettamente connessa alla capacità del mercato di offrire un'ampia gamma di prodotti e servizi di alta qualità a prezzi competitivi. È evidente che la maggiore fiducia, la consapevolezza e la responsabilità del consumatore comportano la richiesta di una sempre maggiore qualità dei beni e servizi, che fa a sua volta aumentare la concorrenza fra i fornitori che saranno stimolati a migliorare l'offerta, mantenendo i prezzi a livelli competitivi.

Sono d'accordo sull'importanza annessa dalla Commissione e dagli Stati membri al fatto di avviare una strategia di comunicazione sui diritti dei consumatori attraverso portali web, campagne di sensibilizzazione, punti informativi, promuovendo anche l'utilizzo del sito Internet "eYouGuide", vigilando nel contempo sull'affidabilità, la credibilità e l'imparzialità degli organismi chiamati a garantire la gestione e l'organizzazione.

Anche i cinque indicatori del quadro di valutazione dei mercati e dei beni individuati dalla risoluzione – sebbene non esaustivi – consentiranno certamente di acquisire dei dati utili per migliorare, se necessario, il quadro normativo di riferimento, a patto che i dati forniti dagli Stati siano completi e che la loro aggregazione possa avvenire su una base facilmente comparabile. Il mio voto sulla relazione è favorevole anche se manifesto le mie perplessità sull'istituzione del Mediatore per i consumatori e sui mezzi di ricorso collettivo.

2-173

**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), *în scris*.** – Consider că, după intrarea în vigoare a Tratatului de la Lisabona și în condițiile actualiei crize economice, interesele și protecția consumatorilor trebuie apărute cu fermitate. Este nevoie de instrumente specifice care să le stea la dispoziție consumatorilor, astfel încât să le fie garantată integrarea eficientă a intereselor în toate politicile Uniunii Europene.

2-174

**Robert Dušek (S&D)**, *v písemné formě*. – Zpravodajka vychází z výsledků hodnotících zpráv o spotřebitelských trzích, což je logický a pragmatický přístup. Spokojenost i potíže spotřebitelů lze vyvozovat právě ze statistických zpráv zaměřených na obsah. Další vývoj důvěryhodné databáze o spotřebitelské problematice je pro identifikaci trhů nezbytný. Je však třeba zlepšit sběr dat tak, aby byly zohledněny rozdíly mezi jednotlivými systémy členských států, které jsou z důvodu rozmanitosti někdy extrémní. Nejvíce problematickou shledávám účinnou vymahatelnost právních předpisů a smluvních závazků. Obzvláště v případě obchodů na příhraničních trzích bývá vymahatelnost práva nulová. Stanovování pravidel ochrany spotřebitele v EU nemá vliv, pokud tato nejsou řádně provedena ve vnitrostátním právu a uplatňována a také vynucována na úrovni členských států. Zpravodajka problematiku ochrany spotřebitele pojala na základě hodnotících zpráv přijatelným způsobem. Uvítal bych však konkrétnější návrhy pro zlepšení současného stavu. I přes tuto výhradu je zpráva přínosem pro ochranu spotřebitelů v EU a budu pro její přijetí hlasovat.

2-175

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A política de consumidores da União Europeia é um pilar fundamental para a concretização do mercado interno. Assim, esta deve permitir que os consumidores e cidadãos europeus tenham acesso a produtos e serviços de alta qualidade a preços competitivos, beneficiando ao mesmo tempo de um elevado nível de protecção dos seus direitos.

Através de uma crescente educação e consciencialização dos seus direitos, bem como dos seus deveres, e de uma atitude responsável das empresas contribuir-se-á para um comércio transfronteiriço cada vez mais dinâmico e, conseqüentemente, para uma sólida integração do mercado interno, com impacto na competitividade europeia.

Também deve ser encontrado um justo equilíbrio entre os direitos e deveres dos consumidores e o impacto da legislação adoptada neste campo relativamente aos direitos e deveres das empresas e fornecedores de serviços.

2-175-500

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O Tratado de Lisboa menciona a protecção dos consumidores como uma política horizontal e fundamental da União Europeia, determinando que os requisitos de protecção dos consumidores sejam tidos em consideração.

Neste contexto é importante reforçar a política europeia de defesa dos consumidores e torná-la mais eficaz e concreta para os cidadãos. É necessário responder às expectativas e problemas dos cidadãos europeus.

Neste sentido, defendem-se instrumentos de observação do mercado, como o Painel de Avaliação dos Mercados de Consumo. Uma boa política de protecção dos consumidores deve garantir mercados saudáveis, segurança e confiança, onde o comércio transfronteiras e a inovação sejam encorajados.

Defendo uma política transparente onde a denominação de marca de origem seja obrigatória. É importante a protecção dos consumidores face a produtos importados que não são seguros, o que torna necessária uma cooperação cada vez maior entre as autoridades de fiscalização do mercado e as autoridades aduaneiras.

Esta segurança dos produtos que circulam no mercado interno exige uma conjugação de esforços com as autoridades dos países terceiros e, por isso, defende-se a iniciativa da Comissão de intensificar a cooperação internacional e celebrar acordos formais com as autoridades competentes dos países terceiros, principalmente da China, dos EUA e do Japão.

2-175-750

**Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of the Hedh report. Scotland currently lacks a voice in EU consumer matters: we have no independent representation in the Council and consumer legislation is largely reserved to London. Given our separate legal institutions it is essential that these powers are returned to the Scottish parliament so that Scotland can play a full role in the ongoing EU debate on these matters.

2-175-875

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A defesa dos consumidores é, desde sempre, uma das prioridades da UE e foi reforçada após a aprovação do Tratado de Lisboa. Consumidores bem informados dos seus direitos e obrigações contribuem para um mercado mais transparente e concorrencial.

Com a presente crise económica, é crucial proteger os consumidores mais vulneráveis e com rendimentos mais baixos. A complexidade cada vez maior dos mercados retalhistas, nomeadamente o relacionado com os serviços, torna cada vez mais difícil a melhor escolha por parte dos consumidores.

Para avaliar de forma eficaz os mercados e adoptar políticas que produzam os melhores resultados possíveis para os consumidores, são necessários instrumentos de observação dos mercados, sendo por isso de grande importância o Painel de Avaliação dos Mercados de Consumo.

2-175-937

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Um einen funktionierenden Konsumentenschutz zu gewährleisten, ist es wichtig Aufklärung und Information für die Verbraucher zu verbessern. Ziel ist der "mündige Verbraucher" im Binnenmarkt. Der Bericht geht allerdings zu wenig auf die Probleme, die ein völlig unregelmäßiger Markt mit sich bringt, ein: Europäische Standards werden nicht immer eingehalten, sei es hinsichtlich der Qualitäts- und Sicherheitsstandards, oder auch die Umwelt- und Gesundheitsauflagen betreffend. Ich habe mich daher der Stimmabgabe enthalten.

2-175-968

**Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Ochrona konsumenta jest niezwykle istotną kwestią, którą musi zająć się Komisja. Samo prowadzenie skutecznych działań w tej sprawie będzie oczywiście niewystarczające, jeśli zabraknie zaangażowania ze strony konsumentów. Konsumentom muszą być świadomi swoich praw. Wykorzystanie do maksimum możliwości, jakie stwarza jednolity europejski rynek jest wielkim wyzwaniem dla Komisji. Aby mu sprostać, skuteczna ochrona konsumenta musi być jednym z obranych priorytetów UE. Uważam, że wykorzystywanie tablic wyników dla rynków konsumenckich – jedno z narzędzi do monitorowania rynków, jest jak najbardziej korzystne z punktu widzenia konsumenta. Tablice te wyraźnie wskazują, które rynki nie odpowiadają wystarczająco potrzebom konsumentów. Analizując je, możemy stwierdzić m.in., że konsumenci napotykać na szczególne problemy na rynku usługowym, oraz że handel internetowy między poszczególnymi krajami członkowskimi jest w dużej mierze ograniczany przez transgraniczne bariery. Wyrażam zadowolenie z faktu, iż planowane są kolejne tablice. Mam również nadzieję, że dostarczą one jeszcze bardziej szczegółowych informacji niż te poprzednie. Dzięki takim narzędziom znacznie łatwiej jest zrozumieć problemy konsumentów i odpowiedzieć na ich potrzeby. Nie ulega wątpliwości fakt, że wprowadzanie unijnych przepisów dot. ochrony konsumenta w poszczególnych krajach UE jest korzystne dla naszych obywateli.

2-176

**Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)**, *schriftelijk*. – Ik stemde voor het rapport van collega Anna Hedh over consumentenbescherming. Dit initiatiefverslag erkent terecht de cruciale rol van consumentenorganisaties omdat zij bij uitstek de organisaties zijn die de overheid wijzen op de problemen waarmee consumenten dagelijks te maken hebben. Uiteraard ondersteun ik ook de eis ten aanzien van de lidstaten om consumentenorganisaties in alle stadia van het besluitvormingsproces, de omzetting en de tenuitvoerlegging van consumentenwetgeving naar behoren te raadplegen. Van groot belang is ook de vraag in het scorebord consumentenmarkten ook lange-termijnindicatoren op te nemen met betrekking tot bij voorbeeld marktaandeel, kwaliteit, reclame, doorzichtigheid en vergelijkbaarheid van aanbiedingen, indicatoren inzake handhaving en consumentenemancipatie, sociale, milieu- en ethische indicatoren, alsmede indicatoren voor het meten van verhaal en consumentenschade.

De enige twee minpunten die ik in dit rapport zie, zijn het niet aanvaarden van het groene amendement om ook lessen te trekken uit het marktfalen van de energiesector alsmede ons amendement met vraag tot herziening van de speelgoedrichtlijn. Dat amendement haalde het niet en dat blijft een jammerlijke zaak. Niettemin wens ik de rapporteur en de collega's van de commissie interne markt en consumentenbescherming te feliciteren met dit degelijk verslag.

2-177

**Catherine Stihler (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I welcome this contribution to the consumer scoreboard from Parliament. The consumer scoreboard is an important indicator of how effective and efficient Member States are at implementing legislation from the EU. I welcome the rapporteur's calls for greater transparency and visibility of the surveillance measures and support her call for improved collective redress mechanisms in the EU.

2-178

**Alf Svensson (PPE)**, *skriftlig*. – Den fria marknaden inom EU gör unionen till en stark aktör, men innebär även att konsumenten måste få bra och tydlig information om utbudet på marknaden. Konsumenternas ställning måste stärkas. Därför har jag i dag röstat för betänkandet om konsumentskydd. Betänkandet innehåller dock en rad problematiska formuleringar. Det finns risk för att det blir en omständlig process att rådfråga konsumentorganisationerna i alla skeden av beslutsfattandet. Det civila samhället är viktigt i arbetet för ett relevant konsumentskydd, men formen för detta kan se olika ut i olika länder, utan att resultatet för den skull blir sämre. Subsidiaritetsprincipen måste vara gällande när det handlar om inrättandet av konsumentskyddsmyndigheter och konsumentombudsmän, liksom formuleringen av skolans läroplan. EU ska upprätta minimivårer och mål för den gemensamma konsumentpolitiken, men inte i varje enskilda detalj styra över hur medlemsländerna uppnår dessa mål. I betänkandet uppmanas samtliga medlemsstater att samla in och registrera uppgifter om olycksfall och skador i en gemensam databas. En sådan databas får inte medföra för stort administrativt arbete. Administrationen måste stå i rimlig proportion till nyttan för den enskilde. Konsumenternas rättigheter och konsumentskyddet på den inre marknaden är dock så viktiga att jag trots betänkligheterna ovan har röstat för betänkandet.

2-179

**Viktor Uspaskich (ALDE)**, *raštu*. – Gerbiama pranešėja, kolegos, malonu, kad mes bandome aktyviai rūpintis vartotojų teisių apsauga. Tačiau tai vyksta jau daugelį metų, o mes vis nesugebame sukurti tobulo mechanizmo, nesugebame sugriežtinti privalomų sąlygų, įgyvendinant šiuos uždavinius nacionaliniu lygmeniu. Kartais tai atrodo tarsi žaidimas ar veidmainystė. Kol mes griežtai nereguliuosime monopolinių organizacijų veiklos, nesvarbu, kokios srities, taip, kad jų pelnai būtų aiškiai apribojami, o veiklos išlaidos, atlyginimai ir premijos – griežtai kontroliuojami: t.y. žaliavų tiekimas, gamyba, produkto tiekimas, – tol tikėtis pigių ir kokybiškų prekių ar paslaugų vartotojams yra sunkiai įsivaizduojamas dalykas. Turėdamas nemenkos patirties šioje srityje esu pasirengęs kartu padirbėti šiuo klausimu.



2-180

**Derek Vaughan (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I welcome the adoption of this report. I feel it is important to protect consumers and to put a greater focus on strengthening market surveillance, so that products destined for citizens meet the highest standards possible. I welcome the move to step up international cooperation on safety products and to pursue formal agreements with enforcement authorities in third countries. I support calls to set up a special Consumer Ombudsman for the extra-judicial settlement of disputes and believe that more effective cross-border cooperation mechanisms will help to improve protection for consumers across the EU.

2-180-500

**Anna Záborská (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – L'article 12 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union réaffirme les exigences de la protection des consommateurs lors de la définition et de l'exécution des autres politiques et actions de l'Union. La Commission doit veiller à l'intégration réelle des intérêts des consommateurs dans toutes les politiques et examiner dans ses analyses d'impact les effets potentiels de tout nouvel acte législatif et des politiques qui concernent directement ou indirectement les consommateurs. Si les réclamations des consommateurs sont un indicateur important de dysfonctionnements du marché, leur absence n'implique pas toujours que les marchés fonctionnent bien car parfois les consommateurs ont tendance à moins se plaindre, en raison de traditions de consommation différentes ou de leur perception de la probabilité que leur plainte sera prise en compte. Les organisations de consommateurs ont un rôle déterminant à jouer en alertant les autorités publiques sur les problèmes que les consommateurs rencontrent. Il convient d'optimiser les instruments pour améliorer l'efficacité de leur intervention à tous les niveaux. Je demande aux États membres de veiller à ce que les organisations de consommateurs soient consultées comme il se doit à toutes les étapes du processus de prise de décision et dans la transposition et la mise en œuvre de la législation relative aux consommateurs.

2-181

**Report: Cristian Silviu Buşoi (A7-0027/2010)**

2-181-500

**Liam Aylward (ALDE)**, *i scríbhinn*. – Vótáil mé i bhfabhar na tuarascála seo ar SOLVIT. Tá sé riachtanach go mbeadh tomhaltóirí na hEorpa ar an eolas go hiomlán faoina gcearta agus go mbeadh an líonra um réiteach fadhbanna seo ar fáil go héasca ag gach aon duine.

San Aontas Eorpach ar an iomlán tá an méid daoine atá ag dul i dteagmháil le SOLVIT, chun comhairle agus cabhair a lorg, ag dul i méid agus as seo is féidir a aithint go bhfuil tábhacht SOLVIT mar uirlis réitigh fadhbanna do shaoránaigh agus do ghnóthais na hEorpa ag fás.

Tacaím go mór leis an éileamh atá sa tuarascáil seo fógraíocht níos fearr agus níos forleithne a dhéanamh ar sheirbhís SOLVIT agus aontaím go mba chóir an t-eolas ar na cearta atá ag saoránaigh agus ag gnóthais sa mhargadh inmheánach a shoiléiriú ionas go mbeadh gach éinne in ann na cearta seo a chur i gcrích ina saol laethúil.

2-181-750

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)**, *in writing*. – To enjoy the benefits of the internal market, consumers must have an effective means of redress following misapplication of internal market law. The SOLVIT network was created to guarantee quick redress without having to use judicial proceedings. I believe that this network could be of great use but at the moment it is not functioning effectively and is not using its potential to the full. Many of our citizens and small businesses are unaware of such a network. Thus I believe that Member States should put greater efforts and means into promoting SOLVIT and raising awareness amongst citizens and businesses. Moreover, some SOLVIT centres receive more cases than they are able to resolve because the centres are understaffed. I believe that Member States need to strengthen the role of national SOLVIT centres by ensuring cooperation among national, regional and local authorities and to engage into an active exchange of views and best practices with other Member States in order to fully exploit the potential of the SOLVIT network.

2-182

**Regina Bastos (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A funcionar desde 2002, o SOLVIT é uma rede em linha que procura a resolução de problemas em que participem os Estados-Membros da União Europeia, com o objectivo de dar uma resposta pragmática às dificuldades que surjam de uma aplicação incorrecta da legislação comunitária por parte das autoridades públicas.

Apesar de, actualmente, o mercado interno funcionar relativamente bem, não é também verdade que, por vezes, surgem erros ou problemas de interpretação no que se refere aos direitos dos cidadãos e das empresas que pretendem aproveitar as vantagens que o mercado interno lhes proporciona.

Votei favoravelmente o presente relatório uma vez que a rede SOLVIT tem-se revelado de extrema importância na resolução dos mais variados problemas, desde o cidadão que procura outro Estado-Membro para estudar, trabalhar, juntar-se ao parceiro(a) etc., até empresas que poderão ter de enfrentar problemas administrativos, problemas de reembolso do IVA, ou outros. A rede SOLVIT tem como objectivo prestar aos cidadãos e às empresas um serviço de elevado nível, regendo-se por padrões importantes de qualidade e desempenho.

2-182-500

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Congratulo-me com o relatório Busoi sobre o SOLVIT. Esta rede informal de resolução de problemas ligados ao Mercado Interno tem sido fundamental pela assistência gratuita que presta, tanto aos cidadãos, como às empresas, na resolução de problemas concretos ocorridos na administração pública. O reflexo dessa importância está expresso no crescente número de processos apresentados ao longo do último ano. No entanto, face aos problemas transversais identificados a nível nacional, é fundamental ponderar uma série de medidas para o melhoramento e eficácia destes centros. Considero, deste modo, que os Estados-Membros devem intensificar os seus esforços de prestação de informações aos cidadãos e às empresas sobre os direitos de que usufruem no mercado interno, recorrendo, para tal, a um aumento dos recursos financeiros e humanos e à formação dos funcionários da Rede SOLVIT sobre as normas do mercado interno. É igualmente importante que os funcionários disponham de conhecimentos sólidos de Inglês, para além da sua língua materna. Apelo aos Estados-Membros e à Comissão a promoverem a aproximação dos cidadãos e empresas à Rede SOLVIT, tendo em vista uma aplicação efectiva das regras do mercado interno.

2-183

**Carlos Coelho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O Mercado Interno não é nem deve ser uma construção meramente burocrática. Para verdadeiramente aproveitarem as suas vantagens plenas, as empresas e os cidadãos europeus têm que conseguir, na prática, exercer os seus direitos através de meios rápidos, ágeis e eficientes. Neste sentido a Rede SOLVIT reveste um carácter fundamental.

Dado o crescente número de processos que deram entrada nos centros SOLVIT no último ano, considero vital, a bem dos consumidores, proceder a um conjunto de reformas e melhoramentos, que o PE vem por esta via propor, a saber: - o reforço do controlo da Comissão Europeia à efectiva aplicação das regras do mercado interno; - um reforço claro dos meios atribuídos aos centros SOLVIT, (contratação de peritos nos domínios do mercado interno, aumento de verbas destinadas aos centros nacionais, formação especializada e actual aos técnicos existentes, acesso em linha coordenado entre os centros locais e os serviços da Comissão); - forte investimento na promoção e publicitação da REDE SOLVIT pelos Estados-Membros e Comissão Europeia através de todos os meios de comunicação social, promovendo um alto nível de proximidade com os cidadãos e empresas. Por todos estes motivos apoio o relatório Busoi sobre o SOLVIT.

2-184

**Lara Comi (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – La rete SOLVIT ha dimostrato di essere uno strumento molto valido per risolvere i problemi che si presentano ai cittadini e alle imprese, senza procedure giuridiche, a causa della scorretta applicazione del diritto del mercato interno da parte delle autorità pubbliche. Pertanto va sostenuta in diversi modi, attraverso una maggiore cooperazione tra Commissione, Parlamento e Stati membri. È innanzitutto necessario promuovere maggiormente la sua conoscenza tra cittadini e imprese e rafforzare la cooperazione tra autorità nazionali, regionali e locali. Va altresì sostenuta con maggiore enfasi la formazione dei funzionari pubblici che lavorano in questo ambito, come quella del personale della rete Solvit che, come sottolinea la comunicazione della Commissione, va potenziato anche attraverso lo strumento del Fondo sociale europeo.

Ho sostenuto con il mio voto questa relazione perché ritengo che il rafforzamento della rete SOLVIT possa davvero contribuire a migliorare il quadro giuridico del mercato interno che con tanti sforzi stiamo cercando di costruire. Promuovere la trasparenza dei dati con una banca dati online interattiva aumenta la conoscenza delle norme e la celerità della risoluzione dei problemi e accresce la fiducia negli operatori.

2-185

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A rede SOLVIT foi criada pela Comissão e pelos Estados com o objectivo de resolver, sem recurso aos tribunais, os problemas que surgem aos cidadãos e às empresas em consequência da aplicação incorrecta da legislação relativa ao mercado interno.

Esta rede tem demonstrado ser eficaz na resolução de problemas, mas é ainda pouco utilizada pelo público em geral. É, por isso, intenção da Comissão promover a rápida e total aplicação da rede SOLVIT, aumentando a transparência para superar os obstáculos à livre circulação e a informação aos cidadãos sobre os seus direitos para potenciar o mercado interno.

Para tal, a Comissão exorta os Estados a promover, devidamente, a rede SOLVIT junto dos cidadãos e empresas, dando conta das suas potencialidades e da mais-valia que representa.

Considerando que muitas das questões que podem ser tratadas pela rede SOLVIT são hoje reguladas judicialmente, aumentando o tempo e o dinheiro despendido por cidadãos e empresas, e considerando que a rede SOLVIT pode consagrar uma solução alternativa de resolução de litígios mais rápida e eficaz, julgo ser benéfico para o funcionamento do mercado interno, e também para a protecção dos interesses e direitos dos cidadãos e das empresas, um funcionamento pleno da rede SOLVIT.

2-185-500

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A Rede SOLVIT entrou em funcionamento em Julho de 2002, tendo sido criada pela Comissão e pelos Estados-Membros com o objectivo de resolver os problemas que surgem aos cidadãos e às empresas, na sequência de uma aplicação incorrecta da legislação relativa ao mercado interno, podendo assim encontrar uma resposta rápida, gratuita e eficaz, sem ser necessário o recurso aos tribunais.

Todos os Estados-Membros da UE, juntamente com a Noruega, a Islândia e o Liechtenstein, criaram centros SOLVIT a nível nacional, na maioria dos casos integrados nos respectivos Ministérios da Economia ou dos Negócios Estrangeiros. Estes centros cooperam directamente por meio de uma base de dados electrónica, de molde a encontrarem soluções rápidas e pragmáticas para os problemas apresentados pelos cidadãos e pelas empresas.

Os Estados-Membros devem intensificar os seus esforços de prestação de informações aos cidadãos e às empresas sobre os direitos de que usufruem no mercado interno, permitindo, assim, que uns e outros exerçam esses direitos na prática. Os serviços prestados pelo SOLVIT devem ser comunicados aos cidadãos e às empresas da forma mais eficaz.

2-185-750

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A “resolução eficaz de problemas no mercado interno”, a rede SOLVIT, tem sido um instrumento bem sucedido na resolução de problemas do mercado interno. Esta rede SOLVIT foi criada em 2002 para responder aos problemas que a aplicação incorrecta da legislação europeia ao mercado interno acarreta para os cidadãos e para as empresas.

A rede SOLVIT substitui de forma eficaz e menos burocrata os tribunais, encontrando soluções num prazo de 10 semanas. No entanto, o aumento do fluxo de casos SOLVIT que se tem verificado tem resultado em várias deficiências na sua resposta. É assim muito importante haver um esforço para o aumento dos meios humanos e financeiros, bem como de formação adequada dos funcionários da rede SOLVIT, para que a mesma melhore a eficácia na resposta ao cada vez maior número de casos que lhe são remetidos.

2-186

**Rovana Plumb (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Piața internă oferă cetățenilor și întreprinderilor numeroase oportunități. În general, piața internă funcționează bine, însă uneori se pot comite și erori.

SOLVIT este o rețea de soluționare a problemelor, în cadrul căreia statele membre ale UE conlucrează pentru a soluționa, fără utilizarea procedurilor legale, problemele survenite datorită aplicării necorespunzătoare a legislației privind piața internă de către autoritățile publice. În fiecare stat membru al Uniunii Europene (precum și în Norvegia, Islanda și Lichtenstein) există un centru SOLVIT.

Am votat acest raport pentru a impulsiona Centrele SOLVIT în rezolvarea plângerilor provenite atât din partea cetățenilor, cât și a întreprinderilor.

2-187

**Robert Rochefort (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Le marché intérieur, avec plus de 1 500 textes souvent complexes, apparaît aux citoyens comme un "grand machin" assez incompréhensible, de surcroît pas toujours mis en œuvre correctement dans les États membres (je pense en particulier à la reconnaissance des qualifications professionnelles). Dès lors, l'outil que représente SOLVIT s'avère précieux: véritable service d'assistance pour les consommateurs et les entreprises en matière de marché unique, ce réseau de coopération s'emploie depuis plusieurs années à résoudre, sur une base informelle, les problèmes liés à une application incorrecte de la législation relative au marché intérieur par les autorités. J'ai voté en faveur du rapport sur SOLVIT.

Et pourtant, malgré son excellent taux de réussite (plus de 80 % des cas se soldent par un succès), et bien qu'il incarne une solution rapide, extrajudiciaire et gratuite permettant d'obtenir réparation, SOLVIT reste très peu connu du grand public. Nous devons davantage le faire connaître. Enfin, je regrette que dans certains États membres, dont le mien, le centre SOLVIT soit aussi mal loti en termes de budget et de personnel. Le temps est venu, je pense, que les États membres prennent la mesure de l'utilité de ces centres et leur fournisse les moyens de fonctionner correctement.

2-188

**Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)**, *schriftelijk*. – Het rapport van collega Silviu Busoi over SOLVIT is erg belangrijk. In de uitoefening van mijn parlementair mandaat word ik vele malen per week gecontacteerd door burgers die me vaak zeer persoonlijke en erg concrete vragen stellen over de werking van het gemeenschapsrecht. Vaak kan ik hen onmiddellijk helpen door hen door te verwijzen naar SOLVIT.

Het verslag dat we vandaag goedkeurden, geeft duidelijk weer wat de voordelen zijn van dit instrument. Het is een uitermate gebalanceerd werkstuk omdat het zo duidelijk aangeeft welke stappen ondernomen moeten worden ter verbetering van het instrument. Een goede mediastrategie is zeker nodig om de bekendheid van SOLVIT te vergroten. De creatie van een uniek internetadres kan daar toe bijdragen.

Het is duidelijk dat de efficiëntie van SOLVIT nog groter moet worden. Dat kan inderdaad door het versterken van de samenwerking tussen ambtenaren met een voldoende hoog kennisniveau. Cruciaal ook is de aanbeveling aan de lidstaten om aan de SOLVIT-centra meer personeel ter beschikking te stellen voor het opbouwen van administratieve capaciteit in de verschillende ministeries van nationaal niveau. Bedoeling moet zijn dat alle SOLVIT-centra op een snelle manier de vragen beantwoorden en komen met echte oplossingen. SOLVIT is precies daarvoor gecreëerd.

2-189

**Viktor Uspaskich (ALDE), raštu.** – Gerbiamas pranešėjau, kolegos, palaikau šią iniciatyvą, visiškai pritariu dėl SOLVIT tinklų stiprinimo ir jų veiklos plėtros. Neturi būti pagailėta lėšų, kad per nacionalines media priemonės titulinuose puslapiuose ar žiūrimiausiose laidose būtų platinama informacija apie šios europinės struktūros veiklą bei galimybes. Kol kas galiu tvirtai jus visus patikinti, kad egzistuoja dvigubi standartai, nevienodas teisės aktų taikymas, ir net už ta pačią veiklą nevienodos baudos.

2-189-500

**Anna Záborská (PPE), par écrit.** – SOLVIT fut créé pour résoudre les problèmes rencontrés par les citoyens et les entreprises en raison de la mauvaise application de la législation relative au marché intérieur. Tous les États membres ainsi que la Norvège, l'Islande et le Liechtenstein, ont établi un centre national SOLVIT. Ils coopèrent directement pour élaborer des solutions rapides et pragmatiques aux problèmes soumis par les citoyens et les entreprises. Les centres ont besoin de conseils juridiques avisés sur le bien-fondé juridique des problèmes qui leur sont soumis et sur les solutions proposées. Ils disposent d'une aide juridique tant dans leur centre que dans l'administration responsable. En cas d'avis juridiques divergents sur le cas traité conjointement, de questions juridiques complexes ou simplement d'accès inadéquat à l'aide juridique dans leur pays, les centres demandent souvent conseil à la Commission. Les États devraient veiller à ce que les centres puissent consulter des juristes facilement dans leur propre administration. La Commission devrait accélérer la fourniture d'évaluations juridiques informelles aux centres sur demande. Je salue l'engagement au suivi de la législation européenne et leur application par les États membres. Il n'est pas suffisant que les Co-législateurs européens mettent en place des lois qui créent plus de problèmes qu'elles ne résoudraient.

2-190

**Report: Bairbre de Brún (A7-0082/2009)**

2-190-002

**Liam Aylward (ALDE), i scríbhinn.** – Tá caighdeán an-arda maidir le ceanglais sláinte ainmhithe againn in Éirinn agus dá bharr sin vótáil mé i bhfabhar na tuarascála tábhachtaí seo; tuarascáil a thabharfaidh cosaint do stádas sláinte ainmhithe na hÉireann. Is moladh riachtanach agus tráthúil atá sa tuarascáil maidir leis an gcóras idirthréimhseach d'iompar ainmhithe a fhadú go dtí deireadh mhí na Nollag 2011.

Bunaíonn na rialacha seo córas ginearálta aitheantais do pheataí (cait, madraí agus firéid) atá ag taisteal idir Ballstáit agus beidh ar gach ainmhí pas a bheith ag gabháil leis a léiríonn go bhfuil vacsaíniú i gcoinne an chonfaidh faighte aige.

Tá na bearta cosanta seo riachtanach toisc go bhfuil caighdeán sláinte fíor-arda in Éirinn faoi láthair agus dá thoradh sin tá an tír saor ó chonfadh, ó sceartáin áirithe agus ó phéisteanna ribineacha a d'fhéadfadh sláinte daoine agus ainmhithe a chur i mbaol.

2-190-003

**Jan Březina (PPE), v písemné formě.** – Vážený pane předsedající, hlasoval jsem pro zprávu o návrhu nařízení EP a Rady o veterinárních podmínkách pro neobchodní přesuny zvířat v zájmovém chovu, i když se plně neztotožňuji s celým textem návrhu. Vadí mi zejména, že upravuje prodloužení přechodného období, během něhož podléhá dovoz psů a koček do Irska, Malty, Finska, Švédska a Spojeného království přísnějším požadavkům. Například Malta, Irsko a Spojené království vyžadují, aby psi a kočky v zájmovém chovu podstoupili dodatečné ošetření proti klíšťatům, které musí být rovněž potvrzeno v pase zvířete. Jedná se v pořadí již o druhé prodloužení přechodného období, což považuji z hlediska legislativní praxe EU za velmi nestandardní. Komise by měla v co nejkratší lhůtě posoudit perspektivu rozšíření obecného režimu na členské státy, ve kterých nyní platí přechodný režim, a za tímto účelem si nechat vypracovat konzultační stanovisko Evropského úřadu pro bezpečnost potravin. Jsem přesvědčen, že opakující se prodloužování přechodného období není v zájmu evropských občanů. Stávající rozdíly v ochranných opatřeních výše uvedených členských států, jako jsou různé lhůty pro očkování a sérologické vyšetření či různé termíny antiparazitárního ošetření zbytečně komplikují, znesnadňují a zvyšují náklady na cestování se zvířaty v zájmovém chovu v rámci EU.

2-191

**Robert Dušek (S&D), v písemné formě.** – Předpisy Společenství řídicí neobchodní přesuny zvířat v zájmovém chovu do Společenství a v rámci něj ustanovují tzv. obecný režim, v rámci něhož musí být psi, kočky a fretky v zájmovém chovu při přesunu mezi členskými státy EU vybaveni dokladem pro jejich identifikaci a údajem o jejich povinném očkování proti vzteklině či prodělaných onemocněních. Nařízení (ES) č. 998/2003 rovněž stanoví tzv. přechodný režim, který členskými státy umožňuje uplatnit přísnější požadavky pro vstup a pohyb těchto zvířat na svém území. Této výjimky užívá výrazně zejména Velká Británie. Komise navrhuje prodloužit jmenovaný přechodný režim do 31. prosince 2011 a zpravodajka paní de Brún tento postup prosazuje. Vzhledem k tomu, že v Radě i ve výboru ENVI bylo dosaženo kompromisu, jehož součástí je i tato zpráva, hlasoval jsem pro její přijetí.

2-192

**Diogo Feio (PPE), por escrito.** – O Regulamento (CE) n.º 998/2003, que a Comissão propõe alterar, estabelece normas harmonizadas para a circulação sem carácter comercial de animais de companhia no interior da Comunidade, bem como para a entrada na mesma. Prevê, ainda, um regime transitório, que permite a alguns Estados-Membros a imposição de condições mais restritivas, para algumas doenças, como sejam a raiva e equinococose e as carraças.

Considerando a importância da livre circulação de animais de companhia no espaço da União Europeia, reitero, contudo, a minha convicção de que é fundamental que estes preencham todas as condições sanitárias para não representarem riscos para a saúde humana ou animal.

2-192-500

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Este relatório regula a deslocação de animais domésticos dentro do espaço europeu e a forma como esta deslocação se deve processar de acordo com objectivos de prevenção da disseminação de doenças, sobretudo a raiva.

A livre circulação constitui um dos pilares fundamentais do mercado único europeu. Este é um assunto que toca particularmente os nossos cidadãos numa Europa sem fronteiras, em que temos testemunhado um aumento da circulação de animais domésticos entre os Estados-Membros.

Todos concordamos que deve ser possível viajar com os nossos animais de companhia, mas todos concordamos também que tal deve ser feito de acordo com determinados critérios de salubridade para garantir um elevado nível de protecção da saúde humana e animal.

Congratulo-me, por isso, com o regime geral de passaporte, que irá harmonizar as medidas sanitárias, e os controlos que facilitam a livre circulação de animais de estimação.

O relatório prevê ainda um regime transitório, até ao final de 2011, para que alguns países se possam preparar para colocar em prática a infra-estrutura necessária.

2-192-750

**Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of Mrs de Brún's report. The freedom of movement which lies at the heart of the single market means that this is an issue of importance to a great many citizens across Europe. Public and animal health matters are also of vital importance and I consider that the rapporteur has done a good job in striking a balance.

2-192-875

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – As condições de polícia sanitária em que devem ser feitas as deslocações transfronteiriças de animais domésticos não destinados à venda visam garantir quer um elevado grau de protecção da saúde humana e animal, quer a facilidade de circulação dos animais de companhia acompanhados pelos respectivos proprietários. Assim, desde que cumprindo as regras aplicáveis, e acompanhados durante as viagens no espaço comunitário por um certificado de vacinação contra a raiva e de uma análise à reacção imunitária a esta vacina passado por um veterinário autorizado, a circulação sem fins comerciais de animais de companhia deverá ser facilitada.

2-193

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *por escrito*. – He votado a favor de este importante informe puesto que con él apoyamos la propuesta de la Comisión relativa a la prórroga del régimen transitorio en relación con la rabia, haciendo que este régimen finalice coincidiendo mejor con el período en que la Comisión Europea espera concluir la financiación comunitaria de programas de vacunación orientados a erradicar en algunos Estados miembros la rabia selvática, que constituye el principal problema de rabia en la UE. Además, la Comisión ha optado por un enfoque precautorio prudente, en el que se hace hincapié en la prevención y en consideraciones sanitarias adicionales relacionadas con el mercado interior y la libre circulación de animales de compañía. La Comisión ha comparado y examinado las distintas opciones políticas, teniendo en cuenta los distintos dictámenes de la Autoridad Europea de Seguridad Alimentaria (EFSA). La fecha propuesta para el final de los regímenes transitorios permitirá la conversión de las infraestructuras y el reciclaje profesional gradual así como la adaptación del personal in situ a la nueva situación.

2-193-500

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I welcome this report, which will allow Member States to continue with measures to protect against the spread of rabies but which will also lead to the free, safe movement of pets throughout Europe after 2011. The extension of the derogation for certain countries until 2011 will allow them to continue with tests and health checks for diseases such as rabies. This transitional period is an important step towards the eventual free, safe movement of pets in the European Union.

I would like to congratulate all those who worked to secure the agreement on the new comitology procedure. It is a good compromise which will allow an effective response if Member States have justified concerns over the spread of other diseases. It also ensures that, when using delegated powers, the Commission will consult a variety of experts – Commission experts, Member State experts, non-governmental experts and Parliament's experts. We must ensure that this commitment is upheld. In the wider context, we have received written assurances that this report will not set a precedent for the future use of delegated powers. This takes into account Parliament's concerns about setting a precedent for the new comitology procedure under the Lisbon Treaty.

2-194

**Report: Carlos Coelho (A7-0015/2010)**

2-194-500

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D), raštu.** – „ES 2020“ strategija yra daug vilčių teikiantis dokumentas. Pastaruoju metu garsiai kalbama apie ES ekonomikos atsigavimą, tačiau daugeliui valstybių narių krizės pabaigos dar nematyti. Viešojoje erdvėje kalbos apie krizę apsiriboja viešųjų finansų būkle, nors labai sparčiai augantis nedarbas kai kuriose valstybėse narėse jau pasiekė kritinę ribą. Keista girdėti ES aukštų pareigūnų žarstomas pagyras kai kurioms vyriausybėms už puikų darbą, nors kas mėnesį tose šalyse bedarbių skaičius katastrofiškai auga, socialinės garantijos mažinamos, o žmonių skaičius, gyvenančių žemiau skurdo ribos, didėja. Tokių šalių žmonėms tampa labai sunku suprasti kokią-skurdo mažinimo ar skurdo didinimo politiką vykdo Europos Sąjunga socialinėje srityje. Manau, kad vyriausybės, nesugebėjusios išspręsti bent jau bedarbystės stabilizavimo problemos neturėtų būti nepelnytai giriamos. Europos Komisija turėtų priimti didesnę atsakomybę ir atsakingai prižiūrėti nacionalinių vyriausybių krizių valdymo planų įgyvendinimą, o ypač socialinių reformų srityje, ir labai aiškiai įvertinti tokių reformų pasekmes žmonėms.

2-195

**Regina Bastos (PPE), por escrito.** – O Acordo de Schengen é uma convenção entre países europeus sobre uma política de livre circulação de pessoas no Espaço Schengen. Qualquer pessoa que esteja na posse de um documento que prove que está a residir legalmente num Estado-Membro deve poder circular livremente nesse espaço onde não existem fronteiras internas.

Todavia, nem todos os países cumprem a sua obrigação de atribuir um título de residência aos nacionais de países terceiros detentores desse visto de longa duração. Assim, é contraditório que um estudante que obtenha um visto para tirar um curso em Portugal não tenha a possibilidade de ir, por exemplo, à Bélgica recolher informação numa biblioteca especializada para escrever a sua tese.

Neste sentido, votei favoravelmente o presente relatório tendo em consideração que importa facilitar a circulação no Espaço Schengen de nacionais de países terceiros que residam legalmente num dos Estados-Membros, com base num visto de longa duração do tipo "D" emitido por esse Estado-Membro. Felicito o relator Carlos Coelho por, uma vez mais, ter conseguido chegar a acordo em primeira leitura, o que permite resolver esta situação antes do Código de Vistos entrar em vigor no próximo mês de Abril.

2-196

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu.** – Balsavau už šio reglamento naujus pakeitimus, kadangi iki šiol ilgalaikes vizas turintys trečiųjų šalių piliečiai susidurdavo su laisvo judėjimo apribojimo problemomis. Jie negalėdavo laisvai keliauti iš vienos Europos Sąjungos valstybės narės į kitą ir netgi kildavo sunkumų grįžtant į savo gimtąją šalį. Šiuo reglamentu yra išplečiama leidimų gyventi ir ilgalaikių vizų, išduotų valstybių narių, kurios visiškai įgyvendina ilgalaikes vizas reglamentuojantį Šengeno *acquis*, lygiavertiškumo principo taikymo sritis. Būtina pabrėžti, kad ilgalaikė visa turėtų turėti tokį patį poveikį laisvam judėjimui Šengeno erdvėje be vidaus sienų, kaip ir leidimas gyventi. Norėčiau atkreipti dėmesį, jog yra labai svarbu, kad supaprastinus trečiųjų šalių piliečių judėjimą Šengeno erdvėje nebūtų pažeidžiamos saugumo garantijos valstybėse narėse. Šio reglamento įgyvendinimas neturėtų sumažinti saugumo, nes pagal jį yra numatyta valstybių pareiga prieš išduodant asmeniui ilgalaikę vizą pasitikrinti jo duomenis Šengeno informacinėje sistemoje, o prireikus – atsiklausti apie jį kitų ES šalių. Iki šiol tai buvo daroma tik išduodant leidimą apsigyventi.

2-196-500

**Marielle De Sarnez (ALDE), par écrit.** – Je me félicite de l'adoption du présent règlement a une très large majorité par 562 voix pour, 29 contre et 51 abstentions. Désormais tout ressortissant d'un pays tiers, titulaire d'un visa de long séjour délivré par un État membre, pourra se rendre dans les autres États membres pendant 3 mois sur toute période de 6 mois, dans les mêmes conditions que le titulaire d'un titre de séjour. C'était une mesure attendue par de nombreux étudiants et chercheurs, comme ceux qui participent aux programmes d'échanges communautaires (Erasmus mundus). C'est une avancée pour améliorer l'attractivité de l'Union en tant que destination pour les étudiants, les universitaires et les chercheurs des pays-tiers. Et on peut y voir un rappel de la demande du Parlement européen aux États membres d'avancer vers la mise en place future d'un visa spécifique pour les étudiants bénéficiaires de programme d'échanges. Un regret cependant : Le Royaume-Uni, l'Irlande et le Danemark ne participent pas à l'adoption du présent règlement et ne seront pas soumis à son application, alors même que ces pays attirent beaucoup les étudiants et chercheurs étrangers présents dans l'espace Schengen.

2-197

**Diogo Feio (PPE), por escrito.** – A criação, com o Acordo de Schengen, de um espaço europeu sem controlo de fronteiras foi um passo importante na construção de um mercado interno aberto, com liberdade de circulação de pessoas e bens.

Por isso mesmo, a questão crucial que está na base do Acordo é permitir a livre circulação de pessoas num espaço onde não existem fronteiras internas. Consequentemente, parece-nos um absurdo que cidadãos de fora da Comunidade, mas na posse de vistos de longa duração concedidos por um dos Estados parte no Acordo de Schengen, não possam circular livremente neste espaço.

Os exemplos dados pelo relator parecem-nos a evidência do absurdo que este sistema representa, na prática. Assim, concordo com a proposta da Comissão, na redacção que lhe é dada pelo Parlamento, de equiparar os vistos de longa duração aos títulos de residência, assegurando assim a liberdade de circulação aos seus titulares.

2-197-500

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Em primeiro lugar, saúdo a excelente qualidade deste relatório. De acordo com a legislação comunitária em vigor, os nacionais de países terceiros titulares de um visto de longa duração (visto para uma estada superior a três meses) não estão autorizados a viajar para os outros Estados-Membros durante a sua estada, nem a transitar pelos outros Estados-Membros quando regressam ao país de origem, visto que tal não está previsto na Convenção de Schengen.

As novas regras propostas prevêem que um visto de longa duração tenha os mesmos efeitos que um título de residência no que se refere à livre circulação no espaço Schengen sem fronteiras internas, ou seja, uma pessoa que seja titular de um visto de longa duração emitido por um Estado-Membro será autorizada a viajar para os outros Estados-Membros durante três meses num período de seis meses e nas mesmas condições que o detentor de um título de residência.

Para que esse sistema funcione, devem ser postos em prática controlos equivalentes aos existentes noutros domínios, a fim de garantir uma boa comunicação entre os Estados-Membros e a coerência entre a emissão de vistos de longa duração, as autorizações de residência e as indicações no Sistema de Informação de Schengen (SIS).

2-198

**Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – É positivo que um estrangeiro que tenha um visto de longa duração emitido por um Estado-Membro possa viajar para os outros Estados-Membros, pelo menos durante três meses, num período de seis meses, e nas mesmas condições que o detentor de um título de residência. Como esse é o principal conteúdo do regulamento a que se refere este relatório, votámos favoravelmente.

Como se sabe, actualmente, de acordo com a legislação comunitária em vigor, os nacionais de países terceiros titulares de um visto de longa duração – que podem ser, por exemplo, estudantes que queiram efectuar uma viagem de estudo noutro Estado-Membro, cientistas, académicos, certos membros da família de nacionais de países terceiros e de cidadãos da UE – não estão autorizados a viajar para os outros Estados-Membros durante a sua estada, nem a transitar pelos outros Estados-Membros quando regressam ao país de origem, visto que tal não está previsto na Convenção de Schengen.

Com as novas regras agora aprovadas, prevê-se que uma pessoa titular de um visto de longa duração (visto para uma estada superior a três meses, ou *visto D*) tenha os mesmos direitos que o detentor de um título de residência no que se refere à livre circulação no espaço Schengen.

2-199

**Bruno Gollnisch (NI)**, *par écrit*. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, nous avons voté contre le rapport de M. Coelho. En effet, permettre aux personnes titulaires d'un visa de long séjour, soit plus de six mois, de bénéficier de manière automatique de la liberté de circulation dans tous les États de la zone Schengen, comme s'ils étaient des titulaires d'une carte de séjour, est irresponsable. Vos exemples sont fallacieux. Qu'il s'agisse d'un étudiant voulant visiter les capitales européennes (à l'exception de Londres, Dublin et Copenhague, hors zone Schengen!), d'un chercheur dont les travaux devraient durer moins d'un an, ou d'expatriés qui n'auraient pas les titres de séjour et de travail ad hoc, tout cela est marginal et tout cela n'est que prétexte.

En fait, cette mesure est une nouvelle négation du droit souverain des États à décider qui peut ou ne peut pas, sous quelles conditions et pour combien de temps, entrer sur leur territoire. Elle revient, par l'uniformisation des droits, à vider de tout sens les visas de long séjour, au profit d'une sorte de statut automatique de résident. Un statut octroyé dès lors que l'on souhaite venir en Europe pour plus de 3 mois et pour autre chose que pour du tourisme. C'est inacceptable.

2-199-500

**Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai soutenu le rapport COELHO sur la liberté de circulation des titulaires de visa de longue durée car, derrière des questions de formalités administratives, il est important par exemple selon moi que les jeunes étrangers qui viennent étudier dans nos pays ne soient pas enfermés à l'intérieur d'un territoire, mais puissent avoir la liberté de se déplacer d'un pays à un autre, que ce soit pour leurs études comme pour découvrir la diversité et la richesse de la culture européenne. A l'inverse de ceux qui agitent l'épouvantail de la sécurité et de la lutte contre l'immigration clandestine, c'est bien le souci du développement d'une société de la connaissance en Europe, comme ailleurs, que nous devons défendre ici.

2-199-750

**Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I abstained on the Coelho report as it deals with aspects of Schengen which are not applicable in Scotland.

2-199-875

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Je tiens en premier lieu à remercier Carlos Coelho pour la qualité de son rapport et pour la véritable expertise qu'il apporte à tous ses dossiers relatifs à la politique des visas. L'adoption de ce règlement est

une nécessité et une urgence. C'est une nécessité, car du fait d'une pratique extrêmement critiquable des États membres qui ne convertissent plus les visas de long séjour en titres de séjour, on parvient à des situations absurdes qui empêchent tout ressortissant de pays tiers légalement présent sur le territoire de l'Union sur la base d'un visa D de voyager dans les autres États membres de l'espace Schengen. Cette pratique crée des obstacles inutiles à la mobilité au sein de l'espace Schengen et va à l'encontre de la philosophie même de l'acquis Schengen. L'adoption de ce texte est également une urgence au regard de l'entrée en vigueur prochaine du code communautaire des visas qui abolit les visas D + C. Tout en maintenant un niveau de sécurité élevé au sein de l'espace Schengen grâce à l'obligation d'interroger le SIS lors du traitement des demandes de visas D, ce rapport apporte une solution juste et équilibrée à des situations qui ne doivent plus se présenter à l'avenir.

2-199-937

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A anterior legislação, que não permitia que um cidadão de um país terceiro com visto de longa duração emitido por um Estado-Membro viajasse para outros Estados-Membros, não se coadunava com as necessidades de mobilidade da maioria desses cidadãos. Estamos a falar de estudantes, cientistas, académicos e outros que, fruto da própria actividade profissional e/ou académica, se vêem na necessidade de viajar entre vários Estados-Membros e não o podiam fazer face à legislação existente.

Estas alterações vêm, assim, repor esta situação anómala sem que, com isso, não se continuem a salvaguardar todas as regras de segurança na circulação dos cidadãos de países terceiros dentro do espaço comunitário.

2-200

**Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Am votat în favoarea acestui regulament pentru că îl consider o reparație binevenită a unei măsuri anterioare, care restrângea drepturile deținătorilor de vize de lungă ședere într-un stat membru. Așa cum societatea se află într-o continuă schimbare, nici legislația europeană nu trebuie să rămână pe loc, pentru că ne confruntăm cu probleme și provocări noi și, în același timp, ajungem să avem la îndemână instrumente noi pentru a gestiona fenomene cum sunt cele legate, de exemplu, de libera circulație.

2-200-500

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Der gegenständliche Bericht zielt darauf ab, erhebliche Erleichterungen für den freien Personenverkehr von Drittstaatsangehörigen mit einem D-Visa für längerfristige Aufenthalte im gesamten Gemeinschaftsgebiet zu schaffen. Er lässt dabei völlig außer Acht, dass es Kompetenz der Mitgliedstaaten sein sollte zu entscheiden, ob und welche Drittstaatsangehörigen einreisen dürfen, und wem sie die Einreise verweigern. Ich habe daher gegen den Bericht gestimmt.

2-201

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I voted, together with my Group, in favour of this report because it points out that the proposals made in this framework seek to make it easier for third-country nationals legally residing in a Member State to move in the Schengen area on the basis of a D long-stay visa issued by that Member State. They are intended to provide a response to situations where Member States are unable, for various reasons, to issue residence permits in time to third-country nationals residing in their territory, by extending the existing principle of equivalence between a residence permit and short-stay C visas to long-stay D visas.

A long-stay visa will thus have the same effect as a residence permit as regards circulation in the Schengen area. This will make it possible for anyone in possession of a document showing that he is legally resident in a Member State to move freely in the Schengen area for short periods of no more than three months in any half year.

2-202

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A livre circulação de pessoas é um dos princípios fundamentais da União Europeia e a criação do Espaço Schengen tem em vista contribuir para a realização efectiva deste objectivo. O Grupo do PPE, ao qual pertencço, sempre defendeu o princípio da livre circulação de pessoas, segundo a ideia de que do acervo de Schengen devem fazer parte regras e procedimentos comuns no que respeita aos vistos, aos títulos de residência e ao controlo das fronteiras.

Neste contexto, e tendo em consideração que a livre circulação de nacionais de países terceiros, residentes num Estado-Membro com base num visto de longa duração de tipo D para outros Estados-Membros do Espaço Schengen, é, por vezes, dificultada em razão do atraso da sua conversão num título de residência, apoio as novas medidas adoptadas.

De acordo com o documento, será alargado aos vistos de longa duração o princípio de equivalência entre títulos de residência e vistos de curta duração. Por estas razões, e porque as medidas adoptadas não só não põem em causa as condições de emissão dos vistos, nomeadamente as relacionadas com as questões de segurança, mas também corporizam um desenvolvimento natural e necessário do acervo de Schengen, votei favoravelmente o documento.

2-203

**Report: Sophia in't Veld (A7-0025/2010)**

2-204



**Liam Aylward agus Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE), i scríbhinn.** – Tá Feisirí Eorpacha Fhianna Fáil, Pat ‘the Cope’ Ó Gallchóir agus Liam Aylward, go láidir i gcoinne a bhfuil beartaithe sa tuarascáil seo maidir le Comhbhonn Cánach Corparáideach Comhdhlúite (CCCTB sa Bhéarla) a thabhairt isteach.

Rinne an Lárionad Eorpach um Staidéir Eacnamaíochta staidéar le déanaí ar a phraiticiúla a bheadh sé an Comhbhonn Cánach Corparáideach Comhdhlúite a thabhairt isteach san Eoraip agus ba léir ó chonclúidí an staidéir sin nach mbeadh córas cánach dá leithéid inoibrithe, praiticiúil ná inmhiannaithe ó thaobh na polaitíochta de.

Ní chuirfeadh Comhbhonn Cánach Corparáideach Comhdhlúite san Eoraip le hiomaíochas an Aontais Eorpaigh nó le feidhmiú an mhargaidh aonair agus, thairis sin, d’fhéadfadh CCCTB cur isteach ar gheilleagair bheaga oscailte, mar atá in Éirinn. Is inniúlacht do na Ballstáit aonair amháin é ceist an chánachais agus tá an ceart ag rialtas na hÉireann a chumhacht crosta a úsáid i dtaca le haon bheart cánach, CCCTB san áireamh. Tá an ceart seo cumhdaithe sna conarthaí, Conradh Liospóin san áireamh.

2-204-500

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), por escrito.** – Uma concorrência eficaz no fornecimento de bens e serviços reduz os preços, aumenta a qualidade e permite uma escolha mais vasta para os consumidores. Além disso, permite que a inovação tecnológica progrida. É fundamental a investigação no sector da energia, assim como o investimento em infra-estruturas, nomeadamente na interconexão das redes de gás e electricidade, para a promoção da concorrência. A segurança do aprovisionamento e uma verdadeira concorrência no mercado da energia dependem da interconexão e do bom funcionamento das estruturas energéticas. É também importante uma forte concorrência no sector das telecomunicações com medidas que favoreçam a concorrência pelas tarifas de preferência, sendo, para tal, importante fazer uma análise do mercado pertinente. Sublinho ainda a importância da vigilância do comportamento concorrencial dos mercados dos combustíveis da União. Saliento que mecanismos de apoio como os auxílios estatais não deverão ser utilizados para proteger as indústrias nacionais em detrimento do mercado interno e dos consumidores europeus e que estes mecanismos deveriam ser utilizados tendo em vista a recuperação de uma economia do conhecimento sustentável.

2-205

**Lara Comi (PPE), per iscritto.** – La relazione sulla politica di concorrenza illustra come migliorare il funzionamento dei mercati a vantaggio dei consumatori e delle imprese europee. Particolare attenzione è stata riservata alle tematiche inerenti i “Cartelli e consumatori”. Combattere i cartelli è fondamentale per garantire che i benefici di un regime concorrenziale giungano al consumatore finale. Infatti rappresentano una delle violazioni più gravi della normativa sulla concorrenza: si consente agli operatori di poter aumentare i prezzi, limitare la produzione e ripartirsi i mercati. La funzione della Commissione è sanzionatoria, vietando così un comportamento anticoncorrenziale, e infligge ammende ai membri di un cartello, scoraggiando ogni impresa dall’assumere o continuare a tenere un comportamento anticoncorrenziale.

Durante una crisi economica il rischio è quello di aumentare il livello protezionistico. Occorre, quindi, evitare un intervento pubblico che modificherebbe le condizioni della concorrenza sul mercato interno ma, allo stesso tempo, riconoscere che, a volte, il ricorso agli aiuti di Stato è indispensabile per affrontare la crisi. Il mio voto è favorevole, in quanto un clima anticoncorrenziale incentiva gli abusi di posizioni dominanti a danno delle PMI ed è, quindi, fondamentale che l’Europa si adoperi per una maggiore garanzia e tutela dei prodotti.

2-206

**Derk Jan Eppink On behalf of the (ECR) Group, in writing.** – The ECR group is a firm supporter of strong and effective competition policy as a tool both for protecting the consumer and encouraging fair access to markets. We are happy to support the actions taken by the Commission in recent years in pursuit of these aims, and in particular their actions against unfair state aid.

Thus, it is to our dismay that the report, which was initially well drafted, has been made less effective by the irrelevant and unwelcome additions of paragraphs pre-empting the outcome of the negotiations on the financial supervisory architecture, calling for a common consolidated corporate tax base and attacking the right of enterprises to employ contract staff.

Members of our group have in the past voted in favour of reports on the Commission's competition policy and our hope is that such reports will in future emerge from the Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee in better shape. Our abstention reflects this concern, and we reiterate in this explanation of vote our support for the continued good work of the Commission in the field of competition.

2-207

**Diogo Feio (PPE), por escrito.** – Maior concorrência significa maior possibilidade de escolha para os cidadãos europeus e um ambiente mais competitivo para as empresas. Como tal, as políticas da UE de concorrência e de consumidores não devem ser dissociadas. Assim, as acções da Comissão que garantem um efectivo ambiente concorrencial no seio do mercado interno são fundamentais para garantir aqueles objectivos, ainda que se possa pôr em causa o facto dos poderes absolutos conferidos àquela instituição.

Na situação de crise vivida nos últimos meses, a autorização de ajudas de Estado justificadas perante os acontecimentos vividos tem sido fundamental para a recuperação da economia. Também a luta contra cartéis e o abuso de posição dominante de empresas é fundamental para garantir que se viva no mercado interno um clima de concorrência leal em que os diversos agentes económicos beneficiem de boas condições para prosseguirem as suas actividades.

2-207-750

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A crise económica cujos efeitos ainda vivemos exige medidas excepcionais, de que são exemplo os auxílios estatais. No entanto, é necessário que estes não distorçam indevidamente a concorrência e não aumentem os défices orçamentais e a dívida pública. Por isso, a sua atribuição deve ser objecto de madura reflexão.

Os valores da dívida pública em rápida ascensão serão um fardo para as gerações futuras e um obstáculo à recuperação e ao crescimento económico. A dívida excessiva e os défices orçamentais não só comprometem a estabilidade do euro, como também impõem severas limitações à despesa pública em sectores prioritários como a educação, a saúde, a inovação e o ambiente.

Neste contexto, é necessário proceder a uma rigorosa avaliação do pacote de salvamento e recuperação e da eficácia das medidas de auxílio estatal. Devem evitar-se o proteccionismo e a fragmentação do mercado único, uma vez que enfraquecem a posição da Europa na economia mundial.

Um mercado único que funcione bem é a chave de uma economia saudável e, com toda a certeza, da recuperação económica. As políticas económicas devem conquistar mais legitimidade através de uma maior intervenção do Parlamento Europeu, em última instância, no quadro do processo de co-decisão.

2-207-875

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A política e as boas regras da concorrência sempre foram de crucial importância para a existência de uma convivência sã entre todos os intervenientes económicos da zona euro. Apesar da UE ter sido bastante afectada pela recente crise económica mundial, a verdade é que uma moeda forte, um mercado único consistente, finanças públicas sãs e um bom sistema de protecção social contribuíram em grande medida para sustentar os efeitos da referida crise.

No entanto, os vários apoios estatais efectuados pelos Estados-Membros sem uma preocupação comum, podem vir a trazer distorções importantes no que diz respeito à concorrência. É portanto crucial que se efectue uma avaliação de todas as medidas tomadas por cada Estado para combater a crise para que no futuro a UE tenha capacidade de reagir em conjunto e harmoniosamente para evitar situações de proteccionismo e de fragmentação do mercado único. Tais situações só prejudicam uma Europa, que quer ser forte na economia mundial.

2-208

**Slawomir Witold Nitras (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Polityka konkurencji należy do głównych i najwcześniej uzgodnionych polityk wspólnotowych. Zasadność i konieczność jej prowadzenia wiąże się bezpośrednio z jednym z głównych celów Wspólnot Europejskich, jakim było stworzenie wspólnego rynku państw członkowskich. Polityka konkurencji ma dać gwarancje, że bariery zniesione w handlu wewnętrznym, w ramach wspólnego rynku, nie zostaną zastąpione innymi działaniami ze strony przedsiębiorstw lub rządów, prowadzącymi do zniekształcenia konkurencji. Polityka konkurencji ma na uwadze przede wszystkim interes konsumentów i stara się o zapewnienie im łatwego dostępu do dóbr i usług oferowanych na jednolitym rynku po maksymalnie zbliżonych cenach. Pragnę jedynie zwrócić państwa uwagę na poważny kryzys, jaki dotknął Europę i stwierdzić, iż dobrze funkcjonujący rynek wewnętrzny jest kluczem do zdrowej gospodarki, a już na pewno do odbudowy, która czeka nas w najbliższym czasie.

2-208-500

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Der Bericht enthält zum Teil sinnvolle Ansätze, wie zum Beispiel die unterschiedliche Behandlung im Wettbewerbsrecht von multinationalen Konzernen auf der einen und Klein- und Mittelunternehmen auf der anderen Seite. Dagegen befindet sich es etwa nicht für richtig, die Einzelhandelspreise im Telekommunikationssektor zu deregulieren beziehungsweise nicht zu regulieren. Allgemein halte ich den Tenor des Berichts, der von einer absoluten Effizienz des freien Markt ausgeht, für verfehlt. Aus diesem Grunde habe ich gegen den vorliegenden Bericht gestimmt.

2-209

**Robert Rochefort (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport de Sophie in 't Veld, qui accueille favorablement le rapport de la Commission sur la concurrence 2008. En effet, je partage cet avis positif: il s'agit tout de même d'un tournant dans l'approche de la Commission qu'il faut souligner.

Dans ce rapport, en effet, la Commission explique qu'"elle place les préoccupations des consommateurs au centre de ses activités concernant la concurrence", et qu'elle "considère comme essentiel que l'objectif principal de la politique de concurrence soit l'optimisation du bien-être des consommateurs". Je m'en réjouis! La Commission agirait-elle enfin en parfait accord avec l'article 12 du traité de Lisbonne, qui stipule que la protection des consommateurs est prise en considération dans la définition et la mise en œuvre des autres politiques de l'Union ?

J'encourage également la Commission à poursuivre dans la voie du dialogue suivi qu'elle a décidé d'établir entre ses services, les consommateurs et les associations qui les représentent. A cet égard, c'est une bonne chose qu'ait été créée, en 2008, une unité chargée des relations avec les consommateurs au sein de la DG concurrence. Nous demandons maintenant un rapport complet sur les activités de cette unité, pour pouvoir mieux juger de son utilité.

2-210

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), in writing.** – I, together with my group, the Greens/EFA, voted in favour of the in't Veld report on the annual Report on Competition Policy (2008) because it provides an opportunity for Parliament to set out its priorities and its assessment of the way the Commission conducts its competition policy. I am glad that, in line with the vote in the ECON Committee, the in't Veld report was adopted (as expected) by a large majority (Greens in favour, as in the case of major political groups).

2-210-500

**Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), na piśmie.** – Europa dotknięta kryzysem gospodarczym dzięki wspólnej walucie, silnemu rynkowi wewnętrznemu, stabilnemu systemowi ochrony socjalnej była w stanie szybko reagować i osłabić skutki kryzysu. Nie znaczy to, że nie ma już żadnych odczuwalnych reperkusji aczkolwiek widoczne są oznaki poprawy sytuacji. Niestety nadal konsumenci borykają się z problemami korzystania z zalet konkurencji. Ich prawa muszą być chronione, a świadomość i wiedza pełniejsze. Dzięki właściwemu funkcjonowaniu i konkurencyjności europejskiego rynku to konsument ma możliwość korzystania z systemu konkurencji poprzez wybór produktów, usług oraz niższe ceny. Niewystarczająca konkurencja jest jednak zjawiskiem aktualnym szczególnie w sektorze farmaceutycznym oraz telekomunikacji. Brak konkurencji szkodzi bezpośrednio konsumentom jak również gospodarce. Istnieje także potrzeba nadzoru nad zachowaniami konkurencyjnymi na unijnych rynkach paliwowych. Za naruszanie prawa o ochronie konkurencji stosowane powinny być kary współmierne do naruszeń i silniejsze środki odstraszające w przypadku wielokrotnego łamania tego prawa. Przede wszystkim jednak kryzys ukazał słabości gospodarki europejskiej i zaznaczył te obszary, które należy wzmocnić. Nadal wszelkie strategie polityki gospodarczej muszą podlegać kontroli demokratycznej i być realizowane z dbałością o dobro i poszanowanie praw obywateli Europy.

2-211

**Report: Róza, Gräfin von Thun Und Hohenstein (A7-0084/2009)**

2-211-500

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D), in writing.** – I voted for this report. An effectively working internal market is essential for the creation of a stable and innovative economic environment. However, the internal market cannot function effectively without correctly transposed, applied and enforced Community rules. Unfortunately, the number of infringement proceedings remains too high in the Member States.

Such a situation distorts the internal market and leaves customers without adequate protection. The European Parliament in 2008 called on the Commission to provide more detailed information on the directives which have not been implemented in the Member States, and I very much hope that the Commission will be able to present such information in the nearest future.

2-212

**Regina Bastos (PPE), por escrito.** – Em 1997, a Comissão publicava o primeiro Painel de Avaliação do Mercado Interno concentrando-se na transposição, pelos Estados-Membros, das regras do mercado interno, tendo em consideração que atrasos substanciais impediam os cidadãos e as empresas de explorar ao máximo o potencial do mercado interno.

Através desta medição e publicação do desempenho no que se refere à transposição, o Painel de Avaliação tem contribuído para a redução do défice no que se refere à transposição de directivas pelos Estados-Membros. Votei favoravelmente o presente relatório por considerar imperativo que os Estados-Membros transponham atempadamente, para o Direito nacional, a legislação relativa ao mercado interno, pois este só poderá funcionar devidamente se forem correctamente transportas e aplicadas as regras comunitárias relativas ao seu funcionamento e verificado o seu cumprimento.

2-213

**Carlos Coelho (PPE), por escrito.** – Não obstante os Estados-Membros terem atingido os melhores resultados no respeito dos prazos de transposição das regras do Mercado Interno para o direito nacional, os dados do mais recente Painel de Avaliação do Mercado Interno não me parecem satisfatórios. A criação de um mercado interno estável, inovador, que corresponda às necessidades dos consumidores e onde as empresas potenciem a criação de novos empregos não se coaduna com os sistemáticos atrasos na transposição da legislação comunitária e não aplicação das directivas.

São as pessoas e as empresas que mais sofrem com o atraso na implementação das medidas referentes ao mercado interno, em termos dos custos decorrentes de menor escolha, menor concorrência e mercados mais fechados. Neste sentido considero importante que o PE pressione no sentido da aplicação das regras do mercado interno. Foram os Estados-Membros que fixaram os prazos de implementação dessas directivas. O mínimo que se lhes exige é respeitar os objectivos

que eles próprios fixaram. Este é um desiderato fundamental para um mercado interno são num contexto de crise económica.

2-214

**Lara Comi (PPE), per iscritto.** – Dopo aver migliorato il deficit di trasposizione delle direttive, avendo raggiunto la percentuale dell'1%, ora rimane fondamentale concentrarsi sul miglioramento dell'applicazione concreta della legislazione sul mercato interno negli ordinamenti nazionali. La Commissione, il Parlamento e gli Stati membri devono fare maggiori sforzi in questo ambito e collaborare tra loro.

Dal canto suo, la Commissione deve sostenere maggiormente gli Stati durante il periodo di recepimento, attraverso il dialogo e lo scambio di informazioni per risolvere i problemi prima della scadenza per la trasposizione, organizzare un forum annuale sul mercato interno e cercare nuove soluzioni per eliminare le barriere che ancora ostacolano il completamento del mercato interno, compresa la semplificazione della legislazione.

Noi deputati del Parlamento europeo, in qualità di rappresentanti dei cittadini, dobbiamo utilizzare ogni occasione possibile per informarli della legislazione europea con la promozione di studi, seminari, convegni e audizioni. I Parlamenti nazionali invece devono partecipare attivamente ai procedimenti legislativi europei per conoscere per tempo le proposte normative, migliorando la cooperazione tra le autorità nazionali, regionali e locali. In questo senso, il trattato di Lisbona conferisce alle Assemblee elettive un ruolo più incisivo che deve essere sfruttato al meglio. Per tutte le ragioni esposte, ben esplicate nella relazione, il mio voto è favorevole.

2-215

**Diogo Feio (PPE), por escrito.** – Após a mais recente publicação dos resultados relativos ao Painel de Avaliação do Mercado Interno (Março de 2010), verificou-se que a percentagem de directivas sobre o Mercado Interno que não são transpostas para o direito nacional é de 0,7 %, resultado inferior ao apresentado em Julho de 2009, e que foi de, como enunciado pela relatora, 1,0 %.

A transposição atempada e adequada das normas comunitárias é fundamental para uma maior integração do mercado interno devido ao seu impacto directo na segurança jurídica e confiança dos cidadãos europeus. Assim, os Estados-Membros devem adoptar uma atitude responsável na aplicação daquelas normas de modo a que, no futuro, não se verifique um défice de transposição, mas sim uma maior certeza jurídica, e os cidadãos possam beneficiar de condições equitativas no mercado interno.

2-215-500

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), por escrito.** – O mercado interno não pode funcionar devidamente se não forem correctamente transpostas e aplicadas as regras comunitárias relativas ao seu funcionamento e verificado o seu cumprimento. É por isso imperioso que os Estados-Membros transponham atempadamente para o direito nacional a legislação relativa ao mercado interno.

Há 22 directivas cujo prazo de transposição terminou há mais de dois anos. Além disso, 6 % das directivas não foram transpostas em todos os Estados-Membros, o que significa que 100 directivas sobre o mercado interno não produzem todos os efeitos possíveis na UE.

Os Estados-Membros e a Comissão devem actuar articuladamente para fazer face a esta situação. Subscrovo a posição de que a Comissão devia fornecer no seu sítio Web as directivas que não foram aplicadas em cada Estado-Membro, de modo a que esta situação seja do conhecimento público. Verifica-se que o número de processos por infracção continua a ser demasiado elevado, havendo alguns Estados-Membros com um número de processos bem acima da média da UE, que é de 47.

Apela-se ainda aos Estados-Membros para garantirem a operacionalidade das redes transfronteiriças de sistemas electrónicos de informação criados pela Comissão.

2-216

**Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito.** – Ao contrário do que se diz no relatório, está hoje claro que o processo de liberalização dos mercados e de privatização dos serviços públicos, ainda em curso, não trouxe quaisquer ganhos visíveis em termos de preços, qualidade de serviço ou redução da despesa pública. Pelo contrário, as associações de defesa dos consumidores e de utentes dos serviços públicos relatam aumentos de preços, degradação da qualidade do serviço e subida do custo da respectiva prestação. A liberalização contribuiu, sim, para o encerramento de postos de trabalho e para a criação de monopólios privados, os quais colocam em causa os direitos dos trabalhadores, dos utentes dos serviços públicos e dos consumidores, como acontece, designadamente, nos correios, telecomunicações, transportes, electricidade. É uma situação que, por sua vez, contribui para o agravar da crise económica e social.

Assim, insistir numa tal política é insistir no continuar do agravamento da situação socioeconómica de milhões de pessoas. É insistir na delapidação desse património público que são os serviços públicos e a sua entrega a grupos privados. É insistir

na precariedade, no desemprego, na pobreza. É insistir no agravamento do fosso entre os mais ricos e os mais pobres. É insistir numa sociedade mais injusta. Daí o nosso voto contra.

2-217

**Bruno Gollnisch (NI), par écrit.** – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, Nous avons voté contre le rapport de Mme Von Thun und Hohenstein. Ce Parlement a les yeux fixés sur le nombre de directives transposées, le fameux tableau de bord du marché intérieur. Personne ne s'interroge jamais sur la qualité intrinsèque de cette législation, sur la réelle nécessité ou la pertinence des 90 000 pages de textes que vous appelez "l'acquis" communautaire, ou des quelques 1 700 directives concernant le marché intérieur. Pas plus qu'on ne se soucie réellement, d'ailleurs, de savoir si les objectifs affichés lors de l'adoption de ces textes ont été atteints, si les analyses d'impact se révèlent exactes, ou si les principes de subsidiarité ou de proportionnalité ont été respectés.

Tous les dysfonctionnements sont réputés être de la responsabilité des États membres, qui ont pourtant de moins en moins de marge de manœuvre dans l'adaptation de ces textes à leur situation nationale, tant les moindres détails sont figés, alors que les traités indiquent une obligation de résultats et non de moyens. Un peu d'introspection et d'autocritique ferait le plus grand bien aux institutions européennes.

2-218

**Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE), na piśmie.** – Tabela wyników rynku wewnętrznego jest bardzo ważnym narzędziem informacyjnym na temat stanu wdrożenia prawodawstwa europejskiego przez państwa członkowskie. Mimo zobowiązań państwa członkowskie spóźniają się z terminowym wdrażaniem prawa bądź też niepoprawnie wdrażają przepisy. Tabela pokazuje, iż coraz lepiej państwa członkowskie radzą sobie z implementacją przepisów, jednak spora grupa państw nadal pozostaje poza wyznaczonym celem. Potrzebujemy wyraźnego zobowiązania państw członkowskich do poprawy tych wskaźników. Dużo ostatnio mówimy w Parlamencie Europejskim o konieczności pogłębienia rynku wewnętrznego. Rynek wewnętrzny nie będzie jednak funkcjonował prawidłowo, jeśli przepisy, będące podstawą dla poprawnie działającego rynku wewnętrznego, nie będą wdrażane prawidłowo i na czas.

Rynek wewnętrzny musi także zyskać poparcie naszych obywateli. Dlatego popieram, inicjatywę pani poseł sprawozdawcy organizowania corocznie forum rynku wewnętrznego oraz inicjatywę „testu rynku wewnętrznego”, a więc inicjatywę sprawdzania legislacji pod kątem czterech swobód rynku wewnętrznego: przepływu kapitału, dóbr, usług i osób.

2-218-500

**Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE), in writing.** – The internal market scoreboard provides a useful overview of the application of Community rules in areas of vital importance to European consumers and businesses. Unfortunately Scotland does not as yet feature as an independent country on the scoreboard. I consider it essential that the Scottish parliament gains full powers in those areas currently reserved to London; when that happens I am confident that Scotland will feature amongst the Member States implementing measures for the benefit of consumers and businesses.

2-218-750

**Alan Kelly (S&D), in writing.** – I fully support the concept of the Internal Market Scoreboard as a tool for measuring the success of the single market. This is an essential tool for communicating how member states treat European law. It also shows that the burden of over-regulation which often tarnishes the image of the EU, is often not the fault of any EU institution but of the member state itself. There is a lesson to be learned here and greater transparency is needed in future.

2-218-875

**Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), kirjallinen.** – Arvoisa puhemies, Toimivat sisämarkkinat edellyttävät tyytyväisiä ja markkinoihin luottavia kuluttajia. Eurooppalaiset kuluttajat ovat avainasemassa, kun nousemme taantumasta kasvuun. Hyväksymämme mietinnöt nostavat esille tärkeitä näkökohtia unionin kuluttajan suojan ja sisämarkkinoiden toimivuuden parantamiseksi, joita tuin valiokuntakäsittelyssä sekä tänään äänestyksessä. Nostan esille kolme. Ensinnäkin sisämarkkinoiden tulostaulu on ollut tervetullut väline. Sen viisi pääilmäistä ovat varmasti keskeisimpiä arvioitaessa sisämarkkinoiden toimintaa myös kuluttajien kannalta. Pidän kannatettavana, että tulostauluun sisällytettäisiin jatkossa tietoja sisämarkkinalainsäädännön täytäntöönpanosta jäsenmaissa, joka edelleen on puutteellista. Kerman kuorinta – mentaliteetista implementoinnissa tulee päästä eroon. Toiseksi ihmettelen sosialistiryhmän voimakkaan kielteistä asennetta ehdotettuun lainsäädännön sisämarkkinatestiin. Taustalla lienee virhepäätelmä: kyseinen testi voisi toimia nimenomaan myös sosiaalisten ja ympäristöllisten päämäärien edistämiseksi. Siitähän koko integraatioprosessissa on kyse: talous, toimivat sisämarkkinat pannaan palvelemaan ylempiä päämääriä. Historia osoittaa Schumanin julistuksen nerokkuuden. Kolmanneksi ilmaisen tukeni kuluttajien oikeussuojakeinojen kehittämiseksi. Meillä Suomessa tuomioistuinin prosessin ulkopuolinen kuluttajariitojen ratkaisujärjestelmä sekä kuluttaja-asiamiesinstituutio toimivat tehokkaasti. Komission on syytä käydä tiivistä vuoropuhelua jäsenmaiden viranomaisien kanssa hyvien käytäntöjen levittämiseksi. On kuitenkin muistettava, että kuluttajansuojan ja sisämarkkinoiden vahvistamisessa ennen viranomaisvalvontaa ja oikeussuojaa kulkee aina valveutunut ja aktiivinen kuluttaja itse.

2-218-937

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Um mercado interno saudável é crucial para que haja uma concorrência sã e o respectivo desenvolvimento económico. Mas para que tal seja uma realidade é necessário que, sem excepção, as directivas comunitárias sejam adoptadas por todos os Estados-Membros de igual forma.

O Pannel de Avaliação do Mercado Interno e o Pannel do Consumo têm um papel crucial para a melhoria do funcionamento do Mercado Interno. Apesar de estarmos no bom caminho, ainda estamos longe de concretizar todos os objectivos traçados no que respeita a um mercado interno mais eficiente. É portanto necessário o esforço de todos, incluindo aqui os parlamentos nacionais que têm um papel muito importante e decisivo.

2-219

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I finally decided to vote against the report because we failed in eliminating Article 10 from the text. The maintenance of this article is crucial because it calls for establishing systematic ‘internal market tests’ in order to verify *ex ante* whether EU legislative proposals comply with all internal market rules.

2-220

**Reports: Jean-Luc Dehaene (A7-0022/2010), Reimer Böge (A7-0020/2010), (A7-0021/2010), (A7-0019/2010), Anna Rosbach (A7-0009/2010), Anna Hedh (A7-0024/2010), Cristian Silviu Buşoi (A7-0027/2010), Bairbre de Brún (A7-0082/2009), Carlos Coelho (A7-0015/2010), Sophia in't Veld (A7-0025/2010), Róza, Gräfin von Thun Und Hohenstein (A7-0084/2009)**

2-221

**Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Por deficiência de funcionamento da máquina de voto, o sentido do meu voto não foi registado.

Declaro, por isso, que votei favoravelmente todos os pontos submetidos a votação na presente sessão.

2-222

## **8 - Corrections to votes and voting intentions: see Minutes**

2-223

*(The sitting was suspended at 12.35 and resumed at 15.00.)*

2-224

**PRZEWODNICZY: JERZY BUZEK**  
*Przewodniczący*

2-225

## **9 - Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół**

2-226

## **10 - Tura pytan z udziałem przewodniczącego Komisji**

2-227

**Przewodniczący**. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego jest tura pytań z udziałem przewodniczącego Komisji Europejskiej.

2-228

**Joseph Daul**, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président Barroso, si mon groupe et la plupart d'entre nous ici ont travaillé d'arrache-pied pendant des années pour le traité de Lisbonne et s'il est entré en vigueur – depuis plus de trois mois maintenant –, c'est en particulier pour que l'Europe dispose d'une politique digne de ce nom sur la scène internationale.

Sommes-nous, à cet égard, sur la bonne voie? Je vous le demande, Monsieur le Président. Comment faire en sorte que les 500 millions d'Européens fassent entendre leur voix de façon forte et audible? Ils le demandent depuis des années et il est plus que temps pour l'Europe de faire valoir au plus haut niveau ses idéaux et ses valeurs.

Enfin, le service d'action extérieure prévu par le traité de Lisbonne devrait voir le jour dans les semaines et les mois à venir, et ce Parlement entend être étroitement associé à sa conception.

En tant qu'autorité budgétaire à égalité de droit avec le Conseil, le Parlement européen sera de toute façon codécideur tant sur la modification du statut des fonctionnaires concernés que sur le règlement financier.

Monsieur le Président, mon groupe attache une importance toute particulière à ce que ce service européen pour l'action extérieure soit pleinement responsable politiquement et budgétairement. Je serai heureux d'entendre votre point de vue à ce sujet.

2-229

**José Manuel Barroso**, *président de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président Daul, vous le savez, la création du service extérieur commun est une innovation très importante du traité de Lisbonne. Ce service sera essentiel pour appuyer la haute représentante dans sa responsabilité d'assurer la cohérence de notre politique externe et de sécurité commune. Il s'agit de renforcer l'Union en permettant aux États membres de participer davantage et de mettre de plus en plus en commun ce qu'ils font actuellement séparément en matière de PESC. Il ne s'agit donc pas de placer des compétences communautaires dans un cadre intergouvernemental, bien au contraire.

Comme vous le savez, la Commission doit donner son accord à la décision du Conseil pour la création du service. Nous avons une réunion spéciale du collège à ce sujet jeudi prochain. Pour ma part, je suis pour un service fort, un véritable service européen pouvant constituer un instrument de coordination stratégique et une interface utile entre États membres et institutions européennes dans le domaine de la politique extérieure.

Pour remplir sa mission, le service a besoin de trouver sa juste place dans l'architecture de l'Union européenne, sous la responsabilité de la haute représentante qui, en tant que vice-présidente de la Commission, est pleinement responsable devant ce Parlement et qui a la responsabilité de coordonner, au sein de la Commission, les autres aspects de l'action extérieure de l'Union.

2-230

**Martin Schulz**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Barroso, die Krise des Euro wurde durch nicht korrekte Zahlen ausgelöst, die aus Griechenland geliefert wurden. Ich möchte von Ihnen wissen: Können Sie bestätigen, dass Sie oder die Dienststellen der Kommission zu keinem Zeitpunkt bereits über die tatsächlichen Zahlen informiert waren, bevor die griechische Regierung die neuesten Zahlen über ihr Haushaltsdefizit vorgelegt hat?

Zweitens: Können Sie bestätigen, dass der Generaldirektor von Eurostat, Herr Rademacher, bereits in den Jahren 2004 und 2005 erhebliche Zweifel an den Daten aus Athen angemeldet hat? Was haben Sie unternommen, um Eurostat bei der Erhebung von Daten zu unterstützen?

Drittens: Stimmt es, dass die Inspektoren von Eurostat Sie informiert haben, dass sie erhebliche Zweifel an den aus Athen gelieferten Daten haben?

2-231

**José Manuel Barroso**, *President of the Commission*. – Mr Schulz, it is precisely because we had doubts regarding the Greek figures – Commissioner Almunia handled this file over the last five years with great competence, great impartiality and great objectivity – that we not only raised the point several times with the Greek authorities, but we did in fact put forward a regulation in the Council to propose that Eurostat be given audit powers. Unfortunately this was rejected by the Member States. They did not want to give Eurostat and the European Commission more powers to examine in depth the Greek national accounts.

I am very pleased to tell you that the first decision of the new Commission was to put that regulation forward again, and my information is that at least some of the countries that voted against that regulation have already told me that they will vote this time for more transparency.

2-232

**Martin Schulz**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Ich habe das verstanden. Herr Almunia war zuständig. Ich hatte zwar nach Ihren Interventionen gefragt, aber Sie können ja jetzt gleich noch mal sagen, was Sie selbst getan haben.

Habe ich Sie richtig verstanden, Herr Barroso, dass die Schuld an der griechischen Krise bei den Mitgliedstaaten liegt, weil die sich geweigert haben, Ihren Vorschlägen zu folgen? Würden Sie uns bitte sagen, welche Regierungschefs welcher Mitgliedstaaten das waren?

2-233

**José Manuel Barroso**, *President of the Commission*. – First of all, if you ask me about blame – I do not use that word – it lies first of all with the Greek authorities who did not respect the Stability and Growth Pact. It is because of this that we have a huge problem.

Regarding the Commission, Commissioner Almunia, with my full support and the support of the College, performed his job in an exceptionally competent way. This issue of the Greek accounts was addressed several times in euro-area meetings.

Regarding the list of Member States that voted against this matter, I cannot tell you off the top of my head exactly which, but I know, for instance, that Germany voted against and it was also Germany that told me they are going to vote in favour this time.

2-234

**Guy Verhofstadt**, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, il y a aujourd'hui un large consensus pour dire qu'il faut une gouvernance économique forte dans l'Union européenne. C'est déjà un énorme changement depuis les dernières années.

Dimanche dernier, M. Schäuble a dit qu'il était, dans ce cadre-là, favorable à un Fonds monétaire européen mais aussi à d'autres propositions et options, comme par exemple la création d'une agence européenne pour la dette, des euro-obligations ou encore une agence de notation européenne.

Selon un porte-parole de la Commission, Monsieur Barroso, les choses sont actuellement en train de bouger rapidement. J'ai trois questions très concrètes. D'abord, est-il vrai que la Commission est en train de travailler sur une proposition pour créer ce Fonds monétaire européen? Deuxièmement, est-il vrai, comme Mme Merkel le dit – moi, j'ai des doutes là-dessus – qu'il est nécessaire de modifier le traité pour cela? Et troisièmement, êtes-vous également d'accord que ce fonds ne pourrait être qu'un premier pas vers une vraie trésorerie européenne, dont nous avons besoin avec l'Union économique et monétaire?

2-235

**José Manuel Barroso**, *President of the Commission*. – First of all, regarding the proposal to have an EMF, this idea was put forward by the German Finance Minister without giving any details of such an institution. It seems, however, an interesting contribution to the current debate about the euro area. The EMF is, however, a longer term proposal which may well require a change in the Treaty.

What we are working on is preparing some initiatives on reinforcing economic policy coordination and country surveillance. We cannot at this stage tell you what exactly will be the format of this.

Of course, generally speaking, as you said, we support everything that moves towards increased economic governance, but we have to see the exact details and make the proposal at the right time.

That said, the question of the EMF could not solve the urgent issue of Greece. It is a separate issue that requires more analysis, and that is for a longer term.

2-236

**Guy Verhofstadt**, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Je veux d'abord remercier le président de la Commission pour sa réponse. Je suis d'accord avec lui pour dire que le fonds en tant que tel ne peut pas résoudre tout de suite les problèmes. C'est pourquoi je demande que, dans la réflexion de la Commission, les différentes options soient mises sur la table.

Il y a le Fonds monétaire européen, c'est un projet à plus long terme; il y a les euro-obligations, autre idée, qui peuvent naturellement aider dans le problème de la Grèce; il y a l'agence de notation du président de l'Eurogroupe, qui est absolument nécessaire, afin que nous ne soyons pas toujours dépendants des agences de notation à l'étranger; puis, il y a l'idée d'une agence européenne de la dette.

Ma demande est donc de mettre toutes ces idées en commun afin de parvenir à une idée cohérente émanant de la Commission plutôt que de l'un ou l'autre des États membres.

2-237

**José Manuel Barroso**, *président de la Commission*. – C'est précisément, pour éviter ce qui se passe actuellement – chacun propose une idée différente, deux idées différentes parfois au sein d'un même gouvernement –, que nous ne voulons pas nous précipiter. Nous voulons nous préparer et, comme le commissaire Olli Rehn l'a déjà annoncé publiquement, nous sommes en train de préparer une communication sur la coordination de la politique économique renforcée et la surveillance par pays à l'échelle de la zone euro et peut-être même à l'échelle générale de l'Union européenne.

Voilà ce que nous sommes en train de préparer et nous ne pouvons pas présenter chaque jour une nouvelle proposition. Nous y travaillons avec objectivité et avec responsabilité, et c'est de cette façon que l'on pourra obtenir les meilleurs résultats.

2-238

**Rebecca Harms**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Angesichts der Situation, dass es in der Europäischen Union zur Zeit keinen wirklichen Markt, keinen Bedarf für den Anbau genetisch veränderter Stärkekartoffeln gibt – es gibt dazu Alternativen –, frage ich Sie, warum Sie mit so großem Druck dafür gesorgt haben, dass die Genkartoffel Amflora in einem sehr kurzen, raschen Verfahren zugelassen wurde. Da es keinen Bedarf gibt, hätte ich gerne eine Erklärung, weshalb Sie den neuen Gesundheitskommissar dazu gebracht haben, die Bedenken der WHO hinsichtlich der Fütterungstests einfach zu ignorieren, warum Sie nicht abgewartet haben, bis die EFSA die neuen Richtlinien vorlegt, die dort gerade für die Risikoabschätzung von Risiken, die insgesamt von GMO für die Biodiversität und die Biosphäre ausgehen, erarbeitet werden, und warum Sie außerdem *en passant* auch noch die Verschmutzungsgrenze für Futtermittel- und für Nahrungsmittel-Kartoffeln auf 0,9 % erhöht haben. Ich halte das für eine Risikostrategie, die bei unseren Bürgern überhaupt nicht auf Akzeptanz stößt.



2-239

**Przewodniczący.** – Ja również chciałbym podziękować koleżankom. Widzieliśmy państwa protest. Dziękujemy bardzo.

2-240

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – The Commission decided unanimously to move ahead with the authorisation of this GMO in accordance with the provisions of European law. We have an institutional setting that we have to respect and we had to take a position: ‘yes’ or ‘no’.

A considerable period of time has elapsed since their application was lodged and this is because this authorisation was subject to intense scrutiny by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), our independent agency in terms of food security. We wanted all concerns regarding the possible presence of an antibiotic resistance marker gene to be thoroughly assessed.

After an extensive and complete review of these pending files, it was clear that there were no new scientific issues that merited further assessments, based on the opinion of our competent agency – that is independent from the Commission.

Therefore, we believe that all scientific issues have been fully addressed.

In fact I was expecting a word of congratulations from you...

*(Protests)*

...because I have announced that the Commission has the intention to propose to give Member States the choice as to whether or not they want to cultivate GMOs.

This is, I think, a reasonable position considering that there are deep differences among our Member States – some very much in favour, and some very much against.

2-241

**Rebecca Harms, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion.** – Erstens, Herr Kommissionspräsident, habe ich jetzt keine Antwort bekommen auf die Frage nach dem Bedarf für diese Genkartoffel, die eben nur Industriestärke liefern soll. Es gibt dazu Alternativen. Also warum dann das Risiko?

Zweitens, die Verschmutzungsgrenze. Warum plötzlich 0,9 %? Bisher haben wir da die Nachweisgrenze diskutiert, und das finde ich gerade bei Futtermitteln und bei Nahrungsmitteln oder bei einer antibiotikaresistenten Kartoffel hochriskant. Dazu haben Sie nichts gesagt.

Ich würde auch noch gerne wissen, ob Sie in absehbarer Zeit, ohne dass die Richtlinie und die Empfehlungen der EFSA vorliegen, weitere Zulassungen, z. B. für Importpreis oder Mais, planen?

*(Beifall)*

2-242

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – Seeing the enthusiasm of your group – and I want to congratulate you on that manifestation – you have a strong position against any GMO. That is clear. You have that right. I do not have any position in favour or against. It depends on the opinion that is given to me by experts of the EFSA. I do not have any prejudice in favour or against GMOs.

The Commission has a position that is to follow in those matters. I do not see the Commission having ideological discussions about each GMO and what it should do regarding each one. The Commission takes a position based on the independent assessment given to us, not because a GMO is necessary, but if there is no evidence that it poses a risk to public health or the environment we feel obliged to accept it, also in accordance with the obligations we have under the WTO, if there is nothing that prevents us – scientifically – from doing so.

*(Protests)*

That said, we respect very much the subsidiarity principle in the European Union.

*(The President cut off the speaker.)*

2-243

**Ivo Strejček, za skupinu ECR.** – Vážený pane předsedo, já vám slibuji, že po geneticky modifikovaných organismech vnesu jednodušší téma. Myslím, že velmi správně na fórum Evropského parlamentu patří projednávání současné hospodářské situace, a jsem si jist, že občany Evropské unie a členských států zcela jistě zajímá mnohem víc zaměstnanost a práce než geneticky modifikované brambory.

Na jedné straně řečníci vystupující v tomto sále obhajují existenci velké, centrální, silné vlády, na straně druhé – a já zde vystupuji za evropské konzervativce – se domníváme, že silné vlády nevytvářejí pracovní příležitosti. Pracovní příležitosti vytvářejí firmy.

Chci se vás zeptat na tři konkrétní otázky: zaprvé, jakou míru samostatnosti přenechá Evropská komise k řešení hospodářských obtíží jednotlivým národním státům? Zadruhé, můžete slíbit významnou redukci evropské legislativy, která značně zpomaluje hospodářský růst? A zatřetí, souhlasíte s námi, že méně regulací, méně centrálního řízení, méně harmonizací je v současné době nejlepším přístupem, jak řešit hospodářské obtíže Evropské unie?

2-244

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – First of all, we fully respect the diversity of our Member States. That is why we make that point very clearly in the European 2020 Strategy and why we address this issue of diversity very precisely with instruments like the social and economic cohesion policies.

The fact is that our Member States are not all the same. At the same time, we need – as was said earlier – stronger economic governance, because failing to coordinate in the euro area and in the European Union as a whole makes no sense. If the Member States tackle these policies on their own they will certainly not have the leverage for discussions on an equal footing on, for instance, the great challenges we now have globally with the United States or with China. So we need to have a common approach but then at the same time to design specific measures for different Member States.

Regarding the issue of reducing the administrative burdens, that has been a very important point in my programme. We believe we should continue considering pragmatically where some European legislation is needed and avoid legislation when it is simply not needed.

2-245

**Lothar Bisky, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion.** – Herr Barroso, Sie haben in der vergangenen Woche Ihren Vorschlag für die Wirtschaftsstrategie vorgestellt. Dazu zählen wichtige Zielsetzungen. Der Rat hat nun Griechenland ein Sparprogramm auferlegt, das die Erreichung dieser Ziele meines Erachtens in den Bereich des Unmöglichen rückt, einem Staat mit einem Anteil von 3 % des Bruttoinlandsprodukts der EU. Sie beharren aber weiterhin auf dem gescheiterten Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakt. Gleichzeitig wird aus mehreren Mitgliedstaaten die Forderung nach einem Europäischen Währungsfonds oder auch nach einer Wirtschaftsregierung vorgetragen.

Meine Fragen sind: Werden Sie Ihren EU-2020-Vorschlag noch einmal überarbeiten, um die Idee des Währungsfonds und einer Wirtschaftsregierung zu integrieren, um eine Abkehr vom Steuer- und Lohndumping sowie von der vorherrschenden Wettbewerbsideologie einzuleiten? Werden Sie unverzüglich gemeinsam mit den Mitgliedstaaten Maßnahmen ergreifen, um die Spekulationen der Banken, die gerade eben noch mit Steuergeldern gerettet wurden, gegen den Euro zu unterbinden?

2-246

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – Regarding the situation of Greece, we believe that Greece has taken the necessary steps to reduce the government deficit this year. These measures show the determination of the Greek Government to tackle their structural problems.

At the same time, we are doing what is required to secure the financial stability of the euro area as a whole. The Commission has been actively working with euro-area Member States to design a mechanism which Greece could use in case of need. Such a mechanism would conform with the current Lisbon Treaty, in particular with the ‘no bail-out’ clause. It would include stringent conditionality.

The Commission is ready to propose a European framework for coordinated assistance which would require the support of euro-area Member States. This is what I can tell you about Greece and about our response for euro area stability.

Regarding the EU 2020 proposals, we do not see any need to change them. We have put those proposals forward. They are now going to be discussed by the European Council and Parliament, and we hope this will be a very fruitful discussion.

2-247

**Lothar Bisky, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion.** – Ich bin nicht ganz zufrieden. Die Frage ist doch, dass mit Steuergeldern gegen den griechischen Staat spekuliert wird. Die Steuergelder kommen auch von deutschen Banken, sie sind auch von deutschen Banken ausgereicht worden. Und es geschieht nichts, sondern es wird immer gesagt, wir ergreifen irgendwelche Maßnahmen. Also ich bin ziemlich enttäuscht, dass so wenig getan wurde, um bestimmte Dinge in der EU einfach zu unterbinden, damit diese Spekulationen endlich aufhören und man sich wirklich auf Wachstum und Beschäftigung konzentrieren könnte.

2-248

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – As regards speculation, let us be clear that the current problems in Greece were not caused by speculation. They were mainly caused by overspending and not respecting the European framework in terms of the Stability and Growth Pact, namely the excessive debt, but it may happen afterwards that speculators act against the sovereign debt of that country.

This also shows the importance of a fundamental reform in the derivatives market and the relevance of the action already undertaken by the Commission. On 20 October 2009, the Commission began a programme of action in favour of efficient, solid derivative markets. The legislative proposals that Commissioner Barnier will present before the summer, and also those concerning the market abuse directive that Commissioner Barnier will present before the end of the year, will increase market transparency and limit risks.

Beyond this systemic response, a new ad hoc reflection is needed on credit default swaps regarding sovereign debt, and the problem of ‘naked’ practices needs particular attention in this context. It is not justified to buy insurance and buy unseen interventions on a risk on a purely speculative basis. In the short term, we must achieve the necessary coordination to ensure that Member States act in a coordinated fashion, but most particularly for naked practices. In this context, the Commission will examine closely the relevance of banning purely speculative naked sales of credit default swaps for sovereign debt.

At the same time, we will push for international coordination. Because these markets are opaque, we are going to bring this issue to the G20 and we also have to raise some of these issues in our bilateral contacts, particularly with the United States.

2-249

**Νίκη Τζαβέλα, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας EFD.** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, χαίρομαι γιατί με προλάβετε στην ερώτηση την οποία θα έθετα. Πρώτα απ' όλα, ως Ελληνίδα ευρωβουλευτής, επιτρέψτε μου να σας ενημερώσω ότι η Ελλάδα θα τα καταφέρει. Η δοκιμασία αυτή, την οποία περνάμε αυτή την περίοδο και για την οποία είμαστε υπόλογοι, είναι ένα πολύ καλό τεστ αντοχής και πειθαρχίας για την Ελλάδα.

Χάρηκα πάρα πολύ που αναφέρατε τους G20 σαν μία ομάδα στην οποία θα φέρετε το θέμα των Swaps. Η Ελλάδα, πέραν των δικών της σφαλμάτων, χτυπήθηκε σκληρά από την κερδοσκοπία των αγορών.

Προτίθεστε πραγματικά, και θα ήθελα κάπως να το αναπτύξετε αυτό στο πλαίσιο των G20, να ηγηθείτε πρωτοβουλίας για τη θέσπιση ξεκάθαρων κανόνων όσον αφορά τις ανοιχτές, ακάλυπτες πωλήσεις και τα credit default swap;

2-250

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – As I said earlier, the basic problem regarding Greece – and it is important to say this – comes from excessive debt. It is true that probably there were also speculative attacks, but that is because they saw an opportunity there.

Now we have to support Greece, and Greece has now announced very important measures. We fully support those measures. At the same time we have to look to the broader issue. I already said that we will examine closely the relevance of banning purely speculative ‘naked’ sales on credit default swaps on sovereign debt. The question of transparency between regulators – particularly on access to information on these practices – should also be raised in the G20 and in other fora and bilaterally.

Last Friday Commissioner Barnier organised a meeting in Brussels with the national regulators precisely to find out what we know about the action of some of these speculators against sovereign debt. We need to proceed with an in-depth analysis of credit default swaps markets so as to determine better how these markets function and if they are the subject of questionable practices. If needed, the Commission will also use its competition powers in that matter.

2-251

**Νίκη Τζαβέλα, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας EFD.** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, υπάρχει χρονοδιάγραμμα σε αυτό που λέτε, για το μηχανισμό καταπολέμησης της κερδοσκοπίας; Πείτε μας αν υπάρχει κάποιο χρονοδιάγραμμα, για να ξέρω, όταν θα βγούμε για δανεισμό στη διεθνή αγορά, αν θα έχουμε κάποια στήριξη από αυτό τον μηχανισμό.

2-252

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – I already said this, but I can repeat it.

Commissioner Barnier will present some legislative proposals regarding the directive on derivatives before the summer and will also present a legislative proposal before the end of the year concerning the market abuse directive. We believe these proposals will increase market transparency and limit the risks.

We intend to put the issue of credit default swaps to the G20 in June.

2-253

**Daniël van der Stoep (NI).** – Voorzitter, mijnheer Barroso, openheid en transparantie zijn basiswaarden van elke zichzelf respecterende democratie. Als bestuurders niet kunnen worden gecontroleerd op hun uitgaven door de burgers kan er een sfeer van inheligheid en zelfverrijking ontstaan. Dit hebben we vorig jaar bijvoorbeeld in Engeland gezien. In de Nederlandse pers is bekendgemaakt dat voorzitter Barroso over 2009 een bedrag van 730.000 euro heeft gedeclareerd. Dat is niet alleen belachelijk veel, maar ook nog eens een prestatie van formaat. Krijg het maar eens voor elkaar om elke dag 2.000 euro te declareren. Petje af voor meneer Barroso.

Serieuzer nu, de democratische controle op deze declaraties is natuurlijk treurig. Een interne audit en wat vooraf goedgekeurde mensen mogen hun stempel voor goedkeuring zetten. Ik sta erop dat deze Commissie, en de heer Barroso in het bijzonder, afstappen van deze doofpotcultuur en hun declaraties openbaar en transparant op internet plaatsen, zodat elke Europese burger inzicht heeft in die declaraties. Graag een reactie.

2-254

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – I am somewhat surprised by this kind of comment.

In fact the so-called representation expenses are expenses incurred in the service of the European Union, namely travel by myself and the other members of the Commission.

In fact, if you compare these amounts with what is spent by governments or Heads of State and Government, you will find that these amounts are very small in comparison.

The budget for the College is fixed annually by the budgetary authority. You are part of that, and this budget has remained the same for five years, only adapted for inflation.

Regarding this expenditure, we believe that it is reasonable and proportionate to the public good it tries to serve. We are, of course, using full transparency. We give the budgetary authority and the Court of Auditors all the information they request from us.

2-255

**Daniël van der Stoep (NI).** – Volgens de heer Barroso krijgt het Parlement inzicht in de declaraties, maar dat is natuurlijk onzin. Alles gebeurt hier achter gesloten deuren. Alles wordt in de doofpot gestopt. Als de heer Barroso echt verantwoording wil afleggen, dan maakt hij die bonnetjes gewoon openbaar. En als hij dat niet wil, moet hij dat gewoon zeggen en eerlijk toegeven. Mijnheer Barroso, als u gewoon alle regels volgt, zie ik totaal niet in waarom u uw bonnetjes niet op internet zou zetten, of u bent gewoon bang voor de reacties van de burger. Maak ze gewoon openbaar.

2-256

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – In a system of law we respect the rule of law, and to analyse the intentions of people is at the least unfair. You cannot attribute to me or to the Commission any intention behind respecting the rule of law. Once again, I think we have to make a distinction between the obligations of the European Commission – or any public body – regarding the rule of law, and giving in to demagogic attacks on the European institutions.

The European Commission, the European Parliament and the European institutions in general have the highest standards in terms of transparency. So I do not accept this kind of easy criticism that is populist and demagogical.

2-257

**Przewodniczący.** – Skończyliśmy pierwszą turę pytań, która miała charakter ogólny. Teraz skupimy się na temacie dotyczącym wdrożenia nowego traktatu i praw podstawowych.

2-258

**Alf Svensson (PPE).** – Herr talman! Jag hoppas att jag inte avviker från de frågor som ska ställas nu. Jag är helt övertygad om att herr Barroso och jag är överens om att respekten för mänskliga fri- och rättigheter är det viktigaste inom EU och i kontakterna mellan EU och övriga länder. Nu är det så att EU har biståndsrelationer med Eritrea, och för perioden 2009–2013 har sammanlagt 122 miljoner euro budgeterats för Eritrea.

Jag begär inte att kommissionens ordförande ska känna till vad dessa medel har använts till, men det skulle vara av värde om herr Barroso redogjorde för sin inställning till staten Eritrea. Våldigt ofta när man omtalar länder med totalitärt styre nämner man inte Eritrea, men man nämner en rad andra länder, och därför kunde det vara av värde att höra herr Barrosos syn på just staten Eritrea.

2-259

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – Thank you for recognising that the Commission defends fundamental rights. Of course we defend them, not only in the European Union but also in our external relations.

This does not mean that we can only have relations with countries that respect fundamental rights. Unfortunately, there are many countries in the world that do not respect fundamental rights and we have to keep relations with those countries.

The case of Eritrea raises concerns in terms of respect for fundamental rights in that country and also because of the extremely difficult situation in which that state exists. According to some commentators, it can be considered a failed state – a state where there is no rule of law, because of civilian conflict and widespread violence. There are many areas of that country where even the authorities cannot exercise legitimate democratic power.

We are in fact following the situation very closely in all countries that can pose a problem for the respect of fundamental rights.

2-260

**Artur Zasada (PPE).** – W kontekście dzisiejszej debaty chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na kwestię skanerów na europejskich lotniskach.

Jednym z oczywistych zadań europejskiej polityki jest ochrona życia, zdrowia i podstawowych wolności obywateli Unii Europejskiej. Dlatego nie może być tak, że w zamian za iluzoryczne poczucie bezpieczeństwa tak łatwo rezygnuje się z poszanowania godności, prawa do prywatności i ochrony danych osobowych mieszkańców Wspólnoty.

Odnoszę wrażenie, że sytuacja ze skanerami jest bardzo podobna do tej, z jaką mieliśmy do czynienia podczas epidemii świńskiej grypy. Działając pod presją zainwestowano ogromne środki w szczepionki, co – dzisiaj już wiemy – było nieracjonalne i nieuzasadnione. Skanery to w moim przekonaniu lekarstwo o małej skuteczności, do którego na siłę próbuje się znaleźć pasującą chorobę.

Panie Przewodniczący, chciałbym wyraźnie usłyszeć, jakie jest Pana zdanie w tej kwestii. Jest Pan za, czy jest Pan przeciw skanerom?

2-261

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – I will be in favour of it if Member States agree, because I think it should be possible to harmonise the security and safety rules at our airports.

What happens now is that some of our Member States are introducing body scanners at their airports. Others are not. As you know, the Commission presented a proposal for body scanners some time ago that was refused.

This does of course raise some concerns but we should try to find, if possible, a harmonised position regarding the utilisation of any security device at European airports.

If not, we will have a kind of discrimination in the evaluation of security at our airports.

2-262

**Derek Vaughan (S&D).** – The Treaty respects the rights of local authorities and regions across Europe, and this will be an important factor when you start discussions on the future of cohesion policy, for example. I wonder if you could assure us that when you start those discussions – for example on the fifth Cohesion Report – that you will have those discussions with local authorities and regions on the future of cohesion policy – and, of course, with this Parliament.

2-263

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – This is not a question of fundamental rights, but of course we will discuss these issues with local and regional authorities.

You know how important social and economic and territorial cohesion is for us. This is now recognised also by the Lisbon Treaty as one of the goals of the European Union. In the new 2020 Strategy that I presented some time ago, we made it clear that cohesion will remain a central feature of our proposals, and we want cohesion to be considered all the time in future policies. This is part of our dialogue with the regional and policy authorities.

I also mentioned the need to consult the Committee of the Regions, for instance, in the document I have just referred to.

2-264

**Catherine Stihler (S&D).** – I would like to raise a case about fundamental rights. I recently visited Cairneyhill Primary School near Dunfermline in Scotland and I was approached by a boy called Douglas, who wanted to raise the case of an Eritrean girl called Rima Andmariam. This relates to what the first speaker was saying about Eritrea.

Rima's family was persecuted and murdered in Eritrea for being Christian. The persecution of Christians in Eritrea is a subject I know you are familiar with. Rima managed to escape to Italy and then to Glasgow in Scotland where Alison and Robert Swinfin took her in and cared for her and looked after her as their own daughter.

Rima is now 17. She is facing deportation back to Italy where she first sought asylum and we are doing all that we can to raise Rima's case to appeal to all those that can help her. She needs to remain in the loving care of Alison and Robert.

Her case is being raised by civil society, human rights organisations and churches across Scotland. It was even mentioned on 'Thought for the Day' on Radio Scotland yesterday. What can the Commission do to protect Rima's fundamental rights?

2-265

**José Manuel Barroso**, *President of the Commission*. – I am sorry, but I do not know about this specific case in Scotland.

I would like to make a general point. In these political debates you cannot expect the President of the Commission, even if he is a relatively hardworking person, to know about all the cases – which are extremely sensitive and extremely serious – that happen in Europe.

Of course I can assure you of our concern and express our solidarity to any person who sees his or her human rights violated but, as regards that specific case, I do not have enough information here. However, I will be more than happy to react in writing to the question that you have just put.

2-266

**Sonia Alfano (ALDE)**. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parlo a nome del gruppo ALDE, il mio gruppo politico. Lo scorso 5 marzo, il Presidente della Repubblica italiana, Giorgio Napolitano ha firmato un decreto legge interpretativo, detto anche "salva liste".

Quel decreto di fatto consente, a campagna elettorale iniziata, di cambiare le regole del gioco. Lo stesso Giorgio Napolitano dal sito del Quirinale afferma che "dalla bozza di decreto prospettata dal Governo, in un teso incontro giovedì sera, il testo successivamente elaborato dal ministro dell'Interno e dalla Presidenza del Consiglio dei ministri non ha presentato a mio avviso evidenti vizi di incostituzionalità".

La Costituzione italiana, all'art. 87, comma 5, prevede che il Presidente della Repubblica italiana "promulga le leggi ed emana i decreti aventi valore di legge e i regolamenti". Il Presidente della Repubblica non può assolutamente partecipare alla stesura di procedimenti e di decreti legge. Lo stesso Presidente della Repubblica suo predecessore, Carlo Azeglio Ciampi, giudica ciò un aberrante episodio di torsione del nostro sistema democratico. È evidente che il governo fa ciò che la Costituzione vieta. Quel decreto, Presidente, ha cambiato le regole del gioco a competizione elettorale già inoltrata, permette a chi ha violato la legge di esibire, riammesso alla competizione elettorale.

Mi chiedo per quale motivo questo Parlamento è sempre pronto ad agire per dare contro a paesi che violano le leggi ma non si rende conto che c'è un paese che fa parte dei 27 Stati membri che viola le leggi.

*(Il Presidente ritira la parola all'oratore).*

2-267

**José Manuel Barroso**, *président de la Commission*. – Madame la députée, encore une fois ne me demandez pas d'entrer dans des questions de politique intérieure. La Commission a des responsabilités en matière de droits fondamentaux lorsqu'il s'agit de l'exécution du droit communautaire soit par les institutions européennes, soit par les États membres.

Apparemment dans le cas que vous avez cité, ce n'est pas l'application du droit communautaire qui est en cause. Il s'agit typiquement, d'après ce que j'ai compris de votre présentation, d'un problème de débat politique interne, avec peut-être une dimension touchant au droit ou à la règle du droit, mais la Commission européenne n'a pas à intervenir dans les conflits entre les différentes forces politiques ou personnalités politiques dans chacun de nos États membres.

2-268

**Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE)**. – Herr Präsident! Herr Präsident Barroso, die Grundrechte-Charta ist das bisher einzige internationale Dokument, das Diskriminierung auch aufgrund der sexuellen Orientierung verbietet. Auch in anderen Teilen der Welt sind viele stolz darauf, dass Europa das geschafft hat, und würden sich das für sich selbst wünschen.

Innerhalb der EU haben wir das Problem, dass drei Staaten, nämlich Großbritannien, Polen und Tschechien, die Grundrechte-Charta nicht als Teil ihrer europäischen Gesetzesordnung sehen. Mich würde interessieren, was die Kommission macht, was Sie vorhaben, um die Grundrechte von Lesben, Schwulen, Bisexuellen und Transgender-Personen in allen Teilen der EU geltend zu machen, so dass klar ist, dass Homophobie und Diskriminierung aufgrund der sexuellen Orientierung nicht nur im Bereich der Beschäftigung, wo wir ja schon eine Richtlinie haben, sondern in allen Bereichen nicht mehr akzeptiert wird und dass Menschen frei von Angst ihre Liebesbeziehungen wählen und leben können.

2-269

**José Manuel Barroso**, *President of the Commission*. – There are two questions there. I do not know if I can respond to them in one minute.

First of all, regarding discrimination on sexual orientation, you know that the previous Commission has proposed a directive against any form of discrimination, including that based on sexual orientation in areas outside of employment. We are committed to ensuring that European legislation, and Member States' implementation measures, fully respect the prohibition of discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation. These principles of non-discrimination, as you know and said, are enshrined in the European Union Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Regarding Poland and the United Kingdom, the protocol clarifies the application of the charter in relation to the laws and initiative action of Poland and of the United Kingdom and its judiciability within these Member States.

It states in particular that the charter does not extend the competence of the EU Court of Justice or any court or tribunal of Poland or of the United Kingdom to find that the laws and regulations or initiative provisions, practices or actions by these Member States are inconsistent with the fundamental rights, freedoms and principles that it reaffirms.

So we still have to see how the European Court of Justice will interpret the protocol of those two Member States.§

2-270

**Ashley Fox (ECR).** – President Barroso, many countries around the world have finely worded bills of rights in their constitutions. Rather fewer afford genuine protection to their citizens. Do you agree that what matters is not the structure of protection of rights but rather how that protection is practiced?

In the United Kingdom we face a general election within three months. If elected, the Conservative Party will repeal the Human Rights Act and replace it with our own bill of rights. This would mean that the European Convention on Human Rights would no longer be directly applicable in UK domestic law.

*(Interjection from the floor: 'You can't do that!')*

President Barroso, will you explain to what extent plans for the EU to sign the European Convention on Human Rights will take into account the differing positions of the Member States?

My party will also seek a Treaty change to guarantee that the Charter of Fundamental Rights does not affect the UK. How will you ensure that the EU does not interfere with the UK's right to opt out of those structures we do not wish to participate in?

2-271

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – I partly already answered the question while answering the previous question.

The United Kingdom and other countries have a protocol regarding the Charter of Fundamental Rights. It has that right. It was negotiated and we have an intergovernmental treaty that recognises this.

Having said this, I would of course prefer all Member States to accept the Charter of Fundamental Rights because I believe this Charter is a basic compass for all European Union policies.

We are also now ready to accede to the European Convention on Human Rights. This will complete the European Union system of protection of fundamental rights.

Certainly, I very much respect the United Kingdom as a democracy and a country of the rule of law. In fact it is one of the countries that has, over the centuries, made a most important contribution to democracy. That is why I really regret that the United Kingdom does not want to be with all its partners in the front line to have human rights not only at national level but also as a European project.

2-272

**Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Presidente da Comissão, os direitos das mulheres e o direito a viver uma vida com dignidade são direitos humanos fundamentais que devem ser promovidos pela União Europeia.

Por isso, tendo em conta as desigualdades gritantes que se mantêm e até se agravam, incluindo as disparidades salariais entre homens e mulheres, a pobreza e o trabalho precário, que atingem fundamentalmente as mulheres, não basta divulgar uma Carta dos Direitos das Mulheres, mais ou menos vaga e imprecisa, que não foi precedida de qualquer debate com as organizações das mulheres e com o próprio Parlamento Europeu.

Assim, eu pergunto se a Comissão Europeia está disponível para dar prioridade a estas questões da defesa dos direitos das mulheres com medidas concretas, designadamente na elaboração da nova estratégia para a igualdade que o próprio Parlamento Europeu está a preparar – um relatório que espero que venha a ser tido em conta.

2-273

**José Manuel Barroso, Presidente da Comissão.** – Na passada sexta-feira, apresentei com a Comissária Reading uma Carta dos Direitos das Mulheres que reafirma o empenhamento da Comissão em termos de igualdade de género e também reafirma a nossa vontade de trabalhar e aprofundar esta área.

Em Setembro, esta Carta que anunciámos agora vai ser seguida por uma nova estratégia para a igualdade entre homens e mulheres. Isto vai dar-nos um quadro geral bastante abrangente para a acção da Comissão em termos de progresso na igualdade entre homens e mulheres nos domínios que a Sra. Deputada agora mesmo referiu, desde o trabalho até a outras formas em que é importante assegurar e garantir essa igualdade.

A Carta não apareceu do nada. A Carta aparece também para comemorar os 15 anos da Declaração de Pequim, e a Carta aparece depois de muitas consultas que eu próprio tenho tido, nomeadamente com o grupo de membros do Parlamento Europeu que se dedica à causa das mulheres. Vou ter, aliás, amanhã mesmo, de manhã, mais uma reunião... Todos os anos tenho tido pelo menos uma reunião com as Sras. e Srs. Deputados que põem isto como uma das suas primeiras prioridades.

2-274

**John Bufton (EFD).** – President Barroso, the question I would like to raise today concerns the financial situation in Greece. Article 121 of the Lisbon Treaty is, for the first time, being used to push through structural reforms in that country. The good people of Greece now find themselves stuck between a rock and a hard place as it becomes very clear that you are running the show in that country and not their elected government.

Does this mean, as you have sent in your officials to sort out the Greek financial situation, that you can now be addressed not only as President of the Commission but also as the Governor of Greece? If the measures your officials put in Greece do not work, do you have a plan B? If so, is it for Greece to leave the eurozone? Finally, do you intend to send your officials into other countries suffering financial hardship, for example Portugal, Spain and Italy?

2-275

**President.** – Mr Bufton, our topic is implementation of the new Treaty and respect of fundamental rights, so please keep to this topic.

President Barroso, are you prepared to give an answer?

2-276

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – Mr President, I try always to be ready for the requests of Members of this Parliament.

Your question, distinguished Member of Parliament, comes from an assumption that is not correct, namely that it is because Greece is in the euro area that it is having some problems. In fact we have countries outside the euro area that have similar problems – in some cases, even more serious ones – both in the European Union and outside the European Union. May I remind you, for instance, of the grave situation of Iceland, which is now asking to join the European Union precisely because Iceland hopes one day to join the euro as well.

So in fact it is a complete mistake to think that the problems in Greece are a result of Greece being in the euro. It is precisely because Greece has not respected the rules of the stability and growth pact that it is now facing difficulties. It will of course have to pay some costs for the difficult adjustment it has to make.

2-277

**Andreas Mölzer (NI).** – Herr Kommissionspräsident, erlauben Sie mir eine Frage zum Problem der Datenspeicherung, da das deutsche Bundesverfassungsgericht die generelle Speicherung aller Telekommunikationsdaten Anfang des Monats für nichtig erklärt hat. Nach wie vor ist es strittig, inwieweit unbeschränkte und unkontrollierte Datenspeicherung bzw. so ein Datenzugriff mit den Grundrechten vereinbar sind. Hier im Parlament wurde ein klares Nein im Zusammenhang mit dem SWIFT-Abkommen ausgesprochen. Auch die EU-Richtlinie zur Vorratsdatenspeicherung wird meines Erachtens wohl an dem im Vertrag von Lissabon enthaltenen Grundrechte-Katalog gemessen werden müssen. Haben Sie vor, bzw. hat die Kommission vor, diesbezüglich so etwas wie eine Überprüfung durchzuführen, wie sich der Grundrechte-Katalog zur Datenspeicherung verhält?

2-278

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – The protection of personal data is a fundamental right explicitly recognised by Article 8 of the European Union Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Thanks to the Lisbon Treaty, we can now establish a comprehensive and coherent framework for the protection of personal data. This is essential to protect the privacy of our citizens, to ensure a common approach to all data-processing activities within the European Union, and Parliament will of course be fully involved in the reform of the current legal framework since the codecision procedure also applies to the former third-pillar areas.



We must also ensure that the fundamental rights of European citizens continue to be protected when personal data leave the Union. In this context, a European Union-United States agreement on personal data protection for persons could be important and, we are working towards this.

Currently we are taking consultations to ensure transparency and collect the views of stakeholders and citizens.

The Commission plans to table a draft recommendation to authorise negotiations with the United States.

2-279

**Sarah Ludford (ALDE).** – During the last decade, international cooperation on counterterrorism has been made more difficult because of human rights concerns, including in the practices of the US Administration.

We had hoped to put that behind us with the Obama Administration. Sadly we learn that unfair military commissions and indefinite detention without trial will carry on, even if Guantánamo is closed.

These departures from international and domestic legal norms make transatlantic data sharing projects even more problematic than they would otherwise be.

What representations is the Commission making to the US Administration in order to uphold fair trials, and warning that their absence will prejudice cooperation? I hope that nowadays, unlike in the past, there is no danger of the EU or its Member States colluding with gross breaches of fundamental rights in counterterrorism.

2-280

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – I am proud of the European Union for being the first, as far as I remember, to raise the issue with a United States President – a former President – of the need to respect fundamental rights and the rule of law, also when dealing with terrorism, namely regarding the issue of Guantánamo. It was myself and the then President of the European Council, Mr Schüssel – then Prime Minister of Austria – who raised the issue. That matter has always been an issue of dialogue with our American partners. You may be sure that this is going to be very high on the agenda.

Regarding data protection, we believe that we should also work with the United States on attaining a framework. I mentioned that in a previous response. At the same time we need to have a framework to combat terrorism together. So the issue is to find the right way of responding to two important needs: the need for freedom and respect of data protection, but also the need for security, because without security there is no possibility of freedom.

2-281

**Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE).** – Mr President, one of the key issues in the new Lisbon Treaty is the increased role of the European Union in the world.

With this new strengthened foreign policy, we as a Union must be more active in the promotion and defence of human rights and fundamental rights in third countries.

What are you and Mrs Ashton planning to do to strengthen the EU's policy on the promotion of democracy? Secondly, will you be supporting greater funding for the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights in the next budget?

Human rights always seem to take second and third place in our dialogues. I think we need to spend more time and money on the promotion of democracy and build a true European endowment for democracy. I would like to hear your opinion on these issues.

2-282

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – The provisions of the Treaty work to promote human rights throughout the world. The European Union has adopted guidelines in human rights on issues ranging from the death penalty to the prevention of torture and support for human rights defenders.

Under these guidelines, the European Union implements a wide range of actions, ranging from public declarations or diplomatic démarches to trial observations. I myself have been raising the issue of human rights in summits with Heads of State and Government from third countries. Just recently, in the summit we had last week with Morocco, we made the point on fundamental rights.

The European Union has established some 40 human rights dialogues with partner countries around the world which serve as dedicated fora for detailed discussions on that issue. Under the European instrument for democracy and human rights, the Commission programmes around EUR 150 million each year to support human rights NGOs across the globe. We try to insert a human rights clause in every framework agreement which we conclude with a third country.

2-283

**Simon Busuttil (PPE).** – Wiehed mill-prinċipiji fundamentali huwa l-libertà ta' moviment issa in vista tal-kwistjoni li għaddejjja bħalissa bejn il-Libja u l-Isvizzera, Sur President, hemm mijiet ta' ċittadini tal-Unjoni Ewropea, haddiema tal-Unjoni Ewropea li ma jistgħux jidhlu l-Libja biex jeżerċitaw il-hidma tagħhom. Il-mistoqsija tiegħi hija: x'qed tagħmel il-Kummissjoni Ewropea biex tinstab soluzzjoni għal din il-kwistjoni b'urġenza? U jidhirlux il-President tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea li huwa aċċettabbli li pajjiż wiehed, bħall-Isvizzera, jiehu deċiżjoni unilaterali li taffettwa liċ-ċittadini kollha taż-żona Schengen u b'mod partikolari lill-haddiema li jridu jidhlu jaħdmu l-Libja biex jaqalghu l-hobża ta' kuljum tagħhom?

2-284

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – We are very concerned with this case. Commissioner Malmström has already said that the suspension by Libya of visas for citizens from the Schengen area is a disproportionate measure. In addition, this situation is not coherent with the positive trend of relations between Libya and the European Union.

Intense diplomatic efforts are ongoing to find a solution to the crisis. Already, one of the two Swiss citizens has left Libya. This is a positive step.

The European Union's Foreign and Justice Ministers discussed the issue on 22 February and 25 February respectively and supported the continuation of diplomatic efforts.

I believe that it is essential to keep dialogue open and make the effort of understanding each party's positions with a view to finding a solution as soon as possible.

2-285

**Olle Ludvigsson (S&D).** – Herr talman! I och med ratificeringen av Lissabonfördraget stärktes respekten för de grundläggande mänskliga och fackliga rättigheterna. Men de senaste årens domslut från EG-domstolen visar att skyddet för grundläggande fackliga rättigheter måste stärkas ytterligare. I fallen Laval, Rüffert, Viking och Luxembourg har domstolen konsekvent gett de fackliga rättigheterna ett underordnat värde.

Genom dessa domar har man omöjliggjort likabehandling av löntagare oavsett nationalitet. Det är inte längre möjligt för fackföreningar att garantera samma lön och likvärdiga arbetsvillkor för utstationerad arbetskraft som för inhemsk arbetskraft. Därför välkomnar jag också det löfte som Barroso gav här i kammaren innan han skulle återväljas som kommissionens ordförande.

Min fråga till Barroso är nu: När kan vi förvänta oss att kommissionen lägger fram ett lagstiftningsförslag för att komma till rätta med de problem som uppstått efter EG-domstolens utslag? Kan kommissionens ordförande redan i dag ge oss denna information?

2-286

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – When these rulings were made public, we expressed our position very clearly. I myself, and Commissioner Špidla, who was responsible for employment and social affairs, made it clear that, in our understanding, those rulings could not call into question fundamental rights such as the right to strike, the right to trade unions and the specificities of some-labour relations mechanisms in our countries.

We are working on some proposals to address this issue. I am afraid that I cannot give you a concrete date now as I was not expecting this question. However, I can tell you that, as I have said before, with the election of this Commission – and the Commissioner responsible has also said this – this is an issue that we will address shortly.

2-287

**Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Chciałbym zapytać o prawa podstawowe, nowy traktat, w tym działania zewnętrzne. Według badań Komisji Kontroli Budżetowej wystąpiło 43% błędnych transakcji finansowych. Jak nowy traktat, nowa zmiana, nowe rozwiązania w kontekście naszego zaangażowania w przestrzeganie praw podstawowych na świecie wpłyną na radykalne zmniejszenie poziomu błędów w budżetowaniu i wykonaniu budżetu i sprawozdawczości? Podkreślam, te 43% to szacunkowy poziom błędów finansowych.

2-288

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – As you know, we have been working over the years to reduce financial errors in the accounts of the European Union. Many of those errors, as you know, are the responsibility of the Member States in the implementation of many European programmes.

I am encouraged by the recent opinion given by the European Court of Auditors recognising the progress made so far, but I believe that we should not be complacent in this area. We are ready to work to reduce all kinds of errors in the implementation of the European Union budget.

2-289

**David Casa (PPE).** – It-Trattat jiteklem dwar kif se nirrispettaw id-drittijiet fundamentali tal-bniedem u dawk il-pajjiżi illi jixtiequ jsiru membri tal-Unjoni Ewropea għandhom jaraw illi jkunu "in line" ma' dak li qed titlob l-Unjoni Ewropea, kif għamlet Malta, u kif għamlu diversi pajjiżi oħra li saru membri flimkien magħna. Dwar it-Turkija, jaħsibx il-President

illi f'dawk li ghandhom x'jaqsmu d-drittijiet fundamentali tal-bniedem it-Turkija fadlilha hafna x'tagħmel? U x'qed tagħmel il-Kummissjoni biex tassigura li qabel ikollna l-ekonomija f'postha fit-Turkija, qabel ikollha kwalunkwe haġa ohra li ahna qed nitolbu mit-Turkija, naħseb l-ewwel haġa u l-iktar importanti huma d-drittijiet fundamentali tal-bniedem illi, jiddispaċini ngħid, illi fit-Turkija huma inezistenti.

2-290

**José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission.** – I would not say 'in existence', frankly speaking. Turkey has made progress in terms of rule of law. However, we do not believe that it is yet compatible – in its standard of respect of fundamental rights and the rule of law – with European standards. This is precisely part of the work we have been developing with Turkey over the years.

Each year, because Turkey is a candidate country to the European Union, the Commission assesses in very objective terms the reforms made by Turkey in the rule of law and all matters related to fundamental rights.

There has been progress in some areas, to be fair. There are others areas where we are requesting more efforts from the Turkish authorities.

I believe that keeping up this dialogue – and in fact these negotiations – for Turkey's accession is indeed the right way to make progress in the matter of respect of fundamental rights, and generally speaking, the rule of law and democratic reforms in Turkey.

2-291

**President.** – President Barroso, thank you very much for a very interesting debate. This has been the fourth Question Hour in plenary. The next will be in one month's time at the next part-session in Strasbourg.

That concludes the item.

2-292

**VORSITZ: SILVANA KOCH-MEHRIN**  
*Vizepräsidentin*

2-293

**David-Maria Sassoli (S&D).** – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono state pronunciate pretestuosamente poco fa in quest'Aula parole vergognose nei confronti del Presidente della Repubblica italiana. Credo che l'Ufficio di presidenza di quest'Aula non debba consentire di portare qui dentro questioni di politica nazionale, specie quando si tratta di questioni istituzionali e politiche di grande rilevanza.

Le ricordo – e ricordo a tutti i colleghi – che la Repubblica italiana non è in vendita, che il Presidente della Repubblica Giorgio Napolitano è il custode della Costituzione italiana. A nome della delegazione italiana del Partito democratico e del Gruppo socialista e democratico invito la presidenza di quest'Aula ad avere maggiore vigilanza sui temi del dibattito e sugli interventi che vengono fatti.

Mi è dispiaciuto che il Presidente Buzek non sia intervenuto a riprendere un intervento di attacco nei confronti del Presidente della Repubblica che soltanto una settimana fa era in visita al Parlamento europeo.

*(Applausi).*

2-294

**Die Präsidentin.** – Sowohl die von Ihnen angesprochene Bemerkung als auch Ihre Ausführungen werden im Protokoll natürlich ausführlich vermerkt, und ich werde versuchen, bei dem Tagesordnungspunkt, bei dem ich jetzt präsidieren darf, Ihren Ansprüchen gerecht zu werden. Ich hoffe, es wird gelingen.

2-295

## **11 - Internationale Klimapolitik nach Kopenhagen: Neubelebung der internationalen Verhandlungen durch sofortiges Handeln**

2-296

**Die Präsidentin.** – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Erklärung der Kommission: Internationale Klimapolitik nach Kopenhagen – Neubelebung der internationalen Verhandlungen durch sofortiges Handeln.

2-297

**Connie Hedegaard, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, this is the first time I have spoken before this House. I am glad that, less than four weeks after I took office, I can today present to you a communication on international climate change policy post Copenhagen – a communication that the Commission adopted in its meeting today.

The communication is entitled 'Acting now to reinvigorate global action and climate change', and that is exactly what we aim to do. Naturally, in drafting the communication, we have taken full account of Parliament's resolution of 10 February on the outcome of COP 15.

Copenhagen was a much smaller step forward than the European Union had wanted but, nonetheless, it was a step forward. One hundred and nine countries – industrialised and developing nations alike which are collectively responsible for more than 80% of the world's greenhouse gas emissions – have now officially included their emission reduction targets and actions in the Accord. In other words, the opportunity is there for us to build on this determination and help channel it into international action. We need to seize this chance to help maintain momentum towards the robust and legally binding global climate agreement for the post-2012 period, which of course remains our objective.

The Commission's starting point is that the EU must continue to show leadership. We believe that the most convincing way Europe can do so is by taking tangible and determined action domestically to become the most climate-friendly region in the world. We must do this as part of the Europe 2020 Strategy put forward last week. And let me say this loud and clear: it is in Europe's own interest. How is that? Well, because it will – if we do it intelligently – enhance our competitiveness, strengthen our energy security and stimulate greener economic growth and innovation, thus creating new jobs. The Commission will therefore now undertake work to outline a pathway up to 2050 for the European Union's transition to becoming a low-carbon economy.

This will involve reducing our emissions by 80% to 95% in 2050, as already agreed, and – as this House is well aware – the EU is committed to reducing its emissions to at least 20% below 1990 levels by 2020 and to scaling up this reduction to 30% if the conditions are right. I fully share the wish expressed by this Parliament that the EU should move beyond the 20% target. We need to bring our reduction more closely into line with what the science tells us is necessary in order to meet the Copenhagen Accord's objective of keeping global warming below two degrees. As you also stated in your resolution, the crisis has made it easier to achieve the targets. If today we want to be as ambitious as we were prepared to be when we adopted the Climate and Energy Package back in 2007 and 2008, we would then have to go beyond the 20%. I am therefore also pleased to announce that the Commission will prepare, before the European Council in June, an analysis of which practical policies would be required to implement a 30% emission reduction by 2020. The Commission will also engage in developing an analysis of milestones on our pathway to 2050, including the necessary scenarios of the ambition level for 2030. This will require a need to set out appropriate strategies for the key emitting sectors, consistent with the EU 2020 Strategy. In line with the deadline agreed in the ETS Directive, the Commission will also set out its analysis of the situation regarding energy intensive industries in the event of carbon leakage.

In parallel with this work, the EU must start implementing the Copenhagen Accord. This means building a robust and transparent international accounting framework for countries' emissions and performance. It also means swiftly mobilising the EUR 7.2 billion in fast-start finance for developing countries that Europe has committed to for the period 2010 to 2012. This is particularly important for our credibility, as well as contributing to securing long-term finance. The Commission is ready to help ensure the EU's assistance is well coordinated.

Finally, this communication proposes a road map for the next steps in the UN process, to be agreed in Bonn this spring when the negotiations restart. The technical meetings in Bonn need to begin the process of integrating the political guidance provided by the Copenhagen Accord into the UN negotiating text and addressing the outstanding gaps. Most importantly, I think it is very important to see what can be specific deliverables for Cancún. Bringing the developed country targets and developing country actions submitted under the Accord, as well as the political guidance on MRV, into the formal UN negotiation process will be crucial, but also decisions on issues which were neglected in the Accord, such as the evolution of the international carbon market, reducing emissions from international aviation and maritime through ICAO and EIMO, agriculture and other things. In the formal negotiations there was actually substantial progress made in Copenhagen on the adaptation framework, technology framework, forestry, that could also be among the specific deliverables for Mexico.

Nobody would be happier than me if Cancún also delivered a legally binding global deal and if the legal question was also solved there – and do not be mistaken, the European Union is ready. However, we need to recognise that remaining differences between parties may delay agreement on this until next year. Therefore we have to manage expectations carefully. I think all of you know that high expectations for Mexico without specific deliverables implies a very high risk of killing this process in the end. So for all of us to whom it is very important to get an international deal, I also think it is very important to pursue this stepwise approach and to try to do whatever we can to ensure that the world gets a legally binding deal before 2012.

Finally, a few words on environmental integrity. Environmental integrity must be our watchwords in the negotiations and I know this is a concern Parliament shares. Therefore the shortcomings of the Kyoto Protocol have to be addressed. By this I mean the limited number of countries it covers – corresponding to only 30% of today's emissions – and the serious weaknesses it contains such as the accounting rules for forestry emissions and the handling of surplus national emission rights from the period 2008 to 2012, which were also highlighted in your February resolution.

Lastly, Europe needs to undertake outreach in order to promote support for the UN process and rebuild confidence that a global deal is possible. We need both to get a better understanding of where our partners stand on key issues and to explain what the EU requires from a global deal. The Commission will undertake outreach in close contact with the Council and the Council Presidency. I will be holding talks in Washington and Mexico this month and plan to visit, among others, India, the Maldives, China and Japan in April.

We would also like to encourage you, the European Parliament, to contribute by engaging with your fellow parliamentarians around the world. I have already met some representatives of your parliamentary delegations with major third countries and will meet others soon in order to discuss how we could join our efforts and reach out together and how the Commission can assist you in this important task.

The Commission's communication sets out a strategy to help maintain the momentum of global efforts to tackle climate change expressed by the growing support for the Copenhagen Accord. EU leadership in this process will be absolutely vital for success. I hope we can count on Parliament's support.

2-298

**Richard Seeber (PPE).** – Ich möchte der neuen Kommissarin zu ihrer ersten Rede gratulieren. Auch die Mitteilung, die sie uns vorgelegt hat, ist sehr interessant. Aber ich möchte jetzt doch auf ein paar Defizite eingehen.

Es wäre angemessen gewesen, wenn Sie in dieser ersten Mitteilung auch den UN-Prozess selbst ein wenig mehr analysiert und ihn auch dort kritisiert hätten, wo er wirklich Schwachstellen aufweist. Insbesondere im Panel 2 wurde, wie wir wissen, ja nicht gerade mit wissenschaftlicher Sorgfalt vorgegangen.

Zum Zweiten hätte man auch das Zwei-Grad-Ziel, das wir festgeschrieben haben, wissenschaftlich mehr untermauern sollen bzw. sollten Sie jetzt Ihre Anstrengungen erhöhen, damit wir hier stärker erforschen, ob das noch möglich ist oder ob wir uns – wie von verschiedenen Seiten schon zu hören ist – zusehends davon entfernen.

Zum Dritten, und das ist wohl das Wichtigste: Wir müssen insbesondere auch jetzt gegen die Vertrauenskrise vorgehen, die weltweit und speziell hier in Europa herrscht. Sie wissen, es gibt Umfragen, die besagen, dass nur 30 % der europäischen Bürger glauben, dass CO<sub>2</sub> einen Einfluss auf das Klima hat. Jedes Projekt, das dies nicht berücksichtigt, ist zum Scheitern verurteilt.

2-299

**Marita Ulvskog (S&D).** – Fru talman! Kommissionsledamot Connie Hedegaard sade flera bra saker, men också två mycket oroande saker: Hon talar hellre om 2050 än om 2010, vilket jag finner oroande, och hon talar mer om att vi måste sänka våra förväntningar än om att vi ska fortsätta att driva på för att ha så höga ambitioner och förväntningar som möjligt på de möten som redan är inplanerade.

Jag vill ställa frågan: Kommer kommissionen att arbeta för att ett ambitiöst och rättsligt bindande klimatavtal verkligen undertecknas i Cancun i december, eller kommer man att fortsätta att förespråka en process där Cancun bara betraktas som ett steg på vägen till ett avtal som undertecknas i Sydafrika eller kanske i något annat land långt fram i tiden: 2011, 2012, 2020 eller i värsta fall ännu längre fram i tiden?

2-300

**Chris Davies (ALDE).** – Madam President, in the wake of Copenhagen, some of us are feeling like the remnants of a defeated army, scattered and demoralised, so I am glad you have raised the standard here and launched a fight-back.

But, although you sound upbeat and positive, in practice a lot of this is based on a wish and a prayer. We are very much dependent upon others to be able to make progress.

I notice that you have talked about revisiting the idea of raising our own target to a 30% reduction. Am I right in saying that you have suggested a new and more subjective formula for applying that? 'If the conditions are right', the document says. That is new, I think.

Why is there nothing in the document that analyses the reasons for failure at Copenhagen and suggests lessons? Why is there nothing here that points at the problem of climate-change denial, which is sapping political will? And, finally, why is there nothing here about the need to bring in more business?

There are lots of businesses in Europe that want to work with us on this and, frankly, while I wish you well, and while we wish you well, you need all the friends that you can get.

2-301

**Connie Hedegaard, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, first to Mr Seeber, about the IPCC and why did we not criticise that or whatever we were supposed to do in this paper: I must say that, although I think it is crucial for the

IPCC to take the criticism seriously and try to correct where there are things that need correction, I have seen nothing to date that changes my profound understanding and feeling that, yes, we need to address climate change. There are things, details, leaked mails and all these kinds of things. I have seen nothing more profound that would change my profound attitude and I think that goes for very many, so that is very much deliberate. I think that the IPCC itself must try to be careful now to restore confidence in whatever comes out of the IPCC.

I very much agree with the point that you almost did not have time to raise – the issue of trust – and that is also why we have a substantial outreach, a thing that is crucial for the European Union.

Mrs Ulvskog, you mentioned that I spoke more about 2050 than 2010. This is a strategy on the way forward for 2012. We already have our policy for right now, 2010, in the European Union, so this is a strategy looking forward. Where I think that one of the new things to pay attention to is that we start to say we must define the pathways between 2020 and 2050, and that is why I will come up with something on what should be achieved by 2030.

The year 2020 is only 10 years away. In this Commission period we must also lay the path for where we are going to be by 2030, so that was very deliberate and that is one of the new things in this.

I definitely do not want to lower expectations but I would be very careful not to raise expectations so high so that those who do not want the international negotiations to succeed could kill the process after Mexico, if we do not achieve anything. That is why we must be practical. I will defend before anyone that up to Copenhagen it was right to keep expectations high, to keep the pressure there and to bring this to the top of the agenda of Heads of State. It made them responsible; it made emerging economies and the United States set domestic targets; it was important. But only once can you do a thing like this and then not achieve it fully. My fear is we cannot do it twice.

Why not, then, make a specific road map in Bonn, guaranteeing momentum is being kept here? That is the thinking.

Finally, to Chris Davies, yes you are right. We are depending on others to make progress, and that is also why we must do the average and try to analyse the information we get. What is going on in Beijing? What is going on in Delhi? What is going on in Washington? What is going on in the US Congress? And then try to see that, by taking all of these things into consideration, we can, at the same time, ensure that we still have our objective met, namely a legally binding, truly international deal.

You mentioned this 30%, if the conditions are right – yes, you are right, this is a new way of putting it. There are footnotes also in the 2020 strategy referring to policies hitherto, that it is provided that other nations... and so on and so forth, but I think if conditions are right and maybe if we do this intelligently it could also benefit Europe itself. We also need to have that in our different strategies and papers.

I know that this is one area where there is not consensus in Europe at this stage. I think it is important to consider this. Say that, for instance, China will not accept an international agreement, would we then stand still for ever on 20%? How would that benefit our economy, our innovation, our growth? Would we not risk losing the markets to China and other regions that are moving on this agenda as well, no matter whether and when we get an international deal?

This is just an opening for discussion, saying, yes, these are bargaining chips in the international negotiations, but we should not forget there is also a domestic side to this. Where will our growth come from in the future? There we should be careful of not being ambitious enough.

2-302

**Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE).** – Hyvät kollegat, arvoisa komissaari, on hienoa huomata, että olette lukenut parlamentin päätöslauselman ja viittaatte siihen. Se on hyvä merkki näin työnne alussa.

Jotta EU voisi oikeasti säilyttää johtoroolin ilmastonsuojelussa, meidän pitää nostaa tavoitettamme vähintään -30 prosenttiin, jota jo perustelite. Haluan tähän lisätä, että oikeasti ne muutokset, jotka lama on tuonut tilanteeseen, tarkoittaa, että -20 prosenttia ei tosiasiallisesti paljon eroa *business as usualista*. Jos haluamme olla kunnianhimoisia, pitää tavoitettamme tiukentaa vähintään -30 prosenttiin, mieluiten -40 prosenttiin.

Toiseksi, kuten parlamentti viime keskustelussaan hyvin yksimielisesti...  
(*Puhemies keskeytti puhujan.*)

2-303

**Martin Callanan (ECR).** – Madam President, I would like to thank the Commissioner for her statement and welcome her to our Chamber.

She talked in her statement about raising our target to 30% if the conditions are right.

What evidence does she have that, if we do so, this will help persuade America, India, China, or other countries to sign up to a globally binding agreement?

In the absence of a globally binding agreement, does she not agree that there is a great risk that we make our industry more uncompetitive, and saddle our consumers with ever higher electricity bills, at no net benefit to the environment at all because those reductions in emissions are of course cancelled out by increases in India, China, the US, etc.?

2-304

**Bairbre de Brún (GUE/NGL).** – A Uachtarán, is gá don AE laghdú astuithe de 40% faoin mbliain 2020 a ghealladh, de réir na heolaíochta is déanaí. Ní féidir a leithéid de ghealltanais a dhéanamh ag brath ar ghníomhartha dhaoine eile.

Cad iad na céimeanna a ghlacfaidh an Coimisiún lena chinntiú go n-ardófar gealltanais de laghdú astuithe an AE chuig 40%? Ó thaobh an mhaoinithe riachtanaigh atá ann do thíortha atá i mbéal forbartha chun dul i ngleic leis an athrú aeráide agus a iarmhairtí, cé go díreach a sholáthróidh an maoiniú seo do na tíortha i mbéal forbartha? Cé mhéid a thabharfaidh gach tír forbartha? Cad é mar agus cá huair a chuirfear ar fáil é?

Labhair an Coimisinéir, fosta, faoi chomhaontú atá uailmhianach agus ina cheangal dlí. Cad iad na céimeanna a ghlacfaidh an Coimisiún le comhaontú a fháil a aithníonn na freagrachtaí coiteanna ach idirdhealaitheacha ar thíortha tionsclaíochas agus ar thíortha i mbéal forbartha, bunaithe ar an ionchur stairiúil de ghéis cheaptha teasa san atmaisféar agus ar na hacmhainní le déileáil leis na dúshlán chun astuithe a laghdú agus le hiarmhairtí an athraithe aeráide?

2-305

**Connie Hedegaard, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, if I understand the last point correctly, it is about how can we enforce whatever we agree upon. That is, of course, a key issue.

The other question was how much should be given to developing countries, as I understood it. The criteria have not been set up yet, but I think it is very important that we do not attach a lot of conditions to that. This was the promise given in Copenhagen, that the fast-start financing, the here-and-now financing, will be given to the least developed countries and the most vulnerable, partly for adaptation, partly for mitigation.

I also think that it is only logical that we defend the fact that it must happen through existing channels. We cannot afford, time-wise, to invent new governing systems or channels or whatever for this money to get out to work, because we should get it out there working as soon as possible.

I would say that the EU is already ready for Bonn to deliver the fast-start financing and I would say that, at the latest in Mexico, the world must be ready to deliver on its promises on fast-start financing from Copenhagen and to set up the different criteria and exactly how we are going to do it.

To Mrs Hassi, it was the point of view of the need to stick to 30% and in many respects it relates also to what Mr Callanan says.

It is not very easy to decide exactly when we should go to 30% and exactly what it would take to go to 30%. That is why in this communication we say that, before the June European Council, we will provide an analysis on exactly how we could intelligently go to 30%. What would it require?

Of course, nobody should be naive. Of course we should take care of our own industry, obviously. We should know what we are doing and we should not be naive. My point is simply that I think that, if we do this in an intelligent and coherent manner, it would be possible to choose tools that could at the same time benefit climate change and emissions reductions, energy efficiency, energy security, and innovation and job creation. That is what we will be looking for. I am not saying it is going to be easy. We should not think going to 30% will be a piece of cake, although we must know what the potential would be, what the implications would be and that would be the analysis that I would provide before the European Council meeting this June. Then, later this year, we would have the analysis on the pathways to 2050, including this 2030 perspective that I think we have to start thinking about, the reason of course being that we have pledged to reduce by 80% to 95% by 2050. If we do not get started, it is going to be extremely tough in the last one or two decades as we approach 2050.

2-306

**Paul Nuttall (EFD).** – Madam President, contrary to the belief of the Commission, the debate regarding man-made climate change is far from over.

In the past month alone we have had the scandal of the University of East Anglia; then we have had the debacle over the Himalayan glaciers and now, we have got questions over the effect climate change will have on wildlife in the Amazon.

Research has shown that at least 20 passages in the IPCC's report cite non-peer-reviewed World Wildlife Fund or Greenpeace reports as authority. This is not science. We need solid, peer-reviewed scientific evidence, not the work of pressure groups using climate change to further their own agendas or politicians who use climate change to justify the existence of the European Union.

I would like to ask whether it is now time to pause, to take stock and consider the ramifications of bounding ahead with policies that could damage economies, result in job losses or potentially result in energy chaos.

2-307

**Andrew Henry William Brons (NI).** – You will be aware that the leaked emails from the University of East Anglia reveal that historical changes in temperature have been manipulated by supporters of the man-made climate change hypothesis by subjectively choosing base years. That trick has been used to disguise recent falls in temperature and to contain the problem of the Medieval Warm Period. The emails also reveal that scientists sceptical of the hypothesis have been squeezed out of peer review processes to avoid flaws in research being revealed to public scrutiny.

Can a hypothesis that depends on manipulation of data be a proper basis for justifying enormous expenditure and the closing-down of factories such as the Corus plant in Middlesbrough? The European Union pays enormous subsidies to environmental pressure groups that agree to advise the EU to follow a policy to which it is already committed. Is it appropriate for the European Union to use public funds to subsidise pressure groups? This wastes public money, gives bogus support for European Union policies and compromises the independence of campaigning organisations.

2-308

**Karl-Heinz Florenz (PPE).** – Herzlich willkommen in diesem Hause. Vertrauensverlust in Kopenhagen, das war meiner Meinung nach eines der großen Probleme. Das könnte sich theoretisch fortsetzen, weltweit, aber auch innerhalb der Europäischen Union. Meine Frage an Sie ist: Wie geht es mit den Instrumenten, die wir im vergangenen Jahr beschlossen haben, weiter? ETS liegt mir schon im Magen, weil ich nicht ganz sicher bin, wie die Kommission jetzt aufgrund der Entscheidung in Kopenhagen z. B. mit Benchmarks, aber auch mit *Carbon Leakage* umgeht.

Die zweite Frage ist: Es gibt einen Vorschlag der französischen Regierung, Importeure aus der dritten Welt in das ETS-System einzugliedern, um damit den Markt größer zu machen und diese Länder an diesem System teilhaben zu lassen. Haben Sie dazu eine Meinung?

2-309

**Connie Hedegaard, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, first to the two gentlemen who raised the question of the IPCC.

First, I am not here to represent the IPCC. I am sure they are perfectly capable of talking on their own.

When I hear this 'is it not time to pause?', I must just say that the international climate negotiations in many ways have been put on hold for quite a long time. We still need, I believe, substantial progress there. I simply do not understand why, because of a few leaked things, one wants to aim the scepticism at a whole project. That is not my approach. I am the politician. I cannot judge the work of the scientists but I can use my common sense and I can read their main conclusions and see what the facts on the table are like. Then I can myself weigh up whether I want to run the risk of doing nothing, with the very big implications that might have – or, instead, will I try to respond to the challenge?

What I simply fail to understand is that those who are sceptical of this climate issue cannot see that it will always be good for a planet whose population is approaching nine billion people, or even more by the middle of this century, to become much more energy efficient and much more resource efficient.

So that is where we should have common ground when it comes to the tools because that will anyhow benefit our environment, benefit our citizens and benefit our economies. It will also benefit business to become very energy efficient, in a future where energy is becoming still more expensive. That will pay off on the bottom line, in a world where there will be a struggle over resources. So I simply do not understand why we cannot take on the same kind of agenda from that angle.

To Mr Florenz, what do we do with the instruments on the ETS? Well, as mentioned, there will be an analysis of the carbon leakage coming out before summer and, when it comes to the benchmark, we will continue the work with the benchmark. There are still many things to be worked on with the ETS. I also think that we should still work with those other parties around the world who are planning to get some kind of trading schemes.

I still think that that will be the most efficient way of trying to regulate this, but then, of course, it is very important that we have our own systems up and running, working as efficiently and as business-friendly as possible, so that they can see that it actually works and that in the end it also benefits their possibility of providing innovation.

2-310



**Jo Leinen (S&D).** – Frau Kommissarin, herzlich willkommen im Parlament. Ich habe dem Parlamentspräsidenten einen Brief geschrieben und ihm mitgeteilt, dass alle Delegationen dieses Hauses das Thema Klimaschutz auf ihrer Agenda haben, wenn wir zu Partnern in der Welt Kontakte unterhalten. Wir müssen noch einen Mechanismus finden, wie diese Informationen und diese Ergebnisse mit Ihren Reisen um die Welt verbunden und vernetzt werden können, sodass wir hier in Brüssel und in Straßburg genau wissen, wo wir stehen.

Ich habe etwas Angst, dass die Klimaverhandlungen das Schicksal der Doha-Verhandlungen erleiden könnten. Diese werden von Jahr zu Jahr verschoben. Die Frage ist also: Was ist Ihr Plan B, um vielleicht in Teilsektoren zu Ergebnissen zu kommen? Eine Frage dann auch noch zum Kyoto-Protokoll: Ein strategischer Fehler in Bangkok war, den Eindruck zu erwecken, wir würden es aufgeben. Wie sieht es denn aus, wenn wir erst 2011 oder 2012 etwas verabschieden? Was ist die Fortsetzung des Kyoto-Protokolls?

2-311

**Frédérique Ries (ALDE).** – Madame la Présidente, je souhaite la bienvenue dans notre hémicycle à Mme Hedegaard. Madame la Commissaire, je suis ravie de vous accueillir pour votre première prestation et de vous répéter ce que je vous avais déjà dit lors de votre audition, de vous féliciter pour l'enthousiasme que vous insufflez dans nos débats, vous qui incarnez quelque part la *climate diplomacy* avec, bien sûr, encore et toujours, notre Parlement à vos côtés.

L'Europe doit être plus offensive, sortir beaucoup plus ses armes que ses intentions, j'en suis convaincue. Ma question, qui va être facile pour vous, rejoint un peu celle de mon président de la commission de l'environnement, car je suis aussi convaincue que l'Europe doit veiller désormais à intégrer systématiquement cette dimension climatique dans tous ses accords commerciaux avec les pays tiers, avec une taxe carbone européenne si c'est le seul langage que comprennent ceux qui ne veulent pas saisir l'ampleur du défi.

Une autre question peut-être un petit peu plus iconoclaste, de ma part, une proposition qui appelle en tous cas une réaction de votre part: le Parlement européen et la Commission, les institutions, ne pourraient-ils pas aussi montrer l'exemple en se proclamant *carbon neutral*, c'est-à-dire en compensant leurs émissions de CO<sub>2</sub> pour assumer au moins – mais ce n'est qu'un des aspects – le coût environnemental de nos déplacements à Strasbourg?

2-312

**Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE).** – Madam President, first I think we are also very much looking forward to this impact assessment. We are really more or less sure that 30% will be good for the European economy and also in the race for green technologies.

I have two questions, Commissioner; one is on the quick-start money. How will you link with Mr Piebalgs to make really sure that this money goes to efficiency, to renewables and, in a decentralised way, to decentralised energy production combining this also with energy poverty? The second question is, how do you bring the large European cities and progressive regions into the game, internationally as well? I was really disappointed that, in the last week's EU 2020 paper, cities and regions basically do not exist. How can we even dare to think that we will move Europe forward while ignoring citizens' regions in Europe and the impact they could have internationally?

2-313

**Connie Hedegaard, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, first to Mr Leinen, I think it is a very good idea that, whenever delegations do go out, you have the time and priority also to get climate on the agenda. This is very important and it could be very useful to compare notes, so that when you get a piece of information in one country and I get information one month later, we get together sometimes and compare notes so that we can really build on the information that we each receive.

The risk of ending up in some Doha-like process was the very reason why we applied so much pressure for Copenhagen in order to do our utmost to try and avoid that situation. You are also right that it is dangerous now: if we did not make it in Copenhagen, could it then drag on for ever? That is why I would like to see a specific road map with exact deliverables for each event, and an exact date on which we have to conclude it. I think that is a very good point.

The last question was about the Kyoto Protocol and the continuation of the Kyoto Protocol. We all know there are problems with the Kyoto Protocol. We all know there are many countries that do not want to be part of it and all these challenges. In the end, it is also a challenge for the European Union. We cannot stand there alone in the Kyoto Protocol. I think it is very important that Europe gets better at not taking the blame when we are not to be blamed.

We are not the problem vis-à-vis the Kyoto Protocol. We delivered before anybody else. We have delivered and lived up to our formal pledges in the first period from 2008 to 2012. We will deliver whatever we have pledged to deliver and we are also ready to continue the Kyoto Protocol. The EU in this context is not the problem. It is other parties that are the problem here and they will have to find out if they want an alternative, should there be one, or how they will cope with the continuation, the second commitment period.

That is why this is an open issue that we must discuss but, as Chris Davies has already said, we are dependent on what other parties do. We should be careful. Why should it be us that kills the Kyoto Protocol? We have lived up to our promises in the Kyoto Protocol, so sometimes we should be better in Europe at not taking the blame where others deserve the blame.

On the proposal on the institutions here, I can say that I have already raised that issue in my own cabinet. I think it is a natural thing. I would very much like to work with Parliament. If you could work with Parliament then I will work with the Commission. I think it is a logical thing also vis-à-vis the citizens.

To Claude Turmes, regarding the quick start and how I can link with Commissioner Piebalgs, you may have noticed that this communication was produced together with Mr Piebalgs. He has co-signed here, because we know that it is very important that we try to work together also on his portfolio and how that can be used in a very positive way. We two Commissioners are already having this kind of discussion.

I understand your point on big cities. I think that C40 and lots of other initiatives are very good, and you are also right that much of the emissions will be related to cities and lifestyle in the cities. The challenge here is that much of the planning and other types of tools that can really address these issues often lie with Member States, but I agree with you and I have also worked with some of the major cities prior to Copenhagen. That is an aspect that we should bear in mind and try to see how we can develop it further. Also, for instance, when it comes to transportation and the decarbonisation of transport, it goes without saying that the major cities will be key to finding solutions there.

2-314

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE).** – Senhora Comissária, a Conferência de Copenhaga mostrou que é preciso preparar a próxima COP a nível interno e global, a nível técnico, mas também a nível político. A nível interno a Europa tem a tarefa de implementar o pacote de energia e clima e investir nas tecnologias limpas, na investigação científica e na eficiência energética.

Liderar pelo exemplo é condição necessária, mas não é suficiente, como ficou demonstrado em Copenhaga. É, assim, fundamental desenvolver e promover o aspecto diplomático e utilizar as possibilidades oferecidas pelo Tratado de Lisboa para preparar o caminho até à próxima COP, com ambição, falando a uma só voz e fazendo as alianças estratégicas com os nossos potenciais aliados nesta matéria como é, por exemplo, o caso dos países ACP.

É importante ainda introduzir o tópico das alterações climáticas em todas as cimeiras e reuniões de alto nível. Gostaria de perguntar à Comissão e à Sra. Comissária quais os avanços nestas negociações políticas.

2-315

**Dan Jørgensen (S&D).** – Fru formand! Velkommen til Dem, fru Hedegaard! De har sagt mange gode ting, og der står mange gode ting i kommunikeet. Jeg vil fokusere på de ting, jeg er uenig i.

Jeg er meget uenig i en strategi, der går på, at vi allerede nu accepterer, at vi ikke får en aftale i Mexico. Mit spørgsmål til Dem er derfor: Er det bare noget De beslutter? Eller er det et mandat, De skal have - og hvor skal De i givet fald have det mandat fra? Er det statslederne? Eller er det den fælles beslutningsprocedure, eller hvad er det? Jeg håber nemlig, at den strategi kan laves om. For det kan ikke hjælpe noget at sige: "hvad nu, hvis der bliver bygget et kæmpe momentum op, og der er høje forventninger, og at det så ikke bliver til noget - kan man så forklare to fiaskoer?" Hør her: Det behøver De ikke være så bekymret for. USA og Kina og andre skal nok sørge for, at der ikke bliver kæmpe forventninger til Mexico. EU's rolle bør ikke være at tale forventningerne ned - EU's rolle bør være at tale forventningerne op! Hvis man allerede inden mødet siger: "Hør her, vi er villige til at acceptere, at der ikke bliver nogen særlig stor aftale, og så videre", så rykker man jo allerede inden start succeskriterierne. Så er det et helt nyt udgangspunkt, og så bliver aftalen bare endnu dårligere.

2-316

**Holger Krahmer (ALDE).** – Frau Kommissarin, ich habe zwei konkrete Fragen an Sie.

Erstens: Ich vermisste in Ihrem Papier eine Analyse der europäischen Verhandlungsposition auf internationaler Ebene. Haben wir wirklich zur Kenntnis genommen, dass Europas Einfluss in der Klimapolitik zurückgegangen ist? Haben wir zur Kenntnis genommen, dass sich die politischen und ökonomischen Gewichte dieser Welt sehr stark nach Asien verschoben haben? Haben wir uns da möglicherweise nicht völlig überschätzt?

Zweitens: Ihr Papier ist bemerkenswert. Es enthält auf den zwölf Seiten, die Sie vollgeschrieben haben, nicht einen einzigen Bezug zum IPCC-Panel. Ist das eine schleichende Distanzierung von diesem Gremium? Zur Erinnerung: Dieses Gremium war die Entscheidungsgrundlage für alle politischen Richtlinien, die wir in den letzten Jahren hier verfasst haben. Wäre es nicht an der Zeit gewesen, hier einen breiten wissenschaftlichen Ansatz zu fordern, der uns tatsächlich wissenschaftliche Aussagen liefert und nicht politische?

2-317

**Connie Hedegaard, Member of the Commission.** – Madam President, it is definitely a clear ‘no’ to the latter point on the IPCC. If I should distance myself from everything that is not in this paper, then I would distance myself from a lot of things. This is a way of trying to take for granted that we are facing a challenge, that we have to solve it and that the EU has to take the lead in terms of how to solve it. That is the thinking behind this paper.

I do not agree that the EU does not have an impact on international negotiations. You are quite right that we do not have as much impact as we would like, to think that we could just dictate what is going on. We are dependent upon others.

However, we saw something very new in Copenhagen: whereas in the past the EU often had only a few partners when going into international negotiations and trying to get things done, this time leaders representing more than 80% of global emissions in Copenhagen promised that, from now on, they would also be on track. That changes the whole dynamic substantially. May I remind you that to get the emerging economies on board and to get them to be co-responsible has been a European priority for years, and that was actually achieved in Copenhagen.

To Mrs Carvalho: yes, I agree very much that we should prepare both technically and politically, and that we should be better at doing so, not least so that, when we come to the negotiating table, we do not just say what we want and then, when the rest of the world disagrees with us, we do not really know what to do because we have expended all our energy trying to come together on a very firm and detailed formulated position. We should be more flexible in the way we negotiate this.

2-318

- og så til sidst til Dan Jørgensen: Jeg er selvfølgelig uenig i, at vi ikke skal have en aftale i Mexico. Det, der er diskussionen, det er: tror vi, at vi kan få alle detaljer, inklusive aftalens form, på plads i Mexico. Det er der, min bekymring er. Jeg mener sådan set, at vi netop øger presset på USA og på Kina og på andre ved at sige, at der skal være helt konkrete ”deliverables”, helt konkrete resultater skal nås i Cancún. Det kan ikke bare udskydes.

Jeg prøver at gøre det svært for dem ikke at levere i Mexico. Jeg tror, at hvis man skal nå det, så skal man nok passe på med at fokusere for meget på den juridiske form, for det kunne godt blokere for, at vi kunne blive enige om nogle indholdsmæssige ting. Der er en masse mellemregninger i dette her, en masse ”hvad tror vi, hvad hører vi – hvad tror vi f.eks. er muligt at få USA med til tre uger efter, at de har haft et midtvejsvalg?”. Der er mange faktorer, der indgår i det her, men jeg tror, at Dan Jørgensen kender mig godt nok til at vide, at det jo ikke er fordi, jeg ikke synes, at vi skal være ambitiøse i Mexico. Vi skal bare prøve at definere, hvad det maksimale er, vi kan få ud af Mexico. Det er sådan set det, der er omdrejningspunktet for strategien, som jeg har prøvet at præsentere her i dag.

2-319

**Die Präsidentin.** – Verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es sind mehr Kollegen nicht zu Wort gekommen als zu Wort gekommen sind. Wir hatten zu wenig Zeit. Ich hoffe, Sie verstehen das. Ich danke allen für die disziplinierte Diskussion. Ich danke Ihnen, Frau Kommissarin. Ich hoffe, wir sehen uns häufiger hier im Plenum. Das wird wahrscheinlich der Fall sein.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

### *Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149)*

2-319-250

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE), în scris.** – UE are toate șansele să devină liderul acțiunilor de reducere a emisiilor de CO<sub>2</sub>. Summit-ul de la Copenhaga i-a lăsat poate pe mulți cu gustul dezamăgirii din cauza reținerii unora dintre participanți în a își asuma niște ținte clare pentru prevenirea schimbărilor climatice. India și China au transmis recent către ONU mesaje privind determinarea lor de a îndeplini țintele asumate prin acordul de la Copenhaga, așa vag cum a fost el. Este un semnal important iar UE poate prelua inițiativa la nivel mondial pentru a readuce la aceeași masă toate statele, în special pe cele asiatice ale căror capacități industriale cresc în fiecare lună. Schimbările climatice sunt o certitudine, cum este și o certitudine faptul că poluarea este cea care le accelerează. Ambițiile UE de a da un exemplu în acțiunile de reducere a poluării devin astfel justificate. Iar obiectivul de a deveni cea mai ne-poluată regiune la nivel mondial nu poate fi decât în folosul nostru. Avantajele nu constau numai în beneficiul imediat al unui mediu mai curat. O re-orientare la nivel european către o industrie și economie verde va aduce locuri de muncă, va deschide noi drumuri cercetării și, nu în ultimul rând, va reduce cheltuielile fiecărui stat.

2-319-500

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), por escrito.** – Sendo certo que a preservação da atmosfera terrestre deverá ser uma responsabilidade partilhada pelos diversos países, é também claro que a influência que cada um desses países foi exercendo sobre a atmosfera ao longo da história – e a que ainda hoje exerce – é muito diferente, o que determina que essa responsabilidade, por razões de elementar justiça, tenha de ser diferenciada. Por outro lado, a definição da responsabilidade de cada país no esforço global de redução de emissões terá, pelas mesmas razões de justiça, que ter em conta as respectivas bases populacionais. As emissões per capita da China são hoje quatro vezes inferiores às dos EUA e cerca de metade da média das emissões da UE. A Índia tem cerca um décimo das emissões médias da UE e vinte vezes

menos do que as dos EUA. Neste momento, na Índia, há cerca de 500 milhões de pessoas (aproximadamente a população da UE) sem acesso à electricidade. São por isso despropositadas e injustas as tentativas de responsabilização destes países pelo fracasso de Copeganha. Já para não falar na ridícula responsabilização dos países da ALBA, feita por uma resolução deste parlamento, uma posição só justificada por um facciosismo político absolutamente primário, que desvirtua e subverte o que efectivamente se passou em Copeganha.

2-320

**Adam Gierek (S&D), na piśmie.** – To, co tak usilnie od lat lobbuje Komisja Europejska i jej Przewodniczący w sprawie „ambitnej” polityki klimatycznej i energetycznej, to zwyczajna próba zniszczenia przemysłu UE. Polityka ta to wynik bądź to niewiedzy pogłębianej przez IPCC, bądź też zwyczajnej głupoty, albo też jest to rezultat nadmiaru cynizmu prowadzącego do sabotażu gospodarczego. Szkoda, że lewica nie rozszyfrowała, iż jest to zwyczajna pułapka na nią, bowiem najwięcej amatorów na handel emisjami rekrutuje się wśród tych, którzy już raz wywołali kryzys. Tym razem jednak „banka finansowa” będzie znacznie większa. Już teraz szkody spowodowane tą samobójczą polityką są ogromne, zwłaszcza dla mojego kraju – Polski. Niepotrzebna jest wojna. Łatwiej jest kraj zrujnować niż odbudować. Wzywam Komisję – opamiętajcie się Państwo, bo to, co robicie jest nie tylko antyeuropejskie, lecz antyhumanitarne. Potrzebna jest natychmiastowa rewizja pakietu klimatyczno-energetycznego. Tym się zajmijcie, a nie namawianiem innych do samobójstwa gospodarczego. Zielona gospodarka – tak, ale to przecież recykling materiałowy i energetyczny, kogeneracja, termomodernizacja, energia odnawialna tam, gdzie nie ma innej, utylizacja ścieków, energetyka atomowa, większa oszczędność energii i wyższa sprawność energetyczna i inne. Czy zatem emisja CO<sub>2</sub> ma też związek z taką „zieloną” gospodarką? Tak, ale paradoksalnie wtedy, gdy emisja wzrośnie... Ale to dobrze...

2-320-500

**Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), kirjallinen.** – Arvoisa puhemies, kiitän komission jäsen Hedegaardia siitä, että hän osoitti ymmärtävänsä ilmastopolitiikan perusdilemman: EU ei voi vähentää yksin, koska silloin eivät ainoastaan omat tuloksemme valu hukkaan vaan synnytämme riskin, että ympäristö kokonaisuutena kärsii. Jos eurooppalainen tuotanto ei pärjää Euroopassa päästökaupan korkean kustannusnousun vuoksi, ja jos näin ollen vaikkapa terästä tai paperia tuotetaan siellä missä se tehdään suuremmilla päästöillä kuin Euroopassa, päästöt kokonaisuutena kasvavat. Yksipuolinen kunnianhimo ei ole kunnianhimoa: vasta kun toimimme yhdessä samoin pelisäännöin, on helppo kiristää vyötä tuntuvasti. Pohjaksi tämä vaatii toisenlaisen ilmastostrategian, ominaispäästöjen johdonmukaisen leikkaamisen. Se on taloudellisista suhdanteista riippumatonta dekarbonisaatiota, joka palkitsee vähentäjää aina, toisin kuin nykyinen päästökaupmallimme. Muun muassa Kiina, Japani ja USA ovat kiinnostuneita tästä strategiasta, siksi EU:nkin pitäisi päivittää strategiansa vastaamaan nykytilannetta. Kysynkin, onko järkeä pitäytyä päästökaupassa vielä 2012 jälkeen, kun nyt näyttää siltä ettei maailmalla synny sellaisia päästökauppajärjestelmiä, jotka olisivat linkitettävissä omaamme. Jollei päästöoikeuksien määräytyminen ja allokointi ole verrannollisia, on mahdotonta välttää kilpailun vääristyminen. Kun aloimme vajaan kymmenen vuotta sitten laatia päästökauppadirektiiviä, koko järjestelmää markkinoitiin meille valmistautumisena globaaliin päästökauppaan. Hankkisimme osaamista ja kokemusta. Se kokemus on totisesti tullut kalliiksi, eikä ympäristöhyöty ole millään lailla selvä. Päästövähennykset voitaisiin toteuttaa vähemmän markkinahäiriöille ja spekulatiolle altistavalla tavalla. Katsooko komissio, että yksipuolinen jatkaminen on perusteltua?

2-321

**Elżbieta Katarzyna Lukacijewska (PPE), na piśmie.** – Pani Przewodnicząca, Pani Komisarz, Szczyt w Kopenhadze na który jechaliśmy jako liderzy zmian klimatycznych był porażką i pokazał, że tylko Europa jest zainteresowana ograniczeniem emisji CO<sub>2</sub>. Pani Komisarz zapowiedziała, że mimo jego fiaska walka z globalnym ociepleniem będzie nadal w centrum polityki europejskiej. Teraz budujemy nową strategię przed szczytem w Meksyku, musimy więc odpowiedzieć sobie na pytanie gdzie popełniliśmy błąd i zweryfikować nasze stanowisko oraz oczekiwania, bo świat nie jest gotowy, aby sprostać dzisiaj tak dużym ograniczeniom. Mam więc do Pani Komisarz trzy pytania: Po pierwsze, jak będziemy negocjować i jakie przed sobą postawimy cele, aby szczyt w Meksyku nie zakończył się podobnie jak szczyt w Kopenhadze? Po drugie, czy Komisja Europejska zweryfikowała informacje o globalnym ociepleniu i topnieniu lodowców w kontekście mylnych czy nieprawdziwych informacji podawanych przez niektórych naukowców? I po trzecie, czy zgodzi się Pani Komisarz z moim stwierdzeniem, że bez zgody na znaczące ograniczenie emisji przez USA, Chiny, Rosję i Indie wysiłek Unii Europejskiej i koszty jakie ponosimy pójdą na marne?

2-322

**Bogdan Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz (PPE), na piśmie.** – Podstawowym wyzwaniem, jakie stoi przed Unią Europejską po szczycie w Kopenhadze, jest jak najszybsze wypracowanie niezbędnej wspólnej mapy drogowej przed szczytem COP 16 w Meksyku. Kopenhaga uświadomiła nam, że dobre intencje nie wystarczą. W jej efekcie możemy dojść do czterech następujących konkluzji: po pierwsze Unia Europejska nie będzie w pełni skuteczna wyznaczając jedynie ramy do naśladowania. Europa powinna udzielić państwom rozwijającym się realnego wsparcia sprzyjając ambitnym wspólnotowym celom emisyjnym. Po drugie, Unia Europejska musi ponownie podjąć dyskusję ze Stanami Zjednoczonymi w ramach transatlantyckiego przywództwa wraz z innymi wiodącymi potęgami światowymi. Po trzecie, Unia Europejska powinna bardziej racjonalnie podejść do strategii redukcji emisji CO<sub>2</sub>, mając na względzie obniżenie emisji przy jednoczesnym uniknięciu wysokich kosztów adaptacji. Po czwarte, Unia Europejska powinna zintensyfikować swoje starania w celu budowy sprawnej gospodarki niskoemisyjnej. Pani Komisarz, pytanie jest proste, czy w Europie jest klimat do takich zmian?

2-323

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE), în scris.** – Salut locul important acordat combaterii schimbărilor climatice în Comunicarea Comisiei - Europa 2020 - O strategie europeană pentru o creștere inteligentă, ecologică și favorabilă incluziunii.

Două aspecte sunt de subliniat. În primul rând, faptul că un instrument important îl reprezintă investirea în tehnologii mai ecologice, cu emisii reduse de carbon. Aceste investiții vor proteja mediul, dar în același timp vor crea noi oportunități de afaceri și noi locuri de muncă. Uniunea Europeană poate să ocupe un loc important pe piața mondială în acest sector. De asemenea, este importantă așa-numita Inițiativă emblematică: „O Europă eficientă din punctul de vedere al utilizării resurselor”. Solicitarea exprimată de Comisie ca statele membre să utilizeze fondurile structurale pentru a investi în construcția de clădiri publice eficiente din punct de vedere energetic este desigur o parte a soluției, însă consider că trebuie să acordăm o atenție cel puțin egală sectorului rezidențial, mai precis clădirilor de locuințe colective construite în trecut care sunt marii consumatori de energie din unele state membre, mai ales cele din est.

2-324

**Rovana Plumb (S&D), în scris.** – Consider că am învățat din eșecul de la Copenhaga și pentru a demonstra acest lucru trebuie să ne revizuiim strategia în vederea obținerii unui acord juridic obligatoriu în Mexic.

Este nevoie de acțiuni prompte pentru a transpune în fapte acordul politic, precum operaționalizarea celor 7,2 milioane de euro destinate „finanțării inițiale rapide” pentru țările în curs de dezvoltare.

UE a notificat dorința de a fi asociată la Acord și a prezentat, cu titlu informativ, un angajament unilateral de a reduce emisiile globale ale UE cu 20% față de nivelurile din 1990 și, într-o ofertă condiționată, de a crește la 30% acest procentaj de reducere dacă și alți mari generatori de emisii sunt de acord să contribuie într-o proporție corespunzătoare la efortul global de reducere.

Până la 18 februarie, 40 de state au notificat planul de reducere și 100 au aderat la Acord, dar nu este suficient.

Solicit Înalțului Reprezentant și Comisarului pentru combaterea schimbărilor climatice să ne prezinte urgent o strategie de diplomație climatică, iar UE și SM să includă politicile privind schimbările climatice în toate parteneriatele strategice bilaterale și multilaterale în vederea atingerii obiectivului major.

Parteneriatele strategice pentru combaterea schimbărilor climatice trebuie să includă ONG-urile și societatea civilă.

2-325

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D), in writing.** – Despite the disappointment of Copenhagen, some good progress was made, including the short-term financing we secured for developing countries. Not only will this provide concrete help on the ground, it will also help to build trust between partners who were divided at Copenhagen.

In the coming months and years, we have to show the developing world that we will honour our commitments to funding for adaptation and mitigation, and we need to be sure that the funds are spent in the best possible way in order to achieve their objectives.

Essential progress was also made in Copenhagen regarding monitoring, reporting and verification. These link directly to building trust, because such a system will enable us to see that everyone is playing their part and will allow us to determine the effectiveness of our policies and how we should adapt them in the future. The European Union needs to continue to implement its Emission Trading Scheme and other initiatives, such as energy reductions in buildings. We need to meet our emissions targets and show how we can all benefit from energy savings. Providing a successful example of an emission reduction policy which translates into benefits for ordinary people is the best way of convincing others to follow.

2-326

## 12 - Zweiter europäischer Roma-Gipfel (Aussprache)

2-327

**Die Präsidentin.** – Als nächster Punkt folgen die Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung an Rat und Kommission über den zweiten europäischen Roma-Gipfel. (B7-0013/2010 ; B7-0014/2010 ; B7-0202/2010 ; B7-0203/2010).

2-328

**Monika Flašíková Beňová, autorka.** – Všetky poslanceké otázky predložené Komisii a Rade pri príležitosti nadchádzajúceho Európskeho samitu o Rómoch spája niekoľko spoločných menovateľov.

Prvým je nespokojnosť so súčasnou situáciou väčšiny Rómov v Európskej únii. S touto témou úzko súvisí aj nespokojnosť s čerpaním alebo s úrovňou čerpania prostriedkov z predstupových a štrukturálnych fondov na účel začlenenia Rómov do zvyšku spoločnosti, ako aj ich resocializácie. Ďalším dôležitým bodom je aj úloha organizácií občianskej spoločnosti vrátane rómskych organizácií na zapojenie do riešenia problémov.

Obidva body sú dôležité, ale chcela by som pripomenúť, že veľmi dôležitý je aj spôsob, ako sa uvedené problémy budú riešiť. Buďme k sebe úprimní – po dlhých rokoch vágnych politických deklarácií a nečinnosti viacerí cítíme akútnu potrebu konečne prejsť ku konkrétnym krokom. Som nekompromisnou zástankyňou ľudských práv a všetky moje vystúpenia na pôde Európskeho parlamentu počas ostatných šiestich rokov vždy tento kontext zahrňali. Počas týchto šiestich rokov som si tiež vypočula niekoľko diskusií o diskriminácii rómskeho etnika a o potrebe riešenia problémov rómskeho etnika. Napriek bohatým rozpravám sme dodnes neboli schopní prijať žiadne zásadné nástroje na konkrétne vyriešenie a som presvedčená, že je to spôsobené najmä tým, že sa formálne zameriavame na terminus technicus *diskriminácia* a neriešime skutočné dôvody, ktoré spôsobujú súčasný stav, v ktorom rómski spoluobčania žijú.

Ak teda chceme skutočne riešiť problém Rómov, musíme sa v prvom rade zamerať na dodržiavanie medzinárodných zmlúv vnútorného práva, ale aj medzinárodných dohovorov. Mám tu na mysli najmä dohovor o právach dieťaťa, ktorého ustanovenia sú v mnohých rómskych rodinách porušované. Budem hovoriť o Slovenskej republike, kde majú zabezpečenú bezplatnú starostlivosť a bezplatné vzdelávanie na základných a stredných školách. Všetko toto zabezpečuje a financuje štát. Napriek tomu ani v týchto dvoch politikách nie sú dodržiavané základné práva dieťaťa.

Ak chceme skutočne objektívne hovoriť o riešení problémov Rómov, potom musíme riešiť dôvody a príčiny, ktoré k diskriminácii vedú.

2-329

**PRESIDE: ALEJO VIDAL-QUADRAS**

*Vicepresidente*

2-330

**Hélène Flautre, auteur.** – Monsieur le Président, l'Agence des droits fondamentaux rapporte que les Roms cumulent l'ensemble des discriminations dans tous les domaines, qu'il s'agisse de l'accès à l'emploi, à la santé, à l'éducation ou encore au logement. Ils sont ainsi la minorité la plus discriminée d'Europe.

En 2009, par exemple, en moyenne un Rom sur quatre était victime d'un crime contre la personne, notamment agressions, menaces et harcèlement grave, au moins une fois au cours des douze derniers mois, alors que, dans le même temps, un Rom sur trois est interpellé par la police en moyenne quatre fois au cours des douze derniers mois. Leur situation de marginalisation est encore alimentée par le manque de conscience de leurs propres droits.

Cette situation, qui est celle de près de dix millions de personnes au cœur de l'Union européenne, désormais dotée de la charte des droits fondamentaux et bientôt signataire de la convention européenne des droits de l'homme, interpelle profondément la politique de non-discrimination et d'effectivité des droits, tant au niveau de l'UE que des États membres. Il aura fallu les violences racistes en Italie de décembre 2007 pour qu'une mobilisation européenne de grande ampleur, de haut niveau, aboutisse enfin à l'organisation du premier sommet européen de septembre 2008.

Cependant, l'appel à une stratégie-cadre de l'Union européenne sur l'intégration des Roms, y compris une directive d'inclusion des Roms, n'a toujours pas vu le jour. Les États membres qui maintiennent – à l'instar de la France mais d'autres également – des mesures transitoires pour l'accès à leurs marchés pour les Bulgares et les Roumains pénalisent en premier lieu les Roms et doivent les lever au plus vite en signe de volontarisme politique.

Les États membres enfin doivent renoncer à négocier des accords de réadmission bilatéraux avec le Kosovo, qui aboutissent au renvoi des Roms dans des camps contaminés au plomb, dans le nord de Mitrovica, comme le commissaire aux droits de l'homme du Conseil de l'Europe, M. Hammarberg, a pu le montrer.

Quant à la Commission européenne, je souhaite lui rappeler la résolution du Parlement européen du 11 mars 2009 sur la situation sociale des Roms. En cette année de lutte contre la pauvreté, je crois que nous pourrions enfin décider d'utiliser au mieux nos instruments et nos Fonds structurels en vue de remédier à cette grave situation.

2-331

**Diego López Garrido, Presidente en ejercicio del Consejo.** – Señor Presidente, voy a contestar a las preguntas planteadas por la señora Flašíková Beňová y la señora Flautre, en relación con un asunto que afecta directamente a los derechos humanos, que nos afecta a todos nosotros y que afecta a una importante población. Porque la población gitana, como es sabido, es la primera minoría étnica que vive en la Unión Europea, y no precisamente al mismo nivel que la media de los ciudadanos y ciudadanas de la Unión.

Para ser concreto en relación con las preguntas que me han hecho, hay una primera que habla de la aplicación de los Fondos Estructurales en este ámbito y debo decirles que las conclusiones que la Presidencia española pretende adoptar en el Consejo incluyen esos diez principios básicos, entre los cuales está la revisión o modificación de los actuales programas operativos de los Fondos Estructurales, así como los futuros reglamentos a partir de 2014.

Se insiste en que se haga pleno uso de los Fondos Estructurales para promover la integración de la población romaní y, en concreto, proponemos que se pongan en marcha acciones integrales, tanto en las zonas rurales como urbanas, a partir de la reciente modificación del artículo 7 del FEDER. Y esto persigue una promoción integral de las comunidades romaníes a partir de la mejora de su situación de vivienda y entorno.

La segunda pregunta se refiere a la acción de las autoridades locales. Nosotros entendemos que, para que los Fondos Estructurales sean accesibles a la población romaní, es necesario que se impliquen activamente las autoridades locales, así como las organizaciones romaníes, incluida la propia población romaní, en todas las fases del proceso, es decir, la planificación, la gestión, el seguimiento y la evaluación de los fondos europeos.

También va a proponer el Consejo en sus conclusiones que la Comisión Europea preste apoyo técnico y orientación a los Estados miembros y las autoridades locales, y que se facilite una coordinación horizontal entre Estados y vertical entre el nivel europeo, el nacional, el regional y el local.

Una tercera pregunta se refiere a si el Trío de Presidencias tiene una propuesta estratégica, una agenda estratégica, a ese respecto. Tengo que decirles que, en el programa del Trío de Presidencias, se habla explícitamente de la integración social y económica de los gitanos. Es una expresión que está en el programa aprobado por el Consejo de Asuntos Generales de forma unánime y que, por tanto, se corresponde con la estrategia para el próximo año y medio, que es al que se extiende el programa del Trío de Presidencias.

Nosotros entendemos que hay que apostar por medidas a corto plazo y largo plazo. En el corto plazo tenemos que priorizar los instrumentos a los que me he referido anteriormente y adoptar además un plan de trabajo para que se aborden inmediatamente problemas como el de los alumnos que van a escuelas especiales, en algunos casos mayoritariamente, o solamente, para gitanos –con lo que hay, por tanto, una desagregación evidente–, o problemas en relación con la vivienda –de los que se ha hablado anteriormente–, así como en el campo de la salud y en el acceso al empleo por cuenta ajena, para corregir las desigualdades.

Y en el largo plazo queremos también que haya un enfoque horizontal, *mainstreaming*, de los asuntos romaníes en todas las políticas de la Unión Europea, y que habrá de hacerse en el marco del llamado método abierto de coordinación y en campos como los derechos fundamentales, la lucha contra la discriminación, el desarrollo regional, la educación, el acceso a los empleos públicos y a los servicios públicos.

Y, por último, en cuanto a los temas de no discriminación, es sabido que la Presidencia española intenta promover a lo largo de su semestre, y el Trío de Presidencias también, la aprobación de una directiva que lleva tiempo en la Unión Europea sin poder aprobarse, sin llegar a sus últimas consecuencias, que es la directiva integral de la lucha contra la discriminación y por la igualdad de trato, que es esencial precisamente para aquellos colectivos que sufren especialmente discriminación y, por tanto, en concreto, la comunidad romaní.

2-332

**Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to thank Mr Swoboda and his colleagues for tabling this oral question on the European Roma summit. It allows the Commission to express its commitment to ensuring the protection of fundamental rights, on the one hand, and full social and economic integration into our societies on the other. We have just heard the Council making a real plea about the way the Member States have to go ahead by putting this in the mainstream of their policies.

As you know, this debate is taking place just some weeks before the second Roma summit, which will be hosted in Córdoba by the Spanish Presidency on 8 and 9 April. The Commission welcomes and actively supports this initiative. I think this initiative will be a welcome moment to take stock of developments at national, European and international level since 2008. It will then help us to contribute to a common perspective for the future.

Two years ago the first summit was held. How far have we got? You can see a glass as being half full or half empty. Of course there have been significant improvements but there are also significant gaps. Your question rightly highlights the central role of the European Union's instruments and policies and the importance of strengthening cooperation between all the key actors – Member States, institutions at European level, international organisations and civil society.

The Commission is committed to enforcing a directive which prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race and ethnic origin, and Roma discrimination is fully covered by this directive. We now have legislation at European level and the framework decision on racism and xenophobia, which will be a key tool to tackle the racism that Roma people suffer from.

By November of this year, all Member States should put into place criminal penalties for racist and xenophobic crimes, as laid down in the framework decision. As I have already announced, I am committed to monitoring the implementation of this framework decision as closely as possible.

The Commission is fully aware that this is not enough and that strong legislation needs to be complemented by information and awareness-raising about rights and obligations. To this end, the Commission is addressing Roma issues in the context of the EU campaign 'For Diversity. Against Discrimination' and in specific training for legal practitioners.

Quite rightly, the structural funds, the rural development funds and the instruments for pre-accession were underlined as being important levers for change because they allow Member States to implement ambitious programmes which are targeted to the Roma. It is evident that these programmes must be very down to earth and pragmatic, based on evidence and must approach the living conditions of the Roma in all their complexity.

This is not an issue that can be solved by a simple slogan. It needs a lot of concrete work. That is why the Commission is encouraging Member States to use the full potential of these funds to support Roma inclusion. To this end, we have launched a series of high-level bilateral visits to Member States with significant Roma populations. They should lead the concrete commitments with agreed targets. The first event took place in October 2009 in Hungary with the full cooperation of the Government. Others will be organised in the future.

Another concrete example of the Commission's commitment to using the Structural Funds for tackling Roma exclusion is the amendment that has been proposed to Article 7(2) of the Regulation on the European Regional Development Fund. A very large majority in this House voted for the report by your colleague, Mr van Nistelrooij, at the beginning of last month: a measure which opens new policy and funding opportunities for housing for the benefit of marginalised communities where we can target the Roma specifically, although not exclusively.

Finally, thanks to the European Parliament, there are the pilot projects on Roma inclusion, with a budget of EUR 5 million over two years. This pilot project addresses early childhood education, self-employment through micro credits and public awareness. The evaluation of this pilot project will be carried out jointly by the UNDP and the World Bank. I am very much looking forward to this evaluation because the evaluation will bring us the information about what we have done well and where the deficiencies are so that we can build on this in order to go ahead with a very targeted action afterwards.

The European platform for Roma inclusion was launched as a joint initiative of the Commission and the Czech Presidency in April 2009. Its objective is to bring together relevant actors at European, national and international level, as well as actors from civil society, and make existing policies altogether much more coherent. This platform has led to the elaboration of the common basic principles for Roma inclusion, which is annexed to the Council conclusions on Roma inclusion adopted in June of last year. These conclusions call upon the Commission to take the 10 common basic principles for Roma inclusion into account when designing and implementing policies. Further meetings of the platform are expected to take place under the Spanish Presidency and the Belgian Presidency so it is not a one-off action but it is followed up. I very much welcome the strong commitment of the trio of presidencies on this objective because we need to play into each other's hands so that progress can be made. The Commission will continue to contribute to the trio's actions through its policies and instruments, in close partnership of course with Member States and civil society.

Ahead of the Roma summit, I would like to inform this House that my colleague Commissioner Andor and I will publish a communication on the social inclusion of the Roma people, looking at the challenges ahead and outlining the EU's contribution to meeting this challenge. This communication will then be the basis of the discussion in Córdoba.

2-333

**Livia Járóka, a PPE képviselőcsoport nevében.** – A hátrányos megkülönböztetés elleni nemzetközi és nemzeti jogszabályok hatékonyabb alkalmazása mellett, ahogy biztos asszony is mondta, a romák társadalmi befogadásának gazdasági szempontjaira kell, hogy nagy hangsúlyt fektessünk majd Cordobában, hiszen a romák munkaerőpiaci integrálása és oktatási integrációja a tagállamok egyik elsődleges gazdasági érdeke is. Az elmúlt években több nemzetközi szervezet is előremutató terveket dolgozott ki, de ezek a megfelelő kötelezőerő, az esetleges szankciók kilátásba helyezése és a megfelelő költségvetés hozzárendelésének hiánya miatt nem váltak valóra a tagállamokban.

Az Európai Unió képes biztosítani egy nem kötelező erejű, úgynevezett „soft law” eszközökön túlmutató közösségi stratégia kialakítását, illetve annak megfelelő végrehajtását és egyértelmű indikátorok alapján történő értékelését. Mint az európai roma stratégia európai parlamenti jelentésteveje rendkívül fontosnak tartom, hogy a stratégia behatárolja azokat a válságterületeket a tagállamokban, ahol azonnali beavatkozásra van szükség. A társadalmi hátrányok ugyanis egyenletlenül oszlanak meg a különböző földrajzi területeken, és a mélyszegény romák és nem romák által sűrűn lakott olyan mikrorégiókban koncentrálódnak a nyomor és a társadalmi kirekesztés, ami súlyos akadályt jelent az európai társadalmi fejlődésnek. Az ilyen térségeket ki kell emelni a számukra esélytelen versenyből és a sajátos igényekhez igazított intenzív programok révén meg kell kezdeni a fejlesztésüket.

A szubszidiaritás elvének megfelelően a stratégia felügyeletét és ellenőrzését helyi szervezeteknek kell végrehajtaniuk, valamint javasolnám, hogy az ír agrártenderekhez hasonlóan kiterjedt felméréseket végezzünk a helyi célcsoportoknak az igényeiről. A program eredményének értékeléséhez elengedhetetlen az etnikai bontásban feldolgozott és függetlenül



kiértékelt statisztikai adatok gyűjtése is. Az Európai Néppárt szerint ezek azok a kulcsfontosságú pontok, amelyek felé, úgy érezzük, hogy a cordobai magas szintű találkozóknak mutatnia kell.

2-334

**Claude Moraes**, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, as the previous speaker said and as the Commissioner said, this is a deeply complex problem, so the oral question that we pose today is a bid from our group, certainly, and I am sure from all the groups, to renew and refresh the debate on the Roma issue.

Roma communities in Europe continue to face unacceptable levels of prejudice, and in many cases violence. However, as we see from the Decade of Roma Inclusion Initiative, there is a genuine feeling in this House that we want to see a comprehensive approach.

However, we have talked about this comprehensive approach before. There is a need in this House to reassess what we have done from the issue of micro-credits to tackling racial violence, and for all of these complex issues we must have a comprehensive strategy.

There is a growing amount of evidence that the situation on the ground is not improving enough. The Open Society Institute talks about prejudice and violence faced by Roma communities across Europe not decreasing. Additionally, the Fundamental Rights Agency's discrimination survey found that the Roma were discriminated against more than any other group surveyed.

We owe it to this House to see that the existing legislation – the Race Equality Directive, the Council framework on tackling violence – is actually implemented, and we owe it to our comprehensive strategy, as has been said earlier, that we look at this as a complex problem but a problem that requires action, an integrated approach, a comprehensive approach.

So let this oral question be a bid to refresh this debate and come up with new solutions and implement those laws which already exist which should be helping Roma communities.

2-335

**Renate Weber**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, in view of the second Roma summit I would like to share with you a couple of ideas, in the hope that they will take effect as soon as possible.

Firstly, I strongly believe we need a broad and coherent strategy on Roma inclusion and we also need an action plan with clear benchmarks and appropriate budgeting. In my view, it should be a strategy not only for the EU Member States, but also for other countries where Roma communities live and which are either in the enlargement process or in the Neighbourhood Policy, thus allowing the EU to use the most appropriate tools available to it on Roma policies.

Secondly, I am convinced that we must apply the lessons learned from the gender equality policy, namely mainstreaming. 'Roma mainstreaming' should become the working approach of all EU institutions.

Thirdly, when it comes to the expertise on Roma we should consider some affirmative actions, especially hiring Roma experts in the Council, the Commission and Parliament. It is on this note that I have prepared letters to President Van Rompuy and President Barroso recommending them to lead by example and hire Roma advisors.

2-336

**Jean Lambert**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I would like to echo the calls that have been made for a comprehensive strategy here.

As has been pointed out, we are now in the European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion, which we know is difficult in times of recession, and that is why we have been asking for social conditionality on rescue packages so that those who are the most excluded do not find themselves falling even further behind.

We have heard already that the gap is widening, which is why our EU 2020 strategy also needs to take into account the need to reduce the gaps between rich and poor.

The changes in the regional development funds are important. Local authorities, we would agree with the Council, are important because that is so often where discrimination is most closely felt, on housing and the specific needs of the Roma people there, on education, and on the police whose job it is to protect and not simply to criminalise, as seems to be the way in some Member States.

And we want to see high-quality public services. Council will remember its recommendation on the active inclusion of those furthest from the labour market where high-quality public services are seen as crucial.

We are interested to know whether Council and Commission are happy with the absorption rate being shown for funds at the moment.

I would also welcome the context change that was strongly put out by the Commission in terms of anti-racism and xenophobia, and would hope that every Member State government would commit itself to those ideals.

2-337

**Peter van Dalen**, *namens de ECR-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, het is goed en ook nodig dat dit Parlement zich het lot van de Roma aantrekt. In de afgelopen eeuwen was discriminatie soms nog het minst erge wat hen overkwam. Het is noodzakelijk om de Europese fondsen en de Europese richtlijnen in te zetten om de integratie van de Roma te bevorderen en hun achterstand weg te werken. Ik vind het ook belangrijk dat er een goede strategie wordt ontwikkeld om te zorgen dat de Europese miljoenen daadwerkelijk terecht komen bij de mensen die het nodig hebben. De nadruk moet daarbij liggen op het onderwijs. We moeten de Roma-kinderen toerusten om de negatieve cyclus die er helaas is, te doorbreken.

Ik voeg wel twee elementen toe aan deze discussie vandaag. In de eerste plaats vind ik het niet goed dat veel Roma in een slachtofferrol blijven hangen. Ze zullen ook zelf actie moeten ondernemen om de vele misstanden in hun gemeenschappen weg te nemen en weg te werken.

In de tweede plaats, met Europees geld en met Europese regelgeving kan de integratie van de Roma niet worden afgedwongen. Uiteindelijk zullen de lidstaten, waar de Roma vaak al vele generaties wonen, het voortouw moeten nemen om in eigen land het vraagstuk van de Roma-integratie op te pakken. Dit is veel meer een maatschappelijke uitdaging dan een politieke of een financiële. Europees geld kan en mag hooguit dienen als steunje in de rug.

2-338

**Cornelia Ernst**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Als ich im Dezember 2009 in Pristina und in Mitrovica war und sah, wie die Menschen in der Mahalla und vor allem in den bleivergifteten Camps leben, war ich ziemlich erschüttert, vor allem auch über die Lage der Kinder. Ich erfuhr in fast jedem Gespräch, dass es nicht nur im Kosovo, sondern in sehr vielen Ländern Europas schlimm um eine der ältesten Bevölkerungsgruppen Europas steht, nämlich die Roma. Ich traf auf Bekim Sylva vom Roma- und Ashkali-Dokumentationszentrum in Pristina, der uns mit den Worten empfing: „Wir sind der Worte müde.“

Es muss gehandelt werden, und deshalb ist die allergrößte Erwartung an Córdoba, dass nicht nur geredet, sondern unverzüglich gehandelt wird. Und unverzügliches Handeln heißt, sich nicht zurückzulehnen hinter die EU-Richtlinien zur Verwirklichung der Gleichberechtigung, der Gleichbehandlung ohne Unterschied von Rasse oder ethnischer Herkunft, aber auch nicht hinter die Beschäftigungs-Rahmenrichtlinie, weil es nichts nützt. Unverzügliches Handeln setzt voraus, zu erkennen und davon auszugehen, dass diese Richtlinien eben nicht ausreichen, um die Roma in der Europäischen Union vor erniedrigender und diskriminierender Behandlung zu schützen und dauerhaft – darauf kommt es an – zu integrieren. Was wir brauchen, ist daher eine europäische Roma-Strategie, die Bestandteil aller Politikfelder ist, integrativer Bestandteil jedweder Politik.

Die Mehrzahl der Regierungen führt aber nur Projekte durch, sporadische Maßnahmen. Aber nötig sind mittel- und langfristige Politikansätze. Notwendig sind ganz zwingend Maßnahmen zur wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung der Roma-Gemeinschaften. Die EU muss ihre Struktur- und Regionalförderung nicht erst ab 2014 flexibler gestalten, sondern jetzt, damit auch Roma sie nutzen können. Dazu gehören Kleinkredite, die möglichst unbürokratisch vergeben werden müssen, z. B. für den Wiederaufbau von Roma-Siedlungen. Dazu gehören sehr konkrete Maßnahmeangebote für Gesundheitsförderung, Bildung, Ausbildung, Förderung des Arbeitsmarktes. Und ich sage es ganz offen: Kein Kind darf an Bildungs- oder Sprachbarrieren scheitern. Wir wollen auch als GUE keine Roma-Schulen, sondern Schulen für alle, wo auch Roma leben und lernen können.

Im Übrigen geht es nicht nur ums Geld, sondern auch darum, dass Rassismus entschieden entgegengetreten wird. Antiziganismus darf kein Kavaliersdelikt sein oder bleiben, sondern muss als Straftat geahndet werden. Die EU trägt große Mitverantwortung dafür, inwieweit es hoffentlich bald gelingt, dass den mehr als 10 Millionen Roma in Europa Gerechtigkeit widerfährt, denn bei Gerechtigkeit beginnt es und mit Gleichheit soll es weitergehen. Dafür bedarf es eines ganz klaren politischen Jas und einer entschlossenen, wirkungsmächtigen europäischen Rahmenstrategie, und – offen gestanden – es bedarf auch unseres leidenschaftlichen Engagements als Abgeordnete, als Menschen für diese Bevölkerungsgruppe, für Roma und Sinti. Handeln wir unverzüglich!

2-339

**Jaroslav Paška**, *za skupinu EFD*. – Druhý samit Európskej únie o Rómoch bude iste dobrou príležitosťou pre zúčastnených, aby si vymenili skúsenosti s výsledkami mnohých opatrení podporujúcich úspešné začlenenie rómskeho etnika do spoločnosti.

Podľa historikov prišli Rómovia do Európy v období medzi 5. a 9. storočím nášho letopočtu a odvtedy hľadajú mnohé európske národy spôsob čo najlepšieho súžitia s rómskym etnikom. Objektívne treba priznať, že ani po viac ako

tisícročnom hľadaní takéhoto modelu sme v Európe nenašli spôsob, ako dobre začleniť rómske etnikum do našej spoločnosti. Nevieť, či je príčina pretrvávajúčich problémov v nás alebo na druhej strane, ale po skúsenostiach z mojej krajiny isto viem, že pomáhať tak, že iba dávame, nemá zmysel.

Naša vláda zobrala z daní všetkých pracujúcich občanov nemalé prostriedky a dala ich rómskym občanom, aby im umožnila viesť dôstojný život. Postavila a dala im nové moderné byty, rovnaké, ako si ostatní občania musia kupovať. Poskytla im prístup k práci, zdravotnej pomoci, vzdelaniu za rovnakých podmienok ako všetkým iným občanom. Nezamestnaným dáva rovnakú podporu a sociálne dávky ako ostatným občanom.

No aký je výsledok? Moderné byty sú zničené, sanitárne zariadenia a ďalšie vybavenia demontované a rozkradnuté. Splašky a smeti vyhadzujú ľudia z týchto bytov z okien rovno na ulicu. Do práce nechcú chodiť, ani keď im ju samospráva ponúka. Zdravotnícky personál, ktorý im prináša ochranu pred infekčnými chorobami, vyženú z osady. Deti sú zanedbané, hladné a často ani nechodia do školy. Preto som presvedčený, že ak chceme rómskemu etniku skutočne pomôcť, musíme sa predovšetkým snažiť učiť rómske deti civilizovanému, kultúrnemu a slušnému spôsobu života.

2-340

**Zoltán Balczó (NI).** – Mivel anyanyelvemen szólalok föl, ezért a roma megnevezés helyett a magyar cigány szót használok, melynek nincs pejoratív értelme, az Alkotmányunkban is így szerepel.

Napirendünk témája a cigánység kirekesztése és diszkriminációja elleni fellépés. A megoldás alapvető feltétele a cigánység társadalmi integrációja. Ennek fontos eszköze az iskola. Sok esetben indokolt a külön foglalkoztatás, ha tetszik pozitív diszkrimináció, a hátrányok leküzdése érdekében. A kisebbségjog-védők ilyenkor rögtön szegregációt kiáltanak, pedig a cél a minél hamarabbi beilleszkedés.

Magyarország egyes régióiban cigány generációk úgy nőnek föl, hogy a család nem munkából, hanem segélyekből él. Munkahelyteremtés nélkül nincsen kiút, ezért a neoliberais gazdaságpolitikával szakítani kell. A nehéz szociális helyzet sem adhat alapot a törvények áthágására. Magyarországon a bűnelkövetésben magas a cigánység részaránya. Ez ellen szigorú fellépésre van szükség, nemcsak a többségi társadalom, hanem a cigánység tisztességes életvitelű többsége részéről is. Okként, mi sem, soha nem jelöltünk meg vérségi, genetikai okot. Szó sincs rasszizmusról, csupán speciális szociokulturális körülményről beszéltünk, mint háttérrel. Tehát ha az ezt kimondókat reflexszerűen rasszistának bélyegezzük, azzal csupán a problémát seperjük szőnyeg alá.

A kiutat közösen kell megtalálnunk. Ehhez a cigányságnak olyan vezetőkre van szükségük – mert nélkülük nem megy –, akik hitelesek saját köreikben és a társadalom egésze szemében is. Valóban szükség van közös európai stratégiára, de olyanra, amely szembenéz e kérdésnek minden oldalával és őszintén látva akarja megoldani.

2-341

**Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE).** – Señor Presidente, empiezo mi intervención felicitando a Livia Járóka por la defensa que viene desarrollando ante las instituciones europeas en favor de la población romaní. Es obligado recordar que ella y el PPE han diseñado la primera estrategia europea sobre la integración de la minoría romaní, proponiendo acciones comunitarias concretas en favor de más de nueve millones de ciudadanos que viven en la Unión Europea. La situación de la población romaní es diferente a la de otras minorías nacionales de Europa, razón por la que se deben adoptar medidas específicas en favor de la misma.

La celebración en Córdoba de la II Cumbre sobre la población romaní debe servir de foro donde abordar los problemas de esta comunidad de forma valiente y concretar los instrumentos específicos, tanto financieros como jurídico-legales, en favor de una minoría que tiene que ser la protagonista indispensable del diseño de su futuro, olvidándonos de políticas de tinte paternalista. Comparto que nadie tiene legitimidad ni derecho para hacer publicidad política a su costa.

Solo una acción multidisciplinar y coordinada entre la Comisión, el Consejo y los Estados miembros puede dar resultados positivos en favor de la población romaní. Es preciso que los distintos Comisarios europeos coimplicados coordinen su acción con el objeto de acabar con toda conducta excluyente y discriminatoria. El Consejo, con los Estados miembros, debe promover la plena integración de la población romaní.

Por último, los Estados tienen la responsabilidad de promover medidas contra la discriminación a la que con frecuencia se ve sometida esta población. El acceso a la sanidad, a una educación de calidad, a la formación continua y al reciclaje profesional son objetivos imprescindibles para acceder, también, a un empleo digno y a la plena participación en la sociedad civil. Y es indispensable, en este sentido, la participación de las entidades locales —sé muy bien de lo que hablo—. «Todo por ellos pero nada sin ellos», y aquí en esta Cámara, señor Presidente, existen excelentes diputados romaníes.

2-342

**Kinga Göncz (S&D).** – Azt gondolom, hogy a cordobai második csúcs valóban nagyon jó lehetőség arra, hogy számba vegyük, mi is történt az utóbbi években Európa legnagyobb létszámú és legkiszolgáltatottabb közösségének, a roma

közösségnek a befogadása területén. Először azt szeretném hangsúlyozni, hogy nagyon fontos lépéseket tettünk abba az irányba, hogy ez valóban európai ügy legyen. Nem kelet-közép-európai, hanem összeurópai ügy. Ahhoz, hogy megoldásokat találjunk, ahhoz így kell kezelnünk a továbbiakban is. Fontos lépések voltak azon a területen, hogy az Európai Parlament elfogadott egy állásfoglalást a roma stratégia szükségességéről. Sajnálatos, hogy ez nem született meg a mai napig sem, és őszintén reméljük, hogy ebben lesz komoly továbblépés a trió-elnökség idején és ennek a Bizottságnak az időszaka alatt. Fontos volt a 2009-es európai parlamenti jelentés is a romák szociális helyzetéről, munkaerő-piaci helyzetéről és fontos a roma évtized program, amelynek most körülbelül a közepén vagyunk. Ahhoz, hogy a stratégia sikeres legyen, szükség van arra, hogy lássuk, hogy a strukturális és kohéziós alapok milyen módon hasznosultak, valóban hozzájárultak-e és milyen feltételek esetén járultak hozzá a roma közösség társadalmi befogadásához. Adatok kellenek, de tudjuk, hogy az etnikai hovatartozásra vonatkozó adatok mindig szenzitív adatok, és óvatosnak kell lennünk, amikor ezeket kérjük és ezekkel bánunk. Miközben sok pozitív lépés történik, azt látjuk, hogy a visszafogadási egyezmények végrehajtásával sok probléma is keletkezik. Koszovóról volt már szó itt. Őszintén remélem, hogy a „summit” hozzá fog járulni ezeknek a megoldásához.

2-343

**Nicole Kiil-Nielsen (Verts/ALE).** – Monsieur le Président, la question des Roms est fortement présente dans ma région, l'ouest de la France. Ainsi, à Nantes, plus de 1000 Roms sont expulsés de lieu en lieu à cause d'un manque de terrains conventionnés pour les accueillir. Les rares communes investies dans l'accueil des Roms, à l'instar de Rezé, Indre, dans l'agglomération nantaise, se retrouvent complètement débordées, sans accompagnement de la part des pouvoirs publics. Les maires les plus volontaires, les plus ouverts sont ainsi confrontés à d'énormes difficultés. Les réponses ne peuvent pas être locales. Elles doivent être globales. Il faut intégrer l'inclusion des Roms dans toutes les politiques de l'Union européenne pour mettre fin aux discriminations subies par ces citoyens européens.

Je souhaite, d'autre part, attirer l'attention sur la situation spécifique des femmes. Les problèmes des femmes roms sont particulièrement criants, en termes de violences conjugales ou de grossesses non souhaitées, par exemple. Ainsi, en France, selon Médecins du monde, une femme rom sur deux, soit 43 %, a déjà avorté à 22 ans. L'âge moyen de la première grossesse est de 17 ans. Seules 10 % des femmes roms ont recours à la contraception. Il faut donc que l'Union européenne intègre la perspective du genre dans toutes les études et les lois concernant les Roms. L'éducation doit être une priorité majeure. Il est urgent d'agir auprès des communautés roms pour les sensibiliser à leurs droits fondamentaux et faciliter leur accès aux services publics.

J'espère que lors du deuxième sommet "Roms", l'Union européenne fera preuve de volontarisme pour un traitement global de cette question rom.

2-344

**Lorenzo Fontana (EFD).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la questione dei Rom sta divenendo sempre più complessa e urgono risposte efficaci e improcrastinabili. I loro rappresentanti, le istituzioni, il mondo dell'associazionismo e parte della società civile ne invocano l'inclusione nel tessuto socioeconomico ma raramente viene focalizzato quello che è il punto fondamentale: ossia che l'integrazione è un processo storico e culturale a carattere bilaterale.

Senza la reale volontà di una parte dei Rom di accettare le regole e la cultura dei paesi in cui vivono e senza la contestuale rinuncia a tutte quelle condotte incompatibili con una civile convivenza, la loro inclusione non verrà mai portata a termine: in questo caso, potremmo continuare a elaborare progetti e a stanziare fondi, ma risultati apprezzabili non ne vedremo mai.

La sfida va affrontata con la demagogia: chiediamo che la questione sia impostata col dovuto pragmatismo e con la consapevolezza del fatto che la preoccupante congiuntura economica e occupazionale sarà un elemento che renderà più difficile il tema dell'inclusione dei Rom nel mercato del lavoro. Riteniamo che, così come secoli di storia ci insegnano, la difficile integrazione non possa essere attribuita solo ai paesi ospitanti e che le responsabilità per la tutt'ora mancata integrazione siano da attribuirsi quantomeno a entrambe le parti in causa.

2-345

**Simon Busuttil (PPE).** – Jien ukoll nixtieq naghti l-appoġġ, b'mod partikolari lid-deputat Livia Járóka, illi tant taħdem fuq dan is-sugġett sensitiv u importanti. Is-sitwazzjoni, kif qal il-kollega tiegħi Sur President, tal-popolazzjoni tar-Roma fl-Ewropa hija wahda li ma tikkoncernax numru limitat ta' pajjiżi biss. Hija sitwazzjoni li tikkoncerna l-Unjoni Ewropea kollha għaliex ir-Roma huma l-akbar minoranza etnika fl-Ewropa. Fid-dawl ta' dan jehtieg naghmlu evalwazzjoni ta' dak li qieghda tagħmel l-Unjoni Ewropea bħalissa biex naraw x'nistgħu naghmlu ahjar. U jiena hadt gost nisma' lill-Viċi President tal-Kummissjoni Ewropea, Viviane Reding, tagħtina spjegazzjoni shiha dwar dan. U dan huwa żmien tajjeb biex naghmluh in vista tas-samit dwar ir-Roma li se jsir f' Córdoba x-xahar li ġej. Li hu żgur hu li ma nistgħux inhallu s-sitwazzjoni kif inhi għax mhix ser titranga wahedha u jekk ma naghmlux li hemm bżonn, dawn in-nies se jibqgħu emarginati u se jibqgħu mwahħlin f'nasba ta' faqar. Għaldaqstant għandha nadottaw politika ta' integrazzjoni li twassal sabiex ir-Roma tassew ikollhom aċċess għall-opportunitajiet illi għandu haddiehor. B'mod partikolari, il-possibilita li jahdmu, li jisfruttaw il-kapaċitajiet tagħhom, li jkollhom hajja dinjituza u li jkunu suċċess. B'hekk mhux biss inkunu kapaċi jmantnu lilhom infushom iżda jkunu wkoll jistgħu jikkontribwixxu għas-soċjetajiet li jghixu fihom. Iżda biex dan

isir irridu niehdu l-passi li hemm bżonn biex innehhu l-ostakli li jezistu. Jiena nittama li l-messaġġ tagħna f'din l-Awla, f'dan il-Parlament, messaġġ tagħna ta' solidarjetà mar-Roma, jasal in vista tas-samit tax-xahar illi ġej.

2-346

**María Muñiz De Urquiza (S&D).** – Señor Presidente, los diez millones de gitanos en Europa constituirían un Estado de tamaño medio en la Unión Europea si fueran un Estado. Pero no lo son. El pueblo gitano siempre antepuso su europeísmo por encima de cualquier frontera. De hecho son ciudadanos de segunda categoría por la discriminación que han sufrido históricamente, no solamente en los temas de educación, de sanidad o de vivienda, sino también como migrantes, lo que, precisamente, es su esencia.

El Comisario de Derechos Humanos del Consejo de Europa ha dicho que los migrantes gitanos no reciben en ciertos países de la Unión Europea el mismo trato que otros migrantes europeos, en una flagrante violación del derecho a la libre circulación.

Los Socialistas apostamos por una Europa donde se reconozca y se respete a las minorías étnicas y culturales, donde avancemos hacia una ciudadanía europea inclusiva y un espacio de igualdad, de libertad y de convivencia en la diversidad, por lo que damos la bienvenida a la directiva sobre no discriminación en todos los ámbitos, una directiva que no todos los grupos han apoyado siempre en esta Cámara.

Y damos también la bienvenida al programa de la Presidencia española en este terreno, que nos parece que es necesario porque no puede haber más retrasos en impulsar iniciativas en el ámbito europeo que reconozcan y apoyen al pueblo gitano.

La Cumbre de Córdoba, bajo la Presidencia española, es una gran oportunidad para poner en marcha un proyecto integral para el pueblo romaní, que deje atrás años de silencio y de racismo.

2-347

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE).** – Mr President, there is very little to add – just a plea. As has been said, let us not forget that the Roma Summit was an initiative of this Parliament and it was tabled during the Slovenian Presidency, aimed at bringing together the EU governments to work together on Roma issues.

This is another reason for this Parliament to be active on this issue. The Greens differ, however, and we will not be proud if all Member States do not admit that we can do better in the Roma issue. Issues like this one have to form part of a joint call for a European strategy for Roma inclusion. We need that strategy; we need that strategy because the European Union is also losing credibility at international level. Many countries are singling us out because of this issue. This is important as well because, even in the past, we understood that this is something that has to do with human rights and social inclusion.

We understand as well that it is a question of politics. It is in the framework of political debate that we have to understand that a necessary solution has to be sought.

2-348

**Elena Băsescu (PPE).** – Constituind una dintre cele mai mari, dar și mai vulnerabile minorități din Europa, romii trebuie să constituie un subiect și mai activ pe agenda europeană. Șomajul, sărăcia, abuzul, discriminarea și, nu în ultimul rând, accesul scăzut la educație reprezintă probleme cu care minoritatea romă se confruntă frecvent, acestea ducând într-un final la excludere socială. Consider că este nevoie de un program integrat la nivel european, care să corespundă culturii și valorilor lor, având în vedere libera circulație a acestora.

Copiii reprezintă 46% din populația romă, datorită efectului compus de natalitate ridicată și, din păcate, de speranță de viață scăzută. O șansă reală pentru ei ar fi accesul la educație. Cu toate că accesul și dreptul la educație este garantat de normele europene, majoritatea copiilor aparținând comunităților sărace de etnie romă nu frecventează școala deloc sau o abandonează. Un pas concret ar fi includerea acestor copii și tineri în sistemul de învățământ obligatoriu complet, prevenind astfel abandonul școlar. În anul școlar 2009-2010, Ministerul Educației din România a alocat 7 483 de locuri speciale în liceele din țară, pentru acestea înscriindu-se doar 2 460 de elevi, din care au fost admiși 2 246.

Efortul trebuie să fie însă de ambele părți. Pentru a-și îmbunătăți nivelul de trai, minoritatea romă trebuie să acționeze responsabil. Lipsa educației exclude participarea activă la viața socială, economică sau politică a țării în care locuiesc romii. Uniunea Europeană sprijină integrarea romilor în societate prin diferite programe de finanțare, cum ar fi: Fondul Social European, Fondul European de Dezvoltare Regională, programele PROGRESS și „Tineret în acțiune”.

Vă mulțumesc.

2-349

**Emine Bozkurt (S&D).** – Mr President, Roma, the largest European minority, are suffering from institutional discrimination, anti-Gypsyism, extraordinary levels of poverty and social exclusion, segregated systems in housing, education and social welfare. Short-term solutions are not an answer to the widespread and deep-rooted problems of

Roma. We need to evaluate existing good practices, as well as the negative effects of existing policies for the Roma population.

One, but not the only, example is taking Roma children away from their families and putting them in separate boarding schools. These measures do not solve problems: they lead, rather, to more segregation, and impact deeply and negatively on the lives of Roma families. Europe needs an effective long-term Roma strategy. This summit gives us a new opportunity for affirmative action, different from the first Roma summit which did not include real political commitments in the EU. The EU should start by setting a good example, by offering more positions to Roma people and including Roma and civil society in the strategy.

2-350

**Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE).** – Mr President, the summit in Córdoba will be a test for all of us, European institutions and Member States. It should demonstrate clear European commitment to considering a fully fledged political and operational strategy that would, in addressing Roma issues, go beyond obvious human rights perspectives, fundamental as they are, towards real economic and social inclusion.

We need an integrated strategy policy and an action plan cutting across all areas relevant to economic and social belonging. Much has been done and achieved but, without any doubt, there is still a long journey ahead of us. We need the Commission, Parliament, the Member States but also, as Minister López Garrido said, local and regional authorities working hand in hand.

We expect from the Commission a clear allocation of the responsibilities for this matter and effective coordination between all relevant services. We expect the EUR 5 million pilot project currently implemented by the Commission to pave the way for efficient and effective solutions in the areas that matter most: early childhood education and economic inclusion, and provide progress on policy learning and evaluation.

We appreciate the Commission' efforts, especially those by the Regional Policy DG, and we encourage the Commission to further enhance local and regional involvement in practical action strengthening the economic inclusion of Roma society.

In Parliament, many colleagues across the political groups have already demonstrated their involvement, but our duty is to put much greater political power into this issue.

Roma inclusion would give us a chance to move forward towards making the European labour market truly inclusive. It would give us a chance to move forward in addressing European demographic challenges.

So let me conclude by saying that we must treat the Córdoba summit as a last call for real inclusion of the Roma.

2-351

**Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D).** – Európa első középtávú roma kormányzati programjának kidolgozójaként és az Európa Tanács 2002-es roma jelentésének rapporteuraként egyetértek azokkal, hogy ma ez Európa egyik legbonyolultabb ügye. Nem irigylem biztos asszonyt, mert ennél komplexebb, bonyolultabb kérdés nincs ma Európában. Evidencia, hogy a romák nem egyszerűen etnikai és nemzeti kisebbség, hanem sokszorosán hátrányos helyzetű szociális kisebbség. Nem evidencia azonban az, hogy mi a felelősség megoszlása a többség és kisebbség között. Többség és kisebbség között aszimmetrikus a felelősség, mert a többségnek sokkal nagyobb a felelőssége, de a kisebbségnek is megvan, a romáknak is megvan a maga felelőssége. A negyedik, nagyon fontos, hogy integráció kell asszimiláció nélkül.

S végül nem költségvetési kérdés, nem forrás kérdése pusztán, hanem annak a kérdése, hogy vannak-e személyek, mechanizmusok mind a többségi, mind a roma társadalom szempontjából. Mint volt államtitkár azt kell hogy mondjam, ott működött a kisebbségi kérdés, ahol volt elkötelezett helyi többségi személy, hiteles helyi kisebbségi vezető, aki mozgósítani tudta a kisebbséget, és a civil szervezetek segítették. Nem pénz kérdés. Kell az uniós szint, de tagállami szinten és helyi szinten dőlnek el a dolgok, ezért támogatom az uniós stratégiát.

2-352

**Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE).** – Dezvoltarea economică și socială a grupului minorității rome reprezintă una dintre cele mai delicate și controversate probleme cu care statele Europei Centrale și de Est se confruntă. Nu avem estimări exacte cu privire la numărul real al romilor în UE, însă ceea ce știm este că minoritatea romă este cea mai numeroasă și mai săracă minoritate etnică transnațională.

Uniunea Europeană are nevoie de o abordare coerentă pe termen lung, pentru că politicile naționale nu sunt suficiente pentru a schimba situația romilor. Responsabilitatea pentru ameliorarea condițiilor de viață a populației rome este proprie fiecărui stat, însă reușita acestui proces rezidă în mare parte în abordarea fenomenului în globalitatea sa, prin acțiuni coordonate.

Lipsa de perspectivă a tinerii generații este, în opinia mea, una dintre problemele cele mai mari cu care ne confruntăm. Populația romă este o populație tânără, cu o proporție însemnată sub vârsta de 20 de ani. În societatea bazată pe cunoaștere și inovare pe care Europa dorește să o dezvolte, dacă nu luăm măsuri imediate, discrepanțele dintre tinerii de etnie romă și restul populației se vor accentua. Copiii și tinerii sunt incluși în puține politici și strategii actuale, deși numărul mare de copii și tineri la nivelul populației rome le permite să joace rolul generației schimbării. Procesul de dezvoltare durabilă trebuie să pornească de la o generație de copii care are acces la educație, asistență medicală și la toate oportunitățile de care se bucură copiii din populația majoritară.

De aceea doresc să atrag atenția că propunerea Comisiei privind strategia UE 2020 nu conține obiective cu privire la rezolvarea problemelor comunității rome. Dacă nu vom lua măsuri concrete, dacă nu vom avea schimbări majore de abordare, milioanele de tineri romi se vor confrunta în continuare cu excluderea socială și marginalizarea pe parcursul întregii vieți. Lipsa de speranță va face din aceste comunități zone de insecuritate pentru locuitorii lor și pentru restul populației. Trebuie să oferim comunității rome o șansă reală de a schimba perspectivele. În centrul proiectului european, se regăsește ca valoare fundamentală solidaritatea, de aceea trebuie să trecem de la voința politică de a lua măsuri la implementarea concretă a acestora.

2-353

**IN THE CHAIR: Edward McMILLAN-SCOTT**  
*Vice-President*

2-354

**Olga Sehnalová (S&D).** – Vážené kolegyně a kolegové, podle nedávného průzkumu veřejného mínění by Roma za svého souseda nechtělo 76 % Čechů. V uplynulých více než 10 letech jsem se ve své každodenní politické praxi místostarostky zabývala problémy soužití a sousedských vztahů mezi romskými a neromskými občany našeho města. Proto jsem přesvědčená, že v penězích řešení nevězí, jak ostatně ukazují i nepřesvědčivé celkové výsledky dosavadních projektů financovaných z evropských fondů zaměřených na zlepšení socio-ekonomické situace Romů.

Řešení podle mého názoru může spočívat pouze v soudržnosti místních komunit ve městech a obcích, které musí přijmout Romy za své plnohodnotné občany se vším dobrým i zlým. Totéž však platí i obráceně. I Romové musí mít pocit sounáležitosti se svou obcí a akceptovat její pravidla a normy. Nesmírně důležité pro vztahy k většinové společnosti i pro efektivní práci uvnitř romské komunity jsou vlastní pozitivní příklady a vzory. Zásadní je však důsledný a nekompromisní boj proti xenofobii a rasismu ve společnosti obecně. Dávejme všemi možnými prostředky, konkrétními činy a postoji jasně najevo, že jsou pro nás zcela nepřijatelné. Tímto směrem by se mělo ubírat naše společné snažení do budoucna.

2-355

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D).** – Doresc de la bun început să îmi exprim speranța că Summitul pentru romi de la Cordoba va reprezenta momentul decisiv pentru asumarea unei strategii comune consacrate incluziunii romilor.

Condițiile de trai ale acestei comunități rămân improprii și discriminarea ei se adâncește, în ciuda faptului că sumele alocate în ultimii ani pentru proiectele dedicate îmbunătățirii situației se apropie de jumătate de miliard de euro. Cred că este momentul să trecem de la bune intenții la fapte.

Din păcate, Comisia Europeană încă nu a dovedit că are voința necesară coordonării acțiunilor pentru îmbunătățirea nivelului de trai și de integrare socială a romilor, precum și pentru combaterea acțiunilor rasiste îndreptate împotriva lor. Consider că este necesar ca problema romilor să se constituie într-o sarcină specială, bine definită pentru comisarul pentru afaceri sociale, iar printre experții Comisiei însărcinați cu această problemă ar fi foarte util să se numere și specialiști de etnie romă.

Cred, de asemenea, că avem nevoie de o abordare atât socială, cât și culturală, pentru a nu adânci inegalitățile deja existente atât în privința gradului de alfabetizare, cât și a celui de ocupare a forței de muncă. În acest sens, solicit Comisiei să încurajeze programele de acces pe piața muncii a romilor migranți, cooperarea dintre autoritățile locale și comunitățile de romi și să aibă în vedere o colaborare mai strânsă cu organizațiile non-guvernamentale.

2-356

**Milan Zver (PPE).** – Spoštovani gospod predsedujoči, spoštovana gospa komisarka, špansko predsedstvo! Najprej bi čestital Španiji, da je uvrstila summit med njihove prioritete, in istočasno Komisiji, da se je odločila, da bo pripravila celovito poročilo o položaju Romov v Evropi, kar priča, da se aktualnosti tega vprašanja zavedamo, aktualno pa je postalo šele zadnja leta s širitvijo Evropske unije.

Sem pa tudi vesel zato, ker praktično vse poslanske skupine ali pa večina njih resno pristopa k reševanju tega problema. Dobili smo z Lizbonsko pogodbo tudi še dodatno pravno podlago, da lahko bolj temeljito pristopimo k pripravi celovite, močne strategije za rešitev romskega vprašanja tudi v okviru tako imenovane mehke zakonodaje.

Jasno je, da ne moremo pripraviti neke skupne romske politike na ravni Evropske unije – države članice so primarno odgovorne –, lahko pa pripravimo neke indikatorje, neko skupno bazo podatkov, izmenjavamo dobro prakso in tukaj si lahko države med seboj lahko veliko pomagajo.

Prihajam iz Slovenije, kjer imamo, recimo, inštitut romskega pomočnika, ki je mediator med šolo in starši in veliko prispeva k vključevanju romskih otrok v šolo.

2-357

**Corina Crețu (S&D).** – Într-adevăr, primul summit al Uniunii Europene privind romii a marcat recunoașterea eșecului individual al statelor europene de a asigura drepturile și integrarea romilor și a reprezentat un prim pas spre asumarea unei strategii comune și pe termen lung la nivelul Uniunii.

Din păcate, se menține o discrepanță masivă între planuri și studii și transpunerea acestora în realitate, pentru a îmbunătăți vizibil viața comunității rome, care rămâne grupul etnic cel mai vulnerabil din Europa, în condițiile în care se confruntă cu nivelul cel mai ridicat al sărăciei și al excluderii sociale. Iar perspectivele nu sunt deloc îmbucurătoare, dacă avem în vedere că aproximativ jumătate din populația romă este alcătuită din minori, datorită natalității crescute și speranței mici de viață.

Cred că primul pas într-o strategie coerentă de incluziune trebuie să asigure accesul nediscriminatoriu la educație al tinerei generații de romi, singura care poate juca rolul decisiv de agent al schimbării, pentru integrarea pe piața muncii și pentru depășirea cercului vicios al excluderii sociale.

2-358

**Iosif Matula (PPE).** – Romii constituie o comunitate etno-culturală transfrontalieră de peste 10 milioane de oameni la nivelul Europei. Problematika socială a romilor necesită o acțiune concertată, pe termen lung, cu implicarea Uniunii Europene și a statelor membre.

Au fost demarate inițiative importante în domeniu, dar cred că este nevoie să mergem mai departe. Trebuie să adoptăm o veritabilă strategie europeană pentru romi, cu acțiuni bine orientate și cu evaluarea periodică a impactului.

Vin dintr-o țară cu o importantă comunitate romă și salut faptul că astăzi recunoaștem problema romilor ca pe o problemă a întregii Europe. În România se aplică încă din perioada de preaderare o strategie pentru îmbunătățirea situației romilor. În universitățile publice li se asigură gratuit locuri speciale, ceea ce contribuie substanțial la creșterea nivelului de educație și cultură în rândurile acestei comunități. Autoritățile publice naționale și locale depun eforturi pentru incluziunea socială a romilor și integrarea lor pe piața muncii, pentru combaterea sărăciei extreme și acces la serviciile sanitare. Dar este nevoie de sprijinul financiar european consistent pentru a obține rezultatele dorite.

2-359

**Krisztina Morvai (NI).** – A cigány gyermekek, roma gyermekek számára a felemelkedés egyetlen lehetséges útja a rendszeres iskolába járás. Rendkívül sajnálatos, hogy a politikai korrektség egyik megnyilvánulási formájaként rendszeresen halljuk azoknak a szülőknek a mentegetését, különböző jogcímenek, akik a gyermekeik iskolába járását nem mozdítják elő, illetőleg egyenesen akadályozzák. Ebből a szempontból különösen is diszkrimináció tárgyai, illetve alanyai a lánygyermekek, a cigány lánygyermekek, akikre a felelőtlen szülők sokszor ráterhelik a sok gyermek gondozásának és az otthoni teendőknél a súlyát, iskolába járás helyett. A nemzetközi emberi jogi normáknak kizárólag az felel meg, hogyha az állam kötelezettséget vállal arra, hogy ilyenkor a gyermek védelmében fellép és bírsággal, büntetéssel ha kell, illetőleg a családi pótlék vagy más segélyek megvonásával kényszeríti, kötelezi a szülőt, hogy a gyermek érdekében a gyermek jogait biztosítsa.

2-360

**Monika Smolková (S&D).** – Najchudobnejšou skupinou ľudí v Európskej únii sú určite Rómovia. Preto som za to, aby sa využili všetky nástroje na začleňovanie Rómov do sociálnych a ekonomických aktivít. Riešenie vidím predovšetkým vo vzdelaní detí a mládeže.

Súhlasím aj s tým, že je potrebné odstraňovať skrytú aj otvorenú diskrimináciu Rómov. Ale som aj za to, aby sa veľmi otvorene hovorilo o tom, ako sú potláčané práva rómskych detí vlastnými rodičmi. Každý má právo na dôstojný život. Rómske deti ich v prevažnej miere nemajú. Hovoríme aj na budúcom samite o tom, že pri riešení rómskeho problému musia byť aktívni predovšetkým samotní Rómovia. Jednak pri výchove svojich detí, ale aj pri osobnom zapojení sa do procesu zlepšovania svojich životných podmienok. A keďže ja v budúcnosti nechcem byť komisárkou, tak na tomto mieste chcem povedať, aby sme na budúcom samite hovorili aj o tom, ako sa zneužívajú podpory pre Rómov samotnými Rómami.

2-361

**Diego López Garrido, Presidente en ejercicio del Consejo.** – Señor Presidente, el debate que hemos tenido sobre la población gitana, sobre la próxima Cumbre de Córdoba, pone de manifiesto claramente una vez más que la integración



social y económica de los gitanos es un problema de dimensión europea y que, por tanto, requiere una estrategia europea. Y eso es lo que pretendemos hacer, precisamente, después de algunos avances que se han producido, no suficientes, en la Cumbre de Córdoba tantas veces citada.

Una estrategia que tiene que basarse en un plan de trabajo que el Consejo pretende seguir y que debe hacer pensando en el conjunto del programa previsto del Trío —programa que tiene, por tanto, largo alcance—, un programa de acción, de trabajo, que tiene que tener como una de sus herramientas esenciales, sin duda, los Fondos Estructurales —es la herramienta más potente que tiene Europa para la cohesión social— y que tiene que proyectarse en acciones determinadas.

Algunas de estas acciones, desde mi punto de vista, deben ser acciones que se proyecten sobre problemas específicos de la población gitana —problemas de discriminación que sufre la población gitana en cuanto tal—, por ejemplo, el problema de acceso a los servicios públicos o al empleo. O el problema de las mujeres gitanas, que sufren especialmente la pobreza, que sufren problemas de acceso a la vivienda y problemas de discriminación o de violencia. O el caso de los jóvenes gitanos a quienes, en estos momentos, con la crisis económica, su falta de cualificación les hace todavía más difícil el acceso al empleo. O el problema de los niños: los niños gitanos —se ha dicho— tienen una esperanza de vida diez años menor que la que tiene la media del conjunto de los niños europeos.

Pero, a su vez, también hay que actuar desde un punto de vista general con acciones que favorezcan a la población gitana en sí misma, porque al ser una de las poblaciones más discriminadas, todo lo que sea una política antidiscriminación les va a favorecer. Es el caso de la acción contra la violencia de género, —por eso es tan importante tener lo antes posible esa directiva, la de la orden de protección contra la violencia de género—, que favorecerá especialmente a las mujeres gitanas, o el caso de la directiva sobre no discriminación, que favorecerá especialmente a la población gitana.

Y todo ello siempre con una orientación en absoluto paternalista, porque lo primero que hay que tener respecto de la población gitana es respeto a su identidad y respeto a sus características culturales.

2-362

**Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Mr President, I would like to thank the House for the many suggestions and proposals that have been made. They will be taken on board by Commissioner Andor and myself when we present our communication before the Summit. In this communication it will also be made very clear that the Commission cannot and will not accept that the Roma are discriminated against and excluded from our society because of their ethnicity.

Now, we do have instruments; we do have policies. The question is, how do we utilise them? How do we mainstream the question and the problems of the Roma in these instruments and policies? I believe that we do not need a Roma directive or a Roma fund. What we need is to take Roma issues fully into account when we apply EU law and when we implement EU funds. The key to this – and it has been said by many of you – is partnership and the cooperation of all the key actors. The Commission pursues this approach in the European platform for Roma inclusion and with its internal procedures.

But I would also like to underline very clearly that, while, of course, Roma exclusion has a lot to do with fundamental rights, mostly it has to do with social and economic issues. For instance, I would like to quote the World Bank's study on the economic cost of Roma exclusion and to see that this is a very important piece of evidence showing that we need to find solutions for the sake of our society in general. So to apply the instruments which we have in the most effective way will need a strategic approach, of course – mainstream, as some of you have said. This approach is based on cooperation, on mobilisation of the necessary resources and on a strategy learning from success as well as from failure.

What we must avoid doing is creating a strategy which exists only on paper. Results are needed; results which lead to the integration of Roma into mainstream schools. I have heard many of you speaking about schooling. I am looking forward to seeing the details of our action on pre-schooling, how this has been working out. The mainstream labour market; here my colleague Mr Andor is going to look for precise targets to be achieved, and the mainstream society which is the responsibility of all our policies.

2-363

**Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D).** – Elnök úr! Egy technikai probléma van. Most vettem észre, hogy a komputer klónozott engem, mert kollégáimnál, akiknél a kártya be volt téve, mindenhol az én nevemet, a Tabajdi nevet tette be. Ezt Gomez asszony helyén vettem észre, de máshol is észrevettem. Tehát valami komputerprobléma van. A kolleganőmnél Gönz Kingánál is a Tabajdi nevet jelzi ki a kártya. Kérem, hogy ellenőrizzék, mert nem szeretném, hogy ennyi mértékben klónozva legyenek az Európai Parlamentben. Kérem, szóljon a technikai szolgálatnak. Köszönöm..... Nálad is Zoli?

2-364

**President.** – Thank you. The technical services will take note of that.

The debate is closed.

The vote will take place at the next part-session.

*Written statements (Rule 149)*

2-365

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu.** – Norėčiau pabrėžti, kad Europos Sąjungai ir valstybėms narėms dalinantis atsakomybe dėl romų nediskriminavimo ir integravimo į visuomenę, romų klausimas tapo Europos žmogaus teisių politikos dalimi. Todėl artėjant antrajam romų Kongresui Kordoboje būtina aptarti romų socialines problemas ir šių problemų sprendimų būdus. Džiaugiuosi, kad ES Tarybai pirmininkaujanti Ispanija rengia šį Kongresą, nes būtina išskirti ir pripažinti egzistuojančias romų problemas. Norėčiau pabrėžti, jog demokratiškoje ir laisvoje visuomenėje yra nepriimtina, kad dalis žmonių būtų išskirta iš visuomenės ir būtų atvirai pažeidinėjamos asmenų pagrindinės teisės bei laisvės. Romų bendruomenės susiduria su rasistiniais išpuoliais, jie negali pasinaudoti visomis socialinėmis ir viešosiomis paslaugomis, egzistuoja didžiulė gyvenimo sąlygų ir švietimo atskirtis. Be to, būtina atkreipti dėmesį į tai, jog romai patiria ne tik tiesioginę diskriminaciją, bet susiduria ir su nematoma, netiesiogine diskriminacija, kaip antai, romų nepriėmimas į darbą ir tuo pačiu jų neintegravimas į socialinį gyvenimą. Todėl pritariu, kad būtina raginti Europos Komisiją, jog ši skatintų valstybių narių, regionų ir vietos valdžią geriau įgyvendinti ES projektus romų atžvilgiu. Taip pat raginčiau Komisiją imtis konkrečių veiksmų ir iniciatyvų, kaip kovoti su tiesiogine ir netiesiogine romų diskriminacija Europoje.

2-365-500

**Cristian Silviu Buşoi (ALDE), în scris.** – Statistics show that unfortunately Roma are the most hated and discriminated ethnic minority in Europe. We have seen the difficulties that several Member States, including mine, have concerning the social inclusion of the Roma. This clearly shows that this is a broader European issue that we must handle together. Better access to education and employment, is crucial so that we avoid the tendency of Roma to choose other more easier but harmful ways of money making. We need to fully apply the anti-discrimination legislation to Roma people and to take further initiatives to integrate them in our society. So far we haven't had any coherent strategy. I wish that this Second European Roma Summit brings about a real EU strategy for Roma. Structural and pre-accession funds should be more efficiently used to finance such initiatives. I would also like to insist that on the fact that this strategy should be a tool of coordination and an impetus for the Member States. The initiatives have to be taken at local level and benefit from the expertise of local NGOs and Roma themselves who know what the main difficulties are, so that this strategy really meets Roma people's needs.

2-366

**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), în writing.** – The Roma continue to be one of the most disadvantaged minorities in all of Europe, subject to widespread discrimination in all spheres of life.

In the last decade, the European Union and its Member States have devoted attention and resources to improving the situation of the Roma. Working in cooperation with the Roma rights movement, some Member States have begun to implement policies aimed at ensuring equal access to quality education for Roma children. Continuing efforts in this area should remain the highest priority in the coming years.

Policies need to be comprehensive in order to achieve a maximum systemic impact in closing the gap between Roma and non-Roma in all areas: education, employment, housing and health. The European Union and Member States should continue to evaluate their Roma-related policies to date and seek ways to eliminate any paternalistic approaches to the Roma issue, which treat the Roma as dependent, passive recipients of policy benefits.

A traineeship scheme should also be set up for young Roma to build up their professional expertise through programmes in Commission departments and appropriate government institutions.

2-366-500

**Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D), în scris.** – Ne aflam la jumătatea decadei consacrate incluziunii romilor(2005-2015), si constatam ca despre minoritatea roma se spun multe, se creează programe si platforme diverse, dar rezultatele sunt limitate. Problemele legate de educație, angajare, dezvoltare regionala, etc., sunt persistente si se acutizează in unele state membre. Al doilea summit pentru minoritatea roma din acest an de la Cordoba este menit sa revigoreze perspectiva europeana si sa găsească noi direcții de acțiune. Sunt de acord cu nevoia de a redefini principiile, dar consider ca mai degrabă ar trebuie sa construim o strategie transversala, orizontala, care sa abordeze problemele acestei minoritati in mod integrat si nu exclusiv. Ce e cel mai important este ca fondurile de pre-aderare si fondurile structurale sa fie utilizate corect si sa producă rezultatele pe care ni le dorim atât noi, decidenții politici, cat si societatea civila si, mai ales, minoritatea roma.

2-366-250

**Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), în scris.** – Primul Summit privind Rromii a avut cel puțin o urmare pozitivă: concluzia la nivel comunitar ca acestia au nevoie de educatie ca prim pas inspre integrarea sociala. Salut in acest sens si cea de-a Doua Reuniune a Platformei europene pentru incluziunea rromilor, dedicata in exclusivitate educatiei acestei etnii in Europa. In procesul lor de reformare educaționala este necesar sa intervina nu numai instituțiile de stat, ci și organizațiile

neguvernamentale care nu trebuie să mai aibă ca prim obiectiv identificarea actelor de discriminare, ci educația etniei. Reducerea analfabetismului, completarea studiilor și nevoia de calificare și recalificare profesională reprezintă posibilități de acces pe piața forței de muncă precum și modalități de incluziune socială. Este evident că avem nevoie urgentă de o evoluție pozitivă în rândul acestei minorități, iar de acest lucru sunt responsabile atât autoritățile cât și comunitatea romă în sine. Cel de-al Doilea Summit privind Romii trebuie să motiveze Comisia Europeană îndeajuns ca să vină cu propuneri legislative în vederea obținerii unor rezultate vizibile. De asemenea, Comisia Europeană trebuie să efectueze o revizuire a Fondului Social și să propună o creștere a finanțării proiectelor menite să îmbunătățească situația socio-economică a celei mai numeroase minorități din Uniunea Europeană.

2-366-625

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Das Gipfeltreffen zur Lage der Roma in Cordoba sollte als Anlass genommen werden, klare Worte zu Parallelgesellschaften in Europa zu finden: Eine effiziente Integration auf alle Ebenen sollte hierbei die Basis sein! Diese sollte auf nationaler wie auch auf europäischer Ebene gefördert werden. Eines dürfen wir dabei aber nicht vergessen: Zu einer wirksamen Integration müssen beide Seiten zusammenarbeiten! Auch die Volksgruppe der Roma muss das ihre zur Integration beitragen und von innen gegen die Schaffung von Parallellgesellschaften vorgehen. Besonders am Herzen liegt mir hier die Schulbildung der Kinder, insbesondere jene der Mädchen: Es kann nicht sein, dass sich Kinder mitten in Europa kaum bis garnicht in das bestehende Schulsystem einfügen und dann die Schule in großer Zahl frühzeitig abbrechen. Ihre künftige Situation am Arbeitsmarkt wird dadurch erheblich gefährdet, sie flüchten sich noch mehr an den Rand der Gesellschaft und isolieren sich. Probleme hinsichtlich der Sozialversicherung und ihrer Wohnsituation sind vorgezeichnet und der Teufelskreis ist perfekt. Es ist daher von zentraler Bedeutung einen Appell an die Roma in Europa zu richten, mit der Aufforderung, die archaische Einstellung zu Schulbildung und Frauenrechten zu ändern, aktiv gegen ihre eigene Abschirmung anzukämpfen und sich für Integration in die Gesellschaft, insbesondere am Arbeitsmarkt, einzusetzen.

2-367

**Csaba Sógor (PPE)**, *írásban*. – Jóllehet a tagországok jelentős uniós és tagállami forrásokat fordítottak a tartósan munkanélküli romák munkához juttatására, mégsem született koherens megoldás EU-szinten: a tagállamok nagyon eltérő módon és mértékben konfrontálódnak a helyzettel. Fontosnak tartom, hogy a máig megoldatlan roma kérdésre, ami az Európai Unió mint jogi személy és a tagállamok közös problémája, egy összefüggő és hatásos stratégiát tudjunk kidolgozni. Az április 8-án Cordobában tervezett Európai Roma Csúcstalálkozó legfontosabb témája az európai szintű stratégia alapelveinek a megfogalmazása kellene legyen, azért, hogy a roma problematika ne "vándorolhasson" többé, hanem minden tagállam, közös európai stratégia alapján maga oldja meg a kérdést. Meggyőződésem, hogy az oktatás az alapvető eszköz erre. Szükségesnek tartom egy olyan átfogó programcsomag kidolgozását, amely elősegíti és motiválja a fiatal roma értelmiségnek a közösségbe való visszatérését és a közösség keretében, illetve annak érdekében végzett munkáját. Ezt nagyban segítheti egy szoros partner-kapcsolat kiépítése a különböző roma érdekvédelmi szervezetek, a felelős állami intézmények, a civil társadalom és az együttműködő EU-s intézmények között. Nagyobb szerepet kell juttatni a kedvezményes mikro-hitelnyújtás vagy állami kamattörlesztés módszereinek. A mezőgazdasági támogatások koncepciójában tekintsék fontos célnak, hogy a roma közösségek elérhessék a megélhetésüket biztosító feltételeket. A helyzet súlyosabb, mint gondolnánk: a hosszú távú munkanélküliség aránya megugrott körökben, és egyre többen marginalizálódnak.

2-368

### 13 - Question Time (Commission)

2-369

**President**. – The next item is Question Time (B7-0017/2010). This will be a little shorter this evening than it should be because the preceding debate overran by 25 minutes because of earlier delays. I am sorry about that. We will finish some time after 19.30. I intend to be very crisp on time. Speakers from the floor have 30 seconds.

The following questions are addressed to the Commission.

#### *Part one*

2-370

Question 28 by Vilija Blinkeviciute (H-0063/10)

Subject: Regulation of private pension funds

In recent years the value of private pension fund assets has decreased a great deal. The need for closer regulation of the private pension fund sector has been underlined by the high level group on financial supervision chaired by Jacques de Larosière.

The financial crisis has highlighted the extent to which Member States are vulnerable to a wide range of risks. These risks are of direct concern to investors in those funds and to the stability and integrity of European financial markets, as well as seriously affecting financial market participants. In this unstable period for the economy, many European citizens have lost confidence in the regulation of the private pension fund system.

Does the Commission not take the view that it should propose a comprehensive legal measure to lay down monitoring standards with the purpose of regulating private pension funds?

2-371

**Michel Barnier**, *membre de la Commission*. – Mme Blinkevičiūtė pose une question très importante sur la réforme des retraites, qui est une question clé pour les années qui viennent, compte tenu des défis que nous avons à relever ensemble: le vieillissement démographique, la viabilité des finances publiques et la mobilité des travailleurs en particulier. Par ailleurs, les fonds de retraite sont des investisseurs institutionnels importants.

La crise financière a révélé des vulnérabilités dans la conception de certains régimes de retraite et, Mesdames et Messieurs, dans le prolongement du rapport de la Rosière, nous allons prendre un certain nombre d'initiatives. Le président Barroso a annoncé à ce sujet des orientations politiques au Parlement européen.

Nous allons présenter courant 2010 un livre vert sur les retraites, qui prévoit d'encourager une discussion rigoureuse sur la réglementation des fonds de retraite privés. Dans ce contexte, une révision de la directive concernant les activités et la surveillance des institutions de retraite professionnelle pourrait être envisagée. La Commission reste engagée pour renforcer le marché intérieur dans le domaine des fonds de retraite. Cette révision de la directive engloberait également les règles de solvabilité pour les fonds de retraite. Cela correspond d'ailleurs, Monsieur le Président, à une demande du Parlement européen lors des négociations de la directive Solvabilité II.

J'ajoute, pour qu'il n'y ait pas d'ambiguïté sur ce sujet très important qui touche les citoyens, que la Commission sera très soucieuse de respecter, au titre de la subsidiarité, les choix qui sont faits dans un grand nombre d'États membres concernant leur attachement au système de retraite par répartition.

2-372

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)**. – Ačiū, pone Komisare, už atsakymą ir iš tikrųjų lauksime, kad kaip galima greičiau Europos Komisija pateiktų Žaliąją knygą dėl pensijų, nes iš tikrųjų daugelyje Europos Sąjungos valstybių tai yra ypatingai aktualus klausimas. Nes kai kuriose valstybėse, kaip antai mano šalyje Lietuvoje buvo sumažintos ir taip mažos pensijos, nes tokia buvo realybė įvertinant esamą ekonominę ir finansinę situaciją. Tačiau gerbiamas Komisare, aš norėčiau dar papildomai paklausti: sakykite, kodėl taip mažai dėmesio Europos Komisija skiria Europos Sąjungos strategijoje „2020“ dėl pensijų patikimumo, stabilumo, dėl jų garantijos, nes turime įvertinti esamą situaciją darbo rinkoje, esamą demografinę situaciją ir, iš tiesų, tai būtų vienas iš svarbiausių klausimų – kokias pensijas žmonės gaus po 10 metų.

2-373

**Michel Barnier**, *membre de la Commission*. – Madame la députée, dans le document relatif à la stratégie 2020, qui est un document pour une croissance verte, une croissance intelligente, équitable et inclusive, il est évident que l'on ne peut pas évoquer tous les sujets. C'est pour cette raison que nous avons d'autres instruments, d'autres occasions, d'autres cadres pour traiter, comme c'est notre responsabilité, des questions fondamentales comme celle des retraites et de la dépendance des citoyens européens.

J'ai déjà dit, tout à l'heure, Madame la députée, que les fonds de retraite sont des investisseurs institutionnels importants. Les différents types de régimes de retraite opérant sur la base d'une capitalisation statutaire, professionnelle ou volontaire occupent aujourd'hui un rôle de plus en plus important dans l'ensemble des régimes de retraite d'un grand nombre d'États membres.

Je redis que nous travaillerons en respectant, au titre de la subsidiarité, la volonté et l'attachement de beaucoup de pays – j'en connais quelques-uns d'assez près – au système de répartition et, sur cette base, nous allons travailler sur ce livre vert, qui sera prêt dans les prochaines semaines ou les prochains mois au plus tard. Je serais heureux qu'avec vous et vos collègues intéressés, nous puissions avoir le débat le plus large possible.

2-374

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**. – Herr Präsident! Meine Heimat Österreich fördert private Pensionsvorsorge mit maximal 210 Euro pro Jahr, obwohl Pensionspekulation nachweislich auch einer der Mitauslöser des Finanzcrashs in den Vereinigten Staaten war.

Ich glaube, die Kommission wird sich schon die Frage stellen müssen, ob Pensionsvorsorge nicht die ureigenste Aufgabe des Staates ist und ob man sich hier an dubiose FinanzspekulantInnen binden sollte. Das ist auch die Frage, die sich jetzt stellt, ob es nach Ansicht der Kommission nicht kurzfristig bis fahrlässig ist, private Vorsorge ohne Qualitätsstandards staatlich zu fördern, wenn die Gefahr besteht, dass nach diesen immensen Verlusten die Pensionsbezieher erst recht wieder staatlich unterstützt werden müssen.

2-375

**Michel Barnier**, *membre de la Commission*. – Le président Barroso a eu l'occasion, à cette place, tout à l'heure, de répondre à plusieurs questions sur les grands sujets des mouvements financiers.

Vous avez parlé, Monsieur le député, de spéculation. Ce que je peux dire, comme commissaire européen du marché intérieur et des services, en charge de la régulation et de la supervision, c'est que nous ne laisserons aucun produit, aucun marché, aucun territoire à l'écart ou à l'abri d'une supervision intelligente et d'une régulation efficace.

Donc, tous ceux qui sont sur ces marchés, avec des produits divers, seront concernés par l'effort que nous allons réaliser, qui est déjà engagé au titre du paquet supervision, qui est en cours de discussion, et nous allons, dans plusieurs révisions de directive, notamment la directive IRP, établir des règles d'investissement strictes.

Je confirme que nous ne laisserons aucun de ces produits et aucun de ces marchés à l'écart du besoin, de l'exigence d'une supervision de la transparence, d'une régulation intelligente et efficace.

2-376

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D).** – Consider că e necesar să existe o gândire strategică pe termen lung privind reforma sistemelor de pensii, atât în cazul celor private, cât și în cazul celor publice. Mă refer aici la faptul că în anii '70 rata natalității a crescut foarte mult. Aceste persoane, în treizeci de ani, vor ieși la pensie, iar astăzi rata natalității este foarte mică. Cei care sunt astăzi născuți, în treizeci de ani vor fi piața forței de muncă și nu vor putea asigura resursele pentru fondurile de pensii la acea dată.

De aceea, vă întreb: care sunt măsurile pe care le luați pentru reforma adevărată a sistemelor de pensii pe termen lung în beneficiul cetățenilor europeni, în mod sustenabil?

2-377

**Michel Barnier, membre de la Commission.** – Madame la députée, j'ai moi-même évoqué, dans la première phrase de mon intervention tout à l'heure, qui était assez courte comme la règle l'exige, l'un des grands défis, au-delà de la mobilité, qui est celui de la démographie. Je pense d'ailleurs que nous aurions tous intérêt à avoir un débat, des comparaisons, même si la question d'une politique familiale ou démographique ne fait pas partie des premières compétences européennes, sur ce sujet qui interpelle, avec plus ou moins d'intensité, tous les pays européens. Notre continent est probablement l'un des rares continents du monde qui verra diminuer sa population si les taux de natalité ne se redressent pas, par rapport aux autres continents.

C'est dans ce contexte extrêmement sérieux que nous avons à travailler sur la question des retraites et de la prise en charge de la dépendance, Madame la députée, au-delà de la question de la retraite elle-même. Voilà pourquoi je crois que ce livre vert est un bon outil, à un bon moment. Vous n'aurez pas trop à attendre. Nous y travaillons et nous allons y mettre la dernière main pour poser toutes ces questions, en prenant bien en compte ce qui relève des responsabilités nationales, au titre des régimes de retraite et ce qui peut être fait au niveau européen, notamment s'agissant de tous ces fonds de retraite privés et de leur multiplication sur les marchés européens.

En tout cas, toutes ces questions – aucune d'entre elles ne sera laissée de côté – feront partie des questions que nous allons poser, en proposant un certain nombre de pistes ou d'orientations, dans le livre vert que je vous ai indiqué et qui sera publié dans quelques mois.

2-378

**President.** – Question 29 by Seán Kelly (H-0068/10)

Subject: Flood insurance systems in the EU

Recent flooding in Ireland has caused approximately €500 million worth of damage to both private and public infrastructure. The Irish Government has made an application to the EU Solidarity Fund to cover a proportion of the damage to public infrastructure.

However, there is often no redress for private households and undertakings due to the prohibitive cost of private flood insurance. It is worth noting that one of the causal factors of the unprecedented flooding was the uncoordinated planning of development, including in some cases on flood plains, and that some insurers are refusing to insure particular households and undertakings.

In the light of this, could the Commission outline any plans it has, if any, to draft legislative proposals to harmonise flood insurance provision in the EU, taking into account the market failure to provide adequate cover in some Member States? Failing that, could the Commission comment on any programmes it has developed to exchange best practice in this area between Member States?

2-379

**Michel Barnier, membre de la Commission.** – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs, Seán Kelly pose une question liée à une actualité tragique, celle qui a touché Madère et la côte atlantique, mon pays, en particulier, avec plusieurs dizaines de morts. Je veux naturellement, au moment où je m'exprime, redire notre solidarité avec toutes les victimes et le commissaire Hahn, mon collègue, s'est rendu sur place, dans les deux endroits que je viens d'évoquer.

Là aussi, nous avons à faire face à un défi global qui est celui du changement climatique, et nous allons voir se multiplier ces catastrophes naturelles, comme nous allons d'ailleurs continuer à voir des catastrophes qui ne sont pas naturelles et qui

peuvent avoir des conséquences graves pour la vie d'hommes et de femmes, pour la nature et pour l'économie. Je pense à des catastrophes industrielles, à des incendies, à des catastrophes maritimes, par exemple.

C'est un sujet sur lequel je me suis personnellement engagé depuis très longtemps. Ici même, dans cet hémicycle, en 1999, tout nouveau commissaire à la politique régionale, j'avais eu à répondre à des collègues grecs qui s'inquiétaient des conséquences des tremblements de terre qui venaient de survenir dans leur pays.

J'avais proposé à l'époque, premièrement, la création d'un fonds de solidarité, deuxièmement, la création d'une force européenne de protection civile. Il a fallu attendre 2002 et les grandes inondations qui ont touché l'Allemagne, l'Autriche et la Slovaquie, pour que, en trois mois, avec le soutien du Parlement et du Conseil, la Commission puisse créer le Fonds de solidarité qui va intervenir à Madère et sur la côte atlantique, comme il est intervenu dans plusieurs catastrophes majeures depuis 2002.

Ma collègue Georgieva travaille avec Mme Ashton à la mise en place de la force européenne de protection civile, et j'espère que nous n'aurons pas besoin d'attendre une nouvelle catastrophe pour mutualiser nos réponses et nos secours sous un même drapeau européen dans des catastrophes comme celles d'Haïti ou du tsunami.

La question qui est posée concerne les assurances, parce que tout n'est pas lié à des biens publics non assurables comme peut les prendre en charge le Fonds de solidarité. Je pense qu'il y a des progrès à faire sur les risques qui peuvent être couverts par des assurances.

Le livre blanc 2009 sur l'adaptation au changement climatique suggère, en l'absence d'assurance, des régimes d'assurance faisant l'objet d'un soutien public. Dans le suivi de ce livre blanc je veux examiner le rôle des produits d'assurance pour compléter ces mesures. J'ai l'intention de commencer par un travail de *benchmarking*: j'ai demandé à mes services d'examiner ce qui existe dans les différents États membres. Dans des situations où l'impact pourrait être transfrontalier il pourrait même être opportun de promouvoir des régimes d'assurance de portée européenne plutôt que nationale.

Je suis très conscient, Monsieur Kelly, de la complexité de ce sujet. Je vais mener ce travail en concertation avec toutes les parties prenantes, avec les compagnies d'assurance, avec les États membres, les experts, pour échanger les meilleures pratiques et fixer les priorités au bon niveau. Je suis convaincu qu'on peut mieux protéger les citoyens européens compte tenu de la multiplication de ces catastrophes naturelles. Voilà pourquoi je veux faire ce travail extrêmement opérationnel de *screening*, de *benchmarking* des différents systèmes d'assurance existant dans les 27 États membres contre les catastrophes naturelles.

2-380

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – We were all obviously very concerned about Madeira and France. In my own country, fortunately, nobody was killed but the insurance problem manifested itself very quickly. Lots of households cannot get insurance now and in one town, Clonmel, where there was flooding a number of years ago, insurance has risen sixfold. Obviously, that is a huge issue and I compliment the Commissioner on looking into it.

I would also just like to ask him about countries and governments that do not implement the Floods Directive. Would he consider sanctions of some nature for them as well?

2-381

**Michel Barnier, membre de la Commission.** – Cette directive "Inondations" date de 2007. Il y a également eu une communication de la Commission en 2009 sur la prévention des désastres naturels d'origine humaine en général.

Monsieur Kelly, vous parlez de directives assez récentes, mais il en va de ces directives comme de toutes les autres, dès l'instant où elles sont opérationnelles: la Commission doit vérifier – et elle va le faire – comment les États membres appliquent ou n'appliquent pas ces directives. Quand on parle des inondations, on l'a bien vu en France et on peut le voir dans votre pays, les conséquences, en termes d'aménagement du territoire, de l'absence de précautions, de la construction dans des zones inondables sont manifestes. La Commission agira dans ce domaine-là comme dans tous les autres, en regardant ce que font les États membres ou ce qu'ils ne font pas, et en prenant les mesures appropriées, y compris au titre des infractions, pour que ces directives soient appliquées.

2-382

**Jim Higgins (PPE).** – Apropos what Mr Kelly raised, and that is the implementation of the Floods Directive: as you know, it has to be transposed into national law this year, 2010, in all 27 Member States. What I would urge is that the Commission keeps an eye on national authorities in relation to the implementation of it. In 1995, I was the Minister with responsibility for flooding in Ireland. We brought a report out at that stage that there should be no further building of new houses in flood plains. And yet many of the houses looking for compensation in parts of Ireland were built post that.

So we need to implement the Floods Directive very rigidly indeed and to impose penalties on the Irish Government and local authorities and on anybody who breaches the conditions of the Floods Directive.

2-383

**Janusz Władysław Zemke (S&D).** – Panie Komisarzu! Chciałbym się Pana zapytać o inną rzecz – my mówimy o ubezpieczeniu, a ja sądzę, że wtedy, kiedy dochodzi do kataklizmów, potrzebne są jednak dwa działania innego typu. Chciałbym się w związku z tym spytać Pana o następującą sprawę – czy nie powinno powstać szybciej w Europie centrum reagowania kryzysowego? Nie mamy ani jednego centrum, które by reagowało w sytuacjach kataklizmów. Po drugie, czy nie trzeba by włożyć większego wysiłku w tworzenie większych zdolności cywilnych (dla przykładu, nie mamy samolotów transportowych)? Czyli oprócz ubezpieczenia potrzebne jest jedno centrum i potrzebne są większe zdolności do pomocy.

2-384

**Michel Barnier, membre de la Commission.** – Deux questions différentes sont posées. D'abord, sur la question des inondations, je suis venu comme commissaire au marché intérieur et aux services répondre à une question précise, Monsieur Kelly, qui était la suivante: comment mieux utiliser les assurances, notamment pour indemniser des personnes touchées dans leurs biens matériels personnels? Je vais travailler à cette photographie des différents systèmes d'assurances privées qui existent de manière plus ou moins sophistiquée, entre des pays qui n'ont pratiquement pas d'assurances pour ce type de catastrophes, et d'autres pays, comme la France, qui ont un système, dans le cadre des catastrophes naturelles, qui indemnise à 100 %.

Les inondations, Monsieur le député, ne sont pas un sujet dont j'ai la responsabilité. Je vais demander à M. Potočnik, mon collègue chargé de l'environnement, de vous donner une réponse écrite pour vous dire comment est appliquée, ou n'est pas appliquée, cette directive concernant les inondations. Mais vous avez raison, la clé réside dans les compétences nationales, voire régionales ou locales, en matière de construction ou de constructibilité. On ne peut pas tout demander à Bruxelles, sauf que la règle générale est évidente: il y a des zones où il ne faut pas construire, où il ne faut plus construire. J'ai même fait voter une loi dans mon pays pour déménager des habitations ou des usines situées dans des zones qui étaient touchées régulièrement par des inondations. J'ai fait voter une loi en 1995, et on indemnise les gens pour qu'ils partent avant que la catastrophe ne se reproduise.

Ce sont ces idées-là que je voudrais réunir, puis revenir devant vous, au titre des assurances, avec des propositions.

Je veux répondre un dernier mot sur la question de la protection civile, même si cette compétence relève d'autres collègues. C'est un sujet sur lequel j'avais fait un travail – vous le savez – qui a été soutenu par le Parlement européen, à la demande du président Barroso, en 2006. Ce travail m'a conduit à proposer la création d'une force européenne de protection civile entre les pays volontaires. On peut faire une coopération renforcée, partir en *bottom-up*, pour prendre l'habitude de préparer les réponses. Ce n'est jamais la bonne volonté qui manque quand il y a un tsunami ou une tragédie à Haïti, c'est la coordination. On gagnerait des vies humaines, on gagnerait du temps, on gagnerait de l'argent et, en même temps, de la visibilité, si les Européens volontaires préparaient leurs réponses aux différentes catégories de catastrophes.

Naturellement, les réponses ne peuvent pas être les mêmes selon qu'il s'agit d'une catastrophe industrielle, d'une catastrophe comme l'Erika, d'inondations en Allemagne ou en France, d'incendies en Grèce, d'un tsunami, de grandes pandémies, voire d'un attentat terroriste comme celui du 11 septembre, qui peut toujours se produire malheureusement en Europe.

L'objectif de cette idée à laquelle travaillent mes collègues – nous reviendrons devant vous avec des propositions concrètes – est de préparer, de mutualiser la réponse préalable. En tout cas, je reste très attaché à cette idée à laquelle j'avais beaucoup travaillé, avec le soutien du Parlement européen.

2-385

**President.** – Question 30 by Silvia-Adriana Ticau (H-0109/10)

Subject: European action to combat poverty

According to Eurostat, around 85 million European citizens, 20% of children and 19% of European citizens over 65 were at risk of poverty in 2008. At EU level, 8% of the active population and 44% of unemployed people had an income below the poverty threshold, and having a job is not sufficient to guarantee a decent standard of living. Social protection measures in the Member States have cut the risk of poverty facing the EU population by 32%. The economic crisis has led to a rise in the unemployment rate to around 10% and widening social gaps.

Can the Commission say what measures it plans to take to create and preserve jobs in the EU and to guarantee a decent standard of living for all EU citizens through a sound and adequate social protection system?

2-386

**László Andor, Member of the Commission.** – I very much share the concerns expressed in this question about the welfare and wellbeing of Europeans, the questions on employment and social protection and fighting poverty.

As you know, 2010 is the European Year for Combating Poverty and Social Exclusion, in order to raise awareness about social problems. Hopefully this year will be good not only for discussing poverty, but also for committing ourselves to fighting it and to renewing this political commitment at EU level and among the Member States.

In order to provide an opportunity for this renewed commitment, the European Commission has included in the new EU 2020 Strategy a headline target on poverty reduction, which is a reflection of our concern and the lessons learned over the past decades. The objective now is to reduce poverty by a quarter by 2020.

Fighting poverty requires prosperity, high-quality jobs for those who can work and sustain themselves, and solidarity towards those in need. These elements are all present in the EU 2020 Strategy. Achieving the headline target on poverty will be supported by a dedicated flagship initiative which is called the European Platform Against Poverty. There are concrete instruments for maintaining and creating jobs at European level through the European Social Fund, the European Globalisation Fund and also the recent micro-credit initiative.

The actions taken by individual Member States are especially important. Still more needs to be done to ensure that high quality jobs are accessible to all to start with, but poverty reduction has to go well beyond questions of employment. As is recognised in the EU 2020 Communication, effective well designed social protection is indispensable for preventing and tackling poverty and exclusion.

The Member States are responsible for the financing and organisation of social protection systems, with the Commission supporting them in this task. As a key partner in the social open method of coordination, the Commission helps to identify and promote clear policy priorities, provides a monitoring framework and facilitates mutual learning. A good example so far includes the active inclusion framework, the benchmarking exercise on child poverty and the monitoring of the social impact of the crisis.

We will work very closely with the two presidencies this year: the Spanish Presidency and the Belgian Presidency. Both have important initiatives: the first stage of the Roma Summit which was discussed a few minutes ago in this House and has a very strong impact on poverty reduction, while with the Belgian Presidency we are preparing an initiative on reducing child poverty.

But it is not only governments we have to work with, but also NGOs. Without the NGOs we cannot make completely successful programmes. We support NGOs dealing with poverty and social protection in general from the Progress Fund.

These are the main issues and they cover various directions where the Commission acts to reduce poverty.

2-387

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D).** – Mulțumesc pentru răspuns, dar aş fi dorit să discutăm puțin și despre procesul de dezindustrializare, care este prezent în multe din statele membre și care este una din cauzele crizei economice și sociale în care ne aflăm.

O politică industrială europeană inteligentă și ambițioasă va întări atât competitivitatea Uniunii Europene, dar, mai ales, va genera noi locuri de muncă. Care sunt deci măsurile privind politica industrială europeană care vor fi incluse în programul de lucru al actualei Comisii și care vor putea crește atât competitivitatea Uniunii Europene, dar mai ales vor putea genera noi locuri de muncă, putând asigura astfel un trai decent pentru cetățenii europeni?

Mulțumesc.

2-388

**László Andor, Member of the Commission.** – Indeed, creating more and better jobs is also included in the Europe 2020 strategy. I would like to draw your attention to two more flagship initiatives. I already mentioned the one which focuses on poverty, but concerning the quantity and quality of jobs in Europe we have the ‘new skills in jobs’ flagship initiative; and under the sustainability pillar of Europe 2020 there is a flagship initiative on industrial policy.

I think this is a crucial point in the context of this question, because it has to be recognised that European Union instruments should not only target the impact of companies leaving Europe, like the Globalisation Fund. This plays a very important role in preventing poverty, preventing the loss of income and the loss of skills when corporations decide to relocate outside Europe; and for the first time now in a very long time there is going to be a flagship initiative on industrial policy for a sustainable economy.

I think this will address many of the issues of industrial development and the issue of location. I fully agree with what was implied in the question, that without a comprehensive economic policy and employment policy we cannot successfully fight poverty.

2-389



**Franz Obermayr (NI).** – Gerade in Zeiten der Wirtschaftskrise ist die Gefahr von sozialem Missbrauch sehr groß. Ist der Kommission bekannt, dass es in Mitteleuropa zwischen Staaten mit hohem Sozialgefälle einen groß angelegten Sozialmissbrauch gibt? So wurden Ausgleichszahlungen auf Mindestrenten durch EU-Bürger aus neun Mitgliedstaaten in betrügerischer Absicht beansprucht, wobei diese Ausgleichszahlungen die Höhe der eigentlichen Pension deutlich überstiegen.

Nun meine Frage: Gedenkt die Kommission, den Einzelstaaten Instrumente an die Hand zu geben, mit denen derartig großangelegter Sozialmissbrauch verhindert werden kann?

2-390

**Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, στην Ελλάδα το ποσοστό του πληθυσμού που ζει κάτω από τα όρια της φτώχειας είναι πάνω από 20%. Από αυτούς, σε συνθήκες φτώχειας το 34% είναι άνεργοι και υπάρχει και ένα ποσοστό 14% εργαζόμενων φτωχών.

Το πρόβλημα της φτώχειας που περιέγραψε η συνάδελφος με την ερώτηση σε σχέση με την Ευρώπη και τα στοιχεία που σας έδωσα για την Ελλάδα κατά τη γνώμη μου οφείλονται στην αποτυχία του νεοφιλελεύθερου οικονομικού μοντέλου που προωθούσε η Συνθήκη της Λισαβόνας και το επαναφέρει το κείμενο της Στρατηγικής για το 2020.

Θα ήθελα να σας ρωτήσω: Είναι δυνατόν να αντιμετωπιστούν τα αυξανόμενα ποσοστά φτώχειας με αποσπασματικές πολιτικές που έχουν και στοιχεία φιλανθρωπίας ή χρειάζεται μια άλλη οικονομική πολιτική, που να έχει στο επίκεντρό της την κύρια απασχόληση, πράγμα που σημαίνει ότι πρέπει να ξαναδείτε το κείμενο της Ευρωπαϊκής Στρατηγικής για το 2020;

2-391

**László Andor, Member of the Commission.** – Starting with the second question if you do not mind, it is indeed very important to have a more stable macroeconomic environment.

In the previous answer I referred to the importance of a comprehensive economic policy in order to create a more stable environment, and indeed what was mentioned as the 'neoliberal trend' of recent decades needs to be reviewed. In Europe 2020 we have a number of initiatives, and I would like in particular to mention the chapter on financial regulation. This is a substantial change as compared to the previous regime and comes from the intention to stabilise the macroeconomic environment which would relieve the pressure on the fiscal systems that are meant to support social protection systems and employment policies.

Concerning the abuse and the effectiveness of the social protection systems, indeed the crisis is a test in this respect. What the Commission can do is to use the open method of coordination and the analytical and reporting capacity available to it to help Member States to better focus the social protection measures.

The challenge in crisis times, which was mentioned in the question, but also in the coming period, when various Member States will face the need for fiscal consolidation will really be a test, and we cannot easily find more resources for fighting poverty. That is why we need to share experiences about how to use our instruments more effectively and how to target the vulnerable groups better.

2-392

**President.** – Question 31 by Georgios Papanikolaou (H-0089/10)

Subject: Evaluation of the Culture Programme 2007-2013

As part of efforts to promote and highlight European culture, in 2007 the European Union adopted the Culture Programme which will run until 2013. It has a total budget of approximately 400 million euros.

The objectives of this programme include raising awareness of those aspects of culture which are of European significance and promoting the transnational mobility of people working in the cultural sector.

How does the Commission evaluate progress so far in attaining these two objectives?

Are Member States showing an interest and taking part in Culture Programme, or does the Commission consider that it should launch new and more dynamic initiatives to attain its objectives by 2013?

2-393

**Ανδρούλλα Βασιλείου, Μέλος της Επιτροπής.** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όπως αναφέρει ο βουλευτής Παπανικολάου, στόχος του προγράμματος "Πολιτισμός" είναι ο εμπλουτισμός της πολιτιστικής εμπειρίας των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών με την προβολή της κοινής μας πολιτιστικής κληρονομιάς. Η Επιτροπή προωθεί την πολιτιστική συνεργασία μεταξύ των δημιουργών, των πολιτιστικών φορέων και των θεσμών των χωρών που συμμετέχουν στο πρόγραμμα, με σκοπό την ενθάρρυνση της διαμόρφωσης της ευρωπαϊκής υπηκοότητας.

Το πρόγραμμα "Πολιτισμός" στοχεύει ειδικότερα στην προώθηση της διακρατικής κινητικότητας των πολιτιστικών φορέων, στην ενθάρρυνση της διακρατικής κυκλοφορίας των καλλιτεχνών και πολιτιστικών έργων και προϊόντων και στη στήριξη του διαπολιτισμικού διαλόγου. Ενδεικτικά αναφέρω ότι το 2009, στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος "Πολιτισμός", υποβλήθηκαν 749 αιτήσεις και επελέγησαν 256 σχέδια για χρηματοδότηση, από τα οποία τα 127 είχαν ως κύριο στόχο την κινητικότητα των πολιτιστικών φορέων.

Σύμφωνα με τη νομική βάση, απαιτείται τακτική εξωτερική και ανεξάρτητη αξιολόγηση του προγράμματος. Τον Ιούλιο του 2009, η Επιτροπή κάλεσε ανεξάρτητο ανάδοχο να αξιολογήσει τα πρώτα τρία έτη εφαρμογής του προγράμματος Πολιτισμός 2007-2009 και, ειδικότερα, τη συνάφεια των στόχων, τα πρώτα αποτελέσματα και τον αρχικό αντίκτυπο του προγράμματος.

Ο ανάδοχος πραγματοποιεί την αξιολόγηση με βάση τα στοιχεία σχετικά με τα αποτελέσματα των σχεδίων, τις πρόσφατες μεμονωμένες αξιολογήσεις, τις έρευνες και συνεντεύξεις με τους δικαιούχους σχεδίων και τους ενδιαφερόμενους πολιτιστικούς φορείς. Η τελική έκθεσή του θα υποβληθεί το δεύτερο εξάμηνο αυτού του χρόνου. Σε αυτή τη βάση, η Επιτροπή θα συντάξει έκθεση σχετικά με την εφαρμογή του προγράμματος και θα την υποβάλει στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο το αργότερο μέχρι τις 31 Δεκεμβρίου 2010.

Παρακαλώ, σημειώστε ότι το πρόγραμμα δεν στοχεύει πρώτιστα στις εθνικές αρχές αλλά στους πολιτιστικούς φορείς. Η συμμετοχή των πολιτιστικών φορέων σε σχέδια είναι σχετικά ομοιόμορφα κατανεμημένη στα κράτη μέλη. Οι εθνικές αρχές συμμετέχουν σε ομάδες εμπειρογνομόνων σε ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο για τη διαμόρφωση της πολιτικής ανάπτυξης του προγράμματος.

Μετά από δύο γύρους πιλοτικών σχεδίων για την κινητικότητα των καλλιτεχνών που εγκαινιάστηκαν από το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο για το 2008 και 2009, και λαμβάνοντας υπόψη τις συζητήσεις που ήδη διεξάγονται στο πλαίσιο της ανοιχτής μεθόδου συντονισμού, η Επιτροπή σε αυτό το στάδιο αξιολογεί την πρόοδο που έγινε μέχρι στιγμής και εξετάζει τρόπους βελτίωσης της εφαρμογής του τρέχοντος προγράμματος.

Αργότερα, εντός του έτους, η Επιτροπή θα αρχίσει διαδικασία δημόσιας διαβούλευσης με σκοπό να προετοιμαστεί το έδαφος για το νέο πρόγραμμα "Πολιτισμός" για το έτος 2014 και μετέπειτα.

2-394

**Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE).** – Κυρία Επίτροπε, σας ευχαριστώ πολύ για την απάντησή σας. Νομίζω είναι η πρώτη φορά που είστε μαζί μας σε αυτή τη διαδικασία. Θέλω να σας ευχηθώ καλή επιτυχία στο έργο σας και καλή δύναμη.

Πράγματι, είναι καθοριστική η ευαισθητοποίηση των Ευρωπαίων πολιτών στα πολιτιστικά στοιχεία που έχουν σημασία για την Ευρώπη και αποτελούν σημεία αναφοράς του ευρωπαϊκού πολιτισμού και των κοινών αξιών μας. Νομίζω μάλιστα ότι το σημείο αυτό αποκτά ιδιαίτερη βαρύτητα το τελευταίο χρονικό διάστημα και για την Ελλάδα –και επιτρέψτε μου έτσι να προχωρήσω λίγο τη συζήτηση– υπό το βάρος της χρησιμοποίησης πολιτιστικών μνημείων για άσχετους με τον πολιτισμό λόγους, προκειμένου να ειρωνευθούν τη χώρα μου. Αναφέρομαι στο δημοσίευμα του γερμανικού περιοδικού Focus με την παραποίηση της Αφροδίτης της Μήλου, αναφέρομαι στα διαδικτυακά δημοσιεύματα που παρουσιάζουν την Ακρόπολη ως ένα ερείπιο.

Υπό το φόβο λοιπόν μήπως πλέον αυτή η πρακτική δεν αποτελέσει εξαίρεση, ερωτώ εσάς, κυρία Επίτροπε, αν καταδικάζετε αυτές τις πρακτικές και αν, στο πλαίσιο του προγράμματος που συζητάμε, αλλά και όχι μόνο, σχεδιάζει η Επιτροπή την ανάληψη μιας πιο αποφασιστικής, πιο επιθετικής, επιτρέψτε μου να πω, πολιτικής για την προώθηση του πολιτισμικού ...

*(Ο Πρόεδρος διακόπτει τον ομιλητή)*

2-395

**Ανδρούλλα Βασιλείου, Μέλος της Επιτροπής.** – Να μου επιτρέψετε να μην κάνω αυτή τη στιγμή παρατηρήσεις για δημοσιεύματα σε διάφορα έντυπα, διότι, πραγματικά, εάν αρχίζαμε να απαντάμε σε δημοσιεύματα αυτού του είδους, νομίζω ότι δεν θα καταλήγαμε πουθενά.

Εκείνο το οποίο λέω είναι ότι πολιτιστικά μνημεία, όπως η Ακρόπολη και άλλα μνημεία της Ελλάδας και άλλων κρατών μελών, αποτελούν πηγή έμπνευσης και διαπολιτισμικού πλούτου, και ακριβώς σήμερα η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή έχει υιοθετήσει ένα νέο σύστημα για σήμανση των μεγάλων πολιτιστικών μνημείων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, μεταξύ των οποίων είναι και η Ακρόπολη.

Αυτό, νομίζω, μιλά από μόνο του όσον αφορά το πώς σκέπτεται η Ευρώπη γι' αυτά τα μνημεία.

2-396

**President.** – Question 32 by Liam Aylward (H-0090/10)

Subject: Strengthening and funding grassroots sporting organisations in the EU

Grassroots sporting organisations make a huge contribution to European society, culture and the health of European citizens; in the current economic climate, however, many grassroots sporting organisations are experiencing financial difficulties. What action can the Commission take to strengthen grassroots sports and promote their development across the Member States?

The Commission has recently closed its public consultation on funding for grassroots sports. Can the Commission give further information on the aims of this public consultation and when further information on the outcome of this consultation will be available?

2-397

**Androulla Vassiliou, Member of the Commission.** – The Commission fully acknowledges the important role of grass-root sport within European society.

The 2007 White Paper on Sport therefore focused on the societal aspects of sport and proposed a number of actions, including the promotion of health-enhancing physical activity or sport's educational role of social inclusion in and through sport and of volunteering in sport, which have been or are currently being implemented.

Similarly the new EU competence for sport enshrined in Article 165 highlights the sector's specific nature, its social and educational function and its structures based on voluntary activity.

It thereby provides the framework for future EU action and gives direction for promoting sport across the EU and for developing the European dimension in sport.

The Commission intends to propose initiatives for implementing the Lisbon Treaty in the field of sport later this year. That will take account of the need to strengthen the grass-root sports sector.

The honourable Member also rightly points out that grass-root sports organisations face challenges in the current economic climate. The ongoing EU study on internal market barriers to sports funding, which was announced in the White Paper and which focuses on grass-root sports funding, addresses such challenges. The study aims to describe the key sources of financing, identify financing models in different Member States and for different sports disciplines and to analyse the EU regulatory environment and national policies that have an impact on sports funding.

Finally, the study should outline efficient business models that are also able to meet future challenges, such as the impact of the economic crisis on public sector budgets or on sponsorship, and identify means of strengthening the development of grass-root sport across the European Union.

The consultations on funding for grass-root sport referred to by the honourable Member were carried out within the framework of this study. The initial results of these consultations were presented to interested stakeholders at a conference on sustainable funding models for grass-root sport in the internal market, organised by the study contractor on 16 February in Brussels.

The outcomes of the conference will soon be published on the website of the Internal Market and Services Directorate-General.

2-398

**Liam Aylward (ALDE).** – I would like to thank the Commissioner for her response. I welcome her commitment, as outlined, to the development of sport at grass roots level.

Because of the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty, I welcome the fact that the European Union now has competence in the area of sport with a support budget. Can the Commission outline firstly how it intends to format the European Union sports programme, and, secondly, say when we can expect the first communication from the Commission on this issue?

2-399

**Androulla Vassiliou, Member of the Commission.** – Indeed, we intend to promote communication on sport this summer. So, we will have the communication before the summer recess. That should provide the framework for enhanced cooperation, a new agenda for sport at EU level and also a draft decision for a two-year EU sport programme for 2012 and 2013.

Of course, in the mean time, as you very well know, we have the ongoing sport actions in 2009, 2010 and 2011, focusing on grass-root sport and the social aspect of sport. Actions for 2009 have already been approved and they are to be enforced this year. We are about to approve the action for 2010, which will also be ready in a couple of months.

Of course, as you very well know, unfortunately the budget for 2010 has been cut from EUR 6 million to EUR 3 million. According to the budget that we have for 2011, we have new actions and new testing material in order to formulate our programme for 2012 and 2013.

2-400

**Piotr Borys (PPE).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowna Pani Komisarz! Chciałem ogromnie podziękować za deklarację stworzenia nowej strategii w obszarze sportu, ale chciałem także przedstawić pewien pomysł związany z tym, o czym dyskutuje także Komisja Kultury, co jest związane z nowymi kompetencjami kluczowymi, w skład których można włączyć dzisiaj umiejętności sportowe, wiedzę o kulturze, wiedzę o Unii Europejskiej. Chodzi o to, czy Pani Komisarz przewiduje włączenie się w ten nowy bardzo ważny aspekt umiejętności kluczowych młodych ludzi w całej Unii Europejskiej, aby także zaznaczyć i zaakcentować kwestie sportowe i kwestie wiedzy o Europie i wiedzy o kulturze, które są tak istotne w budowaniu tożsamości europejskiej?

2-401

**Androulla Vassiliou, Member of the Commission.** – Certainly, when I speak about the societal role of sport, matters concerning education and training are very important, and I think that education is even more important for our common European identity. This will certainly be taken into account when we formulate our more permanent programme on sport.

2-402

**President.** – Question 33 by Jim Higgins (H-0072/10)

Subject: Road deaths

Could the Commission please outline how it intends to combat the three main causes of road deaths: speed, drug/drink driving and inadequate road infrastructure?

2-403

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Within the framework of the third European Action Programme on Road Safety up to 2010, a number of actions were implemented to combat speeding, drug and drink driving as well as to improve road infrastructure. Many of those actions have involved the European Parliament under the codecision procedure. But, of course, further efforts are needed.

The Commission is currently working on the European Road Safety Strategy for the next decade. It will stress the importance of proper enforcement and sanctions for dangerous behaviour, in particular drink driving and excessive speed. Citizens of Member States cannot understand why other EU nationals are not sanctioned when they violate the law. For this reason it is urgent to resume discussions on the proposals for a directive on cross-border enforcement, which received the full support of the European Parliament but was blocked by the Council. The Commission is determined to move forward with this proposal.

Besides control and sanctions, education and awareness are areas to which the Commission will give strong emphasis. Specific actions should be proposed regarding alcohol and speed, such as alcohol locks in certain vehicles or more stringent requirements for novice drivers. Drug driving is an increasing problem. The Commission expects the ongoing DRUID research project to provide ideas for concrete action. As far as infrastructure is concerned, the European Parliament and the Council have adopted legislation regarding safe management and safety requirements for roads and tunnels of the trans-European network.

The Commission, of course, will closely follow their proper implementation by the Member States. But safety of road infrastructure is not limited to the major TEN roads; 56% of road deaths occur on rural roads. So the Commission will therefore examine the extension of current legislation on safe management to the secondary road network of Member States. Finally, the Commission will also verify that infrastructure projects receiving EU funding or loans take road safety requirements into account.

I must also underline that road safety is a shared responsibility between the EU institutions, Member States, local and regional bodies, associations and, of course, citizens. To reach maximum efficiency, solutions must respond to concrete problems on the ground. The next European road safety strategy will propose a number of actions based on this principle. Its main goal is to establish a common European road safety area which will form part of a single European transport area where all EU citizens will benefit from the same level of safety all over Europe.

2-404

**Jim Higgins (PPE).** – A Uachtaráin, ba mhaith liom mo bhuíochas a ghabháil leis an gCoimisinéir. Ag éisteacht leis an gCoimisinéir, is léir go bhfuil a lán oibre déanta ó thaobh luas agus alcól a bheith mar chúiseanna do thimpistí bóithre. Ach, is léir nach bhfuilimid ag déanamh taighde air seo ó thaobh druggaí de. Cúis mhór le beagnach 25% de na timpistí bóithre san Aontas Eorpach gach bliain isea a bheith ag tiomáint ar meisce nó faoi thionchar druggaí. Cailltear 10 000 duine chuile bhliain de bharr na dtimpistí seo.

Ach caithfimid níos mó a dhéanamh ó thaobh druggaí de, mar is léir gur cúis mhór í ó thaobh timpistí bóithre de agus ó thaobh marú daoine ar na bóithre seo. Táim ag moladh don Choimisinéir go gcaithfimid i bhfad níos mó a dhéanamh.

Fáiltím roimh an taighde ach caithfimid i bhfad níos mó a dhéanamh ó thaobh éifeachtachta de.

2-405

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Of course I can only share your concern. The problem with drugs, as you know very well, is that, although we have relatively developed technology to find drivers who are under the influence of alcohol, it is much more difficult to detect the influence of drugs. We really must carry out research to find the necessary technology, because today it is only a visible observation by the police, who then send people for medical testing, and only then can it become clear that there is a problem. We do of course need more.

2-406

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D).** – Ačiū už pateiktus pasiūlymus dėl tos problemos sprendimo. Aš norėčiau paklausti jūsų, ar jums neatrodo, kad mobiliųjų telefonų naudojimas vairuojant automobilį yra viena iš priežasčių, kuri atskirų tyrimų metu yra prilyginta, kad jų reakcijos greitis sumažėja taip pat, kaip būnant apsvaigus nuo alkoholio ir narkotinių medžiagų. Kitas klausimas yra dėl sunkiasvorio transporto. Tai yra padidintos rizikos objektas, ypatingai tamsiu paros metu, ir taip pat sunkiasvoris transportas, jūs gerai žinote, blogina kelių būklę, kas taip pat prisideda prie avarių skaičiaus. Ar jums neatrodo, kad reikėtų padidinti ir su efektyvinti politiką krovinių perkėlimo nuo kelių į geležinkelius.

2-407

**Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL).** – Κύριε Επίτροπε, το θέμα που συζητάμε και που έθιξε ο συνάδελφος με την ερώτησή του είναι πάρα πολύ σοβαρό. Αυτό που λέμε "τροχαία ατυχήματα" κατά τη γνώμη μου είναι συγκρούσεις που οφείλονται σε πολλές αιτίες και είναι πράγματι αιτία πολλών θανάτων στην Ευρώπη.

Θέλω λοιπόν να σας ρωτήσω δύο συγκεκριμένα πράγματα:

Πρώτον, επειδή οι περισσότερες από αυτές τις συγκρούσεις γίνονται στις πόλεις και τα περισσότερα θύματα είναι πεζοί και ποδηλάτες, τι πρωτοβουλίες βλέπετε ότι πρέπει να αναπτυχθούν ούτως ώστε να πάμε στη λογική αυτού που λέμε "vision zero", δηλαδή να μην έχουμε θύματα στις πόλεις, να προσέχουμε ιδιαίτερα τα σχολεία, τους ποδηλατόδρομους, κλπ.;

Και η δεύτερη ερώτηση είναι, τι προτίθεστε να κάνετε ούτως ώστε να απονέμεται δικαιοσύνη υπέρ των θυμάτων και των συγγενών στο πλαίσιο της λογικής, ούτως ώστε με αυτή τη λογική να πετύχουμε και την πρόληψη των ατυχημάτων;

2-408

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Of course the shift in modality, as it is called, to have a preference for the transport of goods by rail is also a clear preference for the Commission, but that has been a desire for decades. We must now find and abolish the bottlenecks that stop us taking full advantage of railways. There are many things which must be done and I think that, during this Commission's term in office, we can move this forward a little.

I should say that the use of mobile phones while driving, at least in some countries – my own country included – is prohibited.

Regarding actions to address casualties and deaths in road-traffic accidents, this Commission had, during this action plan, the ambitious target of reducing the number of deaths by 50%. It was not achieved but the reduction in the number of deaths was substantial.

This was of course brought about by the common efforts of European institutions, but above all of Member States. In my own country, for instance, the reduction in the number of deaths has been even more remarkable during this decade – almost threefold. We have reserves and, although we will never reach zero accidents, we can do a lot to reduce the number of casualties. This is, of course, a very complex issue which includes not using alcohol, better roads, better conditions, education, training – all these things.

2-409

**President.** – As they deal with the same subject, the following questions will be taken together:

Question 34 by Ivo Belet (H-0077/10)

Subject: Railway accident in Buizingen and electronic safety system

The serious railway accident in Buizingen, Belgium, on 15 February 2010 is being blamed on the absence of an electronic safety system which automatically applies trains' brakes if they pass a red light.

In addition to the national automatic train protection (ATP) systems, which have existed for years in some Member States, work is proceeding apace on the introduction of ERTMS (European Rail Traffic Management System) in Europe.

To what extent and for how long have the various Member States been equipping their railway lines and trains with national ATP systems?

What is the state of play with the introduction of ERTMS in the various Member States (both on trains and on railway lines)?

In the case of Member States which do not yet have national train protection systems, is it still worthwhile to invest in them, in view of the ongoing introduction of ERTMS and the major investment involved in a changeover?

How is the danger averted that railway infrastructure may be equipped with ERTMS but the trains may not, or vice versa?

Does this problem arise at present, for example for intercity railway traffic on the Liège-Aachen line?

What lessons should we perhaps learn here with regard to the liberalisation of the railways in Europe?

#### Question 35 by Frieda Brepoels (H-0091/10)

Subject: Causes of the dreadful train crash on Monday, 15 February in Buizingen

Can the Commission demonstrate whether liberalisation has affected safety?

In June 2008, the Commission sent Belgium a reasoned opinion formally criticising the complex three-part structure of Belgian Railways. Have the requisite measures since been taken in response to the objections raised by the Commission? How?

Since when has the European ERTMS standard been available? Did any delay occur in comparison with the scheduled date of introduction? If so, what were the causes of this delay and what remedial action has the Commission taken?

Did the debate on the European standard prevent the railways from introducing a system of their own to guarantee safety on domestic routes? Since when have the specifications for such national systems been available? In how many of the EU-27 countries does a national system already exist, and since when has it done so? Which countries score best?

What is Belgium's position in relation to the EU-27 regarding safety of the railway network?

2-410

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – The train accident in Buizingen on Monday 15 February was a shocking tragedy and, in the aftermath of this serious accident, several technical and political questions concerning rail safety can be asked.

The causes of the accident are not yet fully known and the technical investigation has been launched in accordance with the provisions of the EU Safety Directive. The Belgian investigation body has the responsibility for carrying this out. Two investigators from the European Railway Agency joined the Belgian team in charge of the investigation just a few hours after the accident had occurred.

I would like to stress that, as long as the causes of the accident have not been clarified, it is inappropriate to draw conclusions.

As is all too often the case when rail accidents happen, remarks alleging a link between European rules or regulations and the accidents have been made. I would first like to be very clear on the opening-up of the market. Alongside the opening-up of the rail freight sector to competition and the establishment of requirements to separate the activities of infrastructure managers and railway undertakings, a stringent regulatory framework was introduced covering rail safety and interoperability. We have carefully monitored this opening-up of the rail sector to competition to ensure that it has no negative impact on rail safety, and the indicators clearly show no such impact.

I also see no relationship between the accident and the reasoned opinion we sent to Belgium in 2008 regarding the lack of independence between infrastructure managers and rail undertakings.

Any proposition linking rail safety levels to rail market opening is, in my view, just an excuse to steer the debate away from the true causes of the accident.

The question of the coexistence of national and European train control systems can be put in these terms. More than 20 different national systems are used in Europe today to ensure the safe movement of trains. The incompatibility of the different national systems poses a major problem for international trains because either locomotives have to be changed at each border or they have to be equipped with several onboard systems.

For this reason, a single system for use at European level has been designed and developed and is currently being installed on major international lines and trains in Europe. The system is known as ERTMS, the European Rail Traffic Management System.

As regards the timing, most of the national systems were developed in the early 1980s, but their deployment is a long and costly process. In most of the countries where these systems exist, only part of the national networks and locomotives have been equipped to date, and this partial installation of the equipment took approximately 20 years.

ERTMS specifications have been available since 2000. A number of pilot projects were carried out between 2000 and 2005. Since 2005, several ERTMS equipped lines have been put into service.

At present 10 Member States have lines with ERTMS and there are projects ongoing in almost all Member States. In Belgium, for example, the line between Aachen and Liège is equipped and intercity trains running on this line are equipped.

The ERTMS will, therefore, probably coexist with national systems for a period of 20 years. Some Member States will benefit earlier than others from the European system. We see, for example, that the Italian and Spanish high-speed network is already almost fully equipped, that the conventional network of Luxembourg is also almost fully equipped, while in 15 Member States there are only pilot lines or projects.

It should also be noted that automatic train protection systems are just one element contributing to the safety of the network. Appropriate training, sound maintenance and better protection of level crossings are other important components for safety.

If we take a broader range of safety indicators, overall data show that railway safety standards in Europe are generally very high.

2-411

**Ivo Belet (PPE).** – Voorzitter, commissaris, welke lessen we uit dit drama moeten trekken, dat is inderdaad een vraag voor de Belgische diensten, voor de Belgische overheid. Binnenkort gaat daarover in het Belgische parlement trouwens een speciale onderzoekscommissie aan het werk.

Nog één vraag voor u, commissaris. Hoe kijkt u aan tegen het sociale aspect, het aspect werkdruk voor het treinpersoneel, en met name voor de machinisten? Moeten we dat ook niet onderzoeken, en dringt zich daar geen Europese regeling op, met name omdat de concurrentie op het vlak van het reizigersvervoer de komende jaren toch ook zal toenemen?

2-412

**Frieda Brepoels (Verts/ALE).** – Ik zou de commissaris van harte willen bedanken voor het antwoord dat hij gegeven heeft op een aantal heel precieze vragen. Op een vraag van mij heeft hij niet geantwoord, in verband met de ingebrekestelling van België door de Commissie reeds in 2008. In 2009 is er nog eens vastgesteld dat er een gebrek is aan onafhankelijkheid van Infrabel ten opzichte van de NMBS en de holding. Ik zou willen weten hoeveel tijd de Commissie nog aan de NMBS geeft om de noodzakelijke herstructureringen ook uit te voeren?

2-413

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Firstly, on the operators and social questions. We can look at this in depth and analyse the situation because, of course, if we have more competition and more intensive traffic, we should address very seriously these social aspects as well. We have various regulations already in place concerning, for instance, pilots in aviation. You will know of the Driving Time Directive in road transport, and some similar control over the driving time should be applied to all drivers, including locomotive drivers.

So I think that we should look very seriously at this issue. There is always national legislation as well, and these are primarily questions for national legislation also, but that is a question we should certainly look at.

I said that in 2008 the Commission had communicated a reasoned opinion to Belgium on the lack of safeguards to guarantee the independence of the infrastructure manager from rail undertakings in the exercise of essential functions, track allocation and charging. The Belgian authorities have replied to this and the Commission services are analysing this reply with a view to proposing a follow-up.

But, returning to the rail accident, this was a tragic event which should have been avoided, but never in the world will there be absolutely zero accidents. This is a very complex question. I suppose the investigation will give us concrete answers as to what the causes of the accident were and in many cases this is a tragic combination of several factors, including human factors. From the 19th century onwards, it has been clear that a red light is a signal to stop. So it does not mean that we can find one very simple answer as to why this accident happened.

2-414

**Piotr Borys (PPE).** – Szanowny Panie Komisarzu! Myślę, że z tej tragedii powinniśmy wyciągnąć wnioski. Oczywiście bardzo szczegółowa procedura wyjaśni, czy zawinił czynnik ludzki, czy może kwestie sprzętowe, czy może brak systemu. W jakiej perspektywie czasowej może wejść w życie według Pana system RTMS i czy według Pana przy liberalizacji przewozów kolejowych (zarówno osobowych, jak i towarowych) system bardzo czytelnej weryfikacji jakości usług i sprzętu nie powinien być wyłączony z systemów krajowych?

2-415

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – The plan is to deploy the ERTMS system on main European railway networks before 2015, so there is a date where we think that this deployment plan will be implemented, but this does not mean that every line, especially regional lines, will be equipped with such high-level equipment, so there must always be other systems as well. This deployment plan exists, but it is a costly operation and a big investment.

A European system of measuring quality is a good idea. When I express the idea of developing transport as a whole as an entity for Europe, under the possible name of the European single transport area, then of course this means that we must also harmonise quality requirements and the quality of services must be maintained at a very high level.

2-416

**President.** – Question 36 by Jacek Włosowicz (H-0103/10)

Subject: Daylight Saving Time

Do any up-to-date studies support the practice of changing the clocks twice a year, which severely disrupts the daily lives of EU citizens?

2-417

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Of course, we have had a directive since January 2001, when the Council and Parliament adopted the current directive on summer time in the European Union. This directive harmonises the calendar of the application of summer time in the EU. This is the ninth directive on the issue since 1980 when the first Summer Time Directive was adopted.

In accordance with the above directives, in 2007 the Commission presented a report on the impact of the current summer time regime. The report concluded that, on the basis of the information placed at the disposal of the Commission, the summer time regime has no negative impact and generated some energy savings. The current arrangements do not constitute any subject of concern in the Member States of the European Union. No Member State has required or has, since the report was published, ever required a modification of the current arrangements.

The honourable Member could hardly find a more suitable person to answer this question, not because I am responsible for transport but because I was in the Estonian Government which did exactly what is behind your question. First, in 1999, from 2000 we abolished turning the clock. We changed this regime and maintained one time regime. In 2002 we turned back and again introduced summer time. So, I have very personal experience of this.

Two unpleasant things happened, which is why this step made in 2000 became extremely unpopular. One thing was that the daylight disappears in the evening. Morning will be bright but you have nothing to do with this sunlight in the morning. In the evening it will get dark too soon and, if you come home from work and want to have some exercise or go out with children, it is already evening. People did not like this at all.

Secondly, of course, there was a total confusion about timetables and schedule – as you can imagine – relating to all travel arrangements to other countries. So we restored the present summer time regime, turning the clock twice a year. People are happy and this question has not been raised again.

2-418

**Jacek Włosowicz (ECR).** – Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Mam taką wątpliwość związaną z tym, że niektóre kraje w Europie, np. Anglia, posługują się innym czasem w stosunku do Europy kontynentalnej i tam ten brak zmiany nie przeszkadza. Czy znormalizowanie czasu w całej Europie do jednej strefy nie byłoby jednak korzystne od strony czysto transportowej?

2-419

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – As I said, I have had personal experience and I do not see any reason to start changing the system again or to make some changes to this system. It can become more complicated.

2-420

**President.** – Question 37 by Gay Mitchell (H-0071/10)

Subject: The freedom/security balance



In many countries across the European Union, the alarmism caused by global terrorism has led to a frightening erosion of civil liberties. A fundamental principle underpinning the social contract is that a government must justify any restriction on the rights of the citizen by clearly and irrefutably demonstrating the necessity of that restriction for the general security of the nation. The burden of proof appears to have been transferred from the authorities implementing the security measure to the people subject to it.

Does the Commission agree with this assessment? How will the Commission go about redressing the imbalance between security and freedom?

2-421

**Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission.** – The protection and promotion of fundamental rights should not be seen in opposition to the measures addressing the continuing threat of terrorism: they should go hand in hand. Anti-terrorism activities must be conducted with the full respect for the principle of the rule of law and the full respect of fundamental rights as they are enshrined at the level of the European Union in the Charter of Fundamental Rights.

This is not a question of compromise or balancing one requirement against the other; it is a question of delivering both but without compromising on fundamental rights of course.

Complying with fundamental rights does not prevent the adoption of effective security measures, and this has been recognised by the way in the Stockholm Programme which calls on the European institutions to ensure that all tools deployed to fight against terrorism fully respect fundamental rights. Therefore, I believe that this is a question of balance and not a question of balancing the one against the other.

2-422

**Gay Mitchell (PPE).** – As far as I am concerned, hammer the terrorists, hammer the criminals. I have no problem with that whatsoever, but what I am concerned about is that we, as parliamentarians, are not stressing sufficiently, either in the European Parliament or in Member States, that we expect that to be done in a way that protects the public, rather than undermining it or its privacy, that data is protected, that citizens' privacy is protected and that citizens who are innocent and law-abiding are not subject to intrusion by the state. It is imperative that this is included.

2-423

**Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission.** – I could not agree more with the honourable Member. You know, from my hearing and also from my actions before as Telecoms Commissioner, that data protection is very high on the agenda.

I have pledged to reform the Data Protection Directive of 1995 in order to adapt it to the modern world of technology, but I have also made it very clear that it is not because we have to protect society that we can give data out. The private data of the individual cannot be jeopardised by other measures.

I have seen how Parliament argued and voted on the SWIFT question. The Commission will take the views of Parliament into consideration when developing a new mandate in order to have a new SWIFT agreement with our American partners: one which balances the right to privacy and the need to combat terrorism.

2-424

**President.** – Question 38 by Marian Harkin (H-0087/10)

Subject: Green Paper on volunteering

In order to raise awareness of the value of volunteering throughout the EU, would the Commission consider, in conjunction with the proposed initiatives to celebrate the European Year on Volunteering, drawing up a comprehensive Green Paper on volunteering to facilitate, recognise and add value to volunteering?

In addition to drawing up such a Green Paper, does the Commission consider it important to build synergies between other international organisations such as the ILO and the UN in relation to the JHU/ILO Volunteer Measurement Project and the UN Non-Profit Handbook?

2-425

**Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission.** – I am very sorry, I do not have this question. I have many questions here, but not this one.

*(The President proposed that the question be answered in writing.)*

2-426

**Marian Harkin (ALDE).** – I shall be perfectly happy to get a reply from the Commissioner in writing.

2-427

**Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission.** – I am sorry. Something must have gone wrong in the organisation.

2-428

**Marian Harkin (ALDE).** – I would hope that the Commissioner would look carefully at what I have suggested given the possibilities with 2011 as the European Year on Volunteering, and perhaps also look at the possibility of a green paper following on from that after consultation with voluntary groups etc. I also hope that you take on board the importance of using either the ILO manual or the UN handbook to measure volunteering across the Member States.

2-429

**Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission.** – I can assure the honourable Member that on volunteering – which is a very important question, and the Commission is working on this – she will get the right answers to what she has asked.

2-430

**President.** – Question 39 by Bernd Posselt (H-0088/10)

Subject: Long-standing minorities

What possibilities of developing a strategy to protect and promote ethnic groups and minorities of long standing do the Lisbon Treaty and the EU Fundamental Rights Charter give the Commission, and what practical steps are planned?

2-431

**Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission.** – You are aware that one of the values on which the European Union is founded is the respect for the rights of persons who belong to minorities, and with the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon this is explicitly mentioned in Article 2 of the Treaty. Article 21 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights explicitly prohibits any discrimination on grounds of language or membership of a national minority. The Commission will ensure, within the scope of its mandate, that these fundamental rights are respected in EU law, including when Member States implement EU law.

There are also a number of pieces of EU legislation and EU programmes that can contribute to improving the situation of persons belonging to minorities; the Commission intends to combine these instruments to address difficulties including acts of discrimination which are likely to affect persons belonging to minorities.

You are also aware that there is the existing EU anti-discrimination legislation, which will be used to ensure equal treatment of persons belonging to a minority, and the Commission has adopted a proposal for a new directive currently under discussion that would extend protection against discrimination on the grounds of religion and beliefs, disability, age and sexual orientation to fields other than employment and occupation.

The Council framework decision on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law also aims to ensure that hate speech on grounds of race, colour, religion, descent or national and ethnic groups and hate crimes are penalised in all Member States. Now the Commission is monitoring the implementation of this framework decision as closely as possible and a group of national experts has been created to this end.

There is also the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, which plays a key role in assisting the Commission to enforce its task; and there is a Council of Europe Charter for Regional and Minority Languages and the framework convention for the protection of national minorities.

I would like to tell the honourable Member that I hope that more Member States would follow the example of those who have already signed and ratified those important conventions.

2-432

**Bernd Posselt (PPE).** – Frau Kommissarin, der letzte Aspekt hat den Punkt getroffen, um den es mir ging. Ich möchte noch einmal fragen: Gibt es Instrumente zur positiven Diskriminierung von lang ansässigen nationalen Minderheiten? Dafür sollte man genauso Strategien entwickeln wie für andere.

Zweitens: Ist die Grundrechte-Agentur in Wien auch dafür zuständig, und wie organisiert sie ihre Kontakte zur Zivilgesellschaft? Das ist ja im Moment im Gange, und spielen da auch die traditionellen Minderheiten eine Rolle? Es gibt nichts Ungerechteres als Ungleiches gleich zu behandeln!

2-433

**Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission.** – I agree with the honourable Member. There is nothing more unfair than treating unequal groups in the same way.

We really have to consider utilising the scarce resources which we have in a very active and intelligent way.

The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights has, of course, some objectives to fulfil but, if Parliament or the Commission ask the Agency to accomplish a certain task, the Agency will certainly do that.

Therefore, I would ask the Member to hand me the questions he would like to ask the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights to tackle and I will see what can be done in a positive way.

2-434

**Marc Tarabella (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, je comprends bien les impératifs du timing. Je voudrais juste insister sur la nécessité de consacrer une année particulière à la violence faite aux femmes, tant ce sujet est souvent encore tabou.

Trop de femmes sont victimes de violences, souvent physiques évidemment, mais aussi verbales, psychologiques, et souvent d'ailleurs dans le milieu familial, et ont honte de l'avouer. C'est vrai qu'une année consacrée à ce problème permettrait certainement de faire en sorte que ce phénomène encore tabou régresse et de mieux lutter ainsi contre la violence faite aux femmes.

2-435

**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 19.50 and resumed at 21.00.)*

2-436

**Elnökváltás: UR PÁL SCHMITT**  
*Alelnök*

2-437

## **14 - Az első vasúti csomaggal kapcsolatos irányelvek végrehajtása (vita)**

2-438

**Elnök.** – A következő pont a Brian Simpson által a Közlekedési és Idegenforgalmi Bizottság nevében a Bizottsághoz intézett, az első vasúti csomag (a 2001/12/EK, 2001/13/EK és 2001/14/EK irányelv) végrehajtásáról szóló szóbeli választ igénylő kérdésről (O-0030/2010 - B7-0204/2010)

2-439

**Brian Simpson, author.** – Mr President, I do not think I will pull my punches here tonight in regard to this particular oral question on the implementation of the First Railway Package. You will be aware, Commissioner, that the three directives that make up the First Railway Package were adopted in 2001, with a deadline of March 2006 for their transposition into national law. It is my obligation, as Chair of the Transport Committee, to raise this issue with you now by way of this oral question.

Here we are, nine years later, debating the fact that 21 Member States had, by October 2009, failed to enact these directives and have now been sent reasoned opinions because of this failure. It beggars belief that, as we approach the revision of the First Railway Package, a number of states – including so-called influential states, including states that like to inform us of their pro-European credentials – have failed to enact this significant piece of European legislation. Those Member States should hang their heads in shame and remember and honour the obligations they gave to this Parliament in 2001.

It is one of politics' most bewildering facts that we can deliver throughout the European Union the single market in numerous areas, but we cannot deliver it in the railway sector. That is not a failure of this Parliament. That is a failure of the Member States, often supported by sections of the railway industry and, frankly, Parliament's patience is beginning to run out.

This oral question is born out of a frustration, a frustration that the law is being deliberately flouted and that as yet the Commission has failed to bring Member States to book. We are now demanding to know what aspects in each failing Member State of each directive have not been enacted. We need to know why certain Member States have not correctly implemented these directives. We want to know which Member States are still resisting the concept of fair competition in the railway sector and deliberately protecting their own national companies.

We have concerns regarding the powers and independence of regulators and infrastructure managers in some of these Member States. We believe the lack of transparency and lack of harmonisation on infrastructure charges is leading to a protectionist practice and is acting as a break on delivering the single market to the railway sector, as well as stifling cross-border activity. If you add to this various national measures such as rolling stock taxes, then you have to question whether certain Member States ever intended to implement these directives in the first place.

Today we need to know many things. We need to know how the Commission, via the recast, will facilitate the full implementation of the full railway package. Today we need to know what the Commission is doing to enforce European

law on this issue. Today we need to know why it has taken so long for action to be taken against those Member States who have failed.

We on the Transport Committee often highlight the need for effective interoperability in the rail sector. Without that, and without the opening of national infrastructure, European rail freight is doomed. Transborder European passenger trains will be stifled. The single market will never be delivered, and the ERTMS will never happen.

The time has come to develop a true European perspective for our railway network, and the first step for that development is the first railway package. Without that first step being taken, then others cannot follow. We need direct action and we need it now. Let us name and shame those Member States that are failing, and let us take action against them now.

2-440

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Simpson and the Committee on Transport and Tourism for initiating this discussion and for promoting competitiveness and openness in the railway sector. I have always had strong support in Parliament and I hope this will continue.

The report on rail market monitoring which the Commission published at the end of 2009 shows that the progressive decline of the railways since the 1970s has been stopped in all market segments after the opening of the market and adoption of the first package. So there are some positive notes as well.

However, the economic crisis has had a serious impact on rail, with rail freight operators losing up to 30% of their business; this crisis has highlighted and increased existing structural problems of the railways.

These problems are on the one hand linked to the economics of rail and the persisting financial weakness of some actors. A number of Member States still fail to ensure sufficient budget for the infrastructure managers. This not only results in underinvestments which undermine the quality and performance of the rail network, it also builds up indebtedness levels.

On the other hand, there are still economic and technical barriers to market entry. Very often new entrants find themselves discriminated against, in particular where incumbent rail operators also have indirect control over the provision and use of rail infrastructure.

The newly established regulatory bodies do not all have the necessary powers and independence to ensure fair and transparent market conditions. The Commission adopted a two-tier approach to tackle these problems: infringement procedures to address incorrect implementation of the rules, and changes to the rules when they were not clear or precise enough.

The first line of approach – infringement procedures – required a detailed analysis of the legal situation in all the 25 Member States that have railway systems and resulted in the reasoned opinions that were sent out in 2009. The main problems are, first, insufficient implementation of the provisions of the directive on track access charging; second, lack of independence of the infrastructure manager in relation to railway operators and the failure to ensure sufficient independence, resources and powers for the regulatory body.

The second line of approach was to take advantage of the announced process of recasting the existing rail packages to propose improvements to the existing rules on rail market access.

In parallel we will pursue our holistic approach with a view to achieving a genuine internal market for rail. We will continue to promote the technical harmonisation of rail in conjunction with the European Railway Agency.

2-441

**Mathieu Grosch, im Namen der PPE-Fraktion.** – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wenn der belgische Maler Magritte die Richtlinien des Ersten Eisenbahnpakets gemalt hätte, hätte er bestimmt auch darunter geschrieben: „Das sind keine Richtlinien“. In der Tat ist für mich die gesamte Diskussion, die wir seit einiger Zeit führen, eine fast surrealistische Diskussion. Wir haben im Jahr 2003 Beschlüsse gefasst, die Umsetzung sollte im Jahr 2006 abgeschlossen sein, und im Jahr 2010 stellen wir die Frage, warum 21 Länder das nicht mitmachen, was sie selbst unterschrieben haben.

Die Liberalisierung sollte neue Akteure auf dem Markt zulassen. Das war die Theorie. Die Praxis sieht auch hier ganz anders aus. Und heute sind wir in einer Situation, wo wir – ob Gegner oder Befürworter von Liberalisierung in dem Bereich – eine Bewertung dieser Liberalisierung machen müssten und mit dem Problem konfrontiert sind, dass sie weitgehend gar nicht umgesetzt wurde. Die Gesellschaften ihrerseits – das haben wir in verschiedenen Ländern gesehen – haben im Namen der sogenannten Liberalisierung Entscheidungen getroffen, die das Personal und die Technik angingen, die nicht immer angenehm waren, obwohl diese Liberalisierung nicht umgesetzt wurde

Vor diesem Hintergrund müssen wir auch feststellen, dass historische Nutznießer der Bahn so gesehen die Schlüssel der Öffnung des Marktes weiter in den Händen behalten – Zugang zur Schiene, technische Interoperabilität, die Ausbildung und die Zertifizierung, um nur einige Beispiele zu nennen. Mit diesen Schlüsseln kann man die Tür zu einem offenen Markt öffnen, man kann die Tür aber auch schließen. Und das ist in den meisten Ländern der Fall gewesen und ist heute noch der Fall.

Deshalb sind die Vorschläge, die Sie hier gemacht haben und die wir kurz zur Kenntnis genommen haben, ein erster Schritt. Für mich geht es darum, dass wir, um die Liberalisierung korrekt zu bewerten, diese Umsetzung schnell herbeiführen bzw. mit den Mitteln erzwingen, die die Kommission hat oder die sie sich noch geben muss.

2-442

**Saïd El Khadraoui**, *namens de S&D-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, commissaris, om te beginnen stel ik vast dat het marktaandeel van vrachtvervoer per spoor eerst gedaald is, van ongeveer 13% in 1995 naar 10,5% in 2002, en dan gestabiliseerd werd. Voor personenvervoer, waar de liberalisering eigenlijk ook niet gefunctioneerd heeft of niet toegepast wordt, zien we eigenlijk wel een stijging de laatste jaren.

Daarmee wil ik vooral zeggen dat marktopening slechts een middel kan zijn en dat een geslaagde eengemaakte Europese spoorwegmarkt eigenlijk een combinatie moet zijn van maatregelen. Maatregelen inzake marktwerking uiteraard, maar ook sociale spelregels, elementen van *human resources*, een doorgedreven interoperabiliteit - ik denk dat we daar nog heel veel werk hebben - en ook wel voldoende instrumenten voor de financiering van infrastructuurprojecten. Enkel als we dat op een samenhangende, coherente manier aanpakken kunnen we slagen in ons opzet.

Commissaris, ik heb nog een vraag. We horen dat er inderdaad een herziening op til is van dat eerste spoorwegpakket. De vraag is: wanneer mogen we dat verwachten en wat is voor u de voornaamste doelstelling die we hiermee moeten bereiken?

2-443

**Gesine Meissner**, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, es hat mir sehr gut gefallen, als Sie bei der Anhörung im Ausschuss für Verkehr und Fremdenverkehr gesagt haben, das Größte, was man in Europa erreichen konnte, war die Mobilität und die Freizügigkeit für die Menschen. Zu der Freizügigkeit und auch zu dem Binnenmarkt, den Sie dabei auch erwähnt haben, gehört es unbedingt, dass nicht nur Personen von A nach B kommen, sondern auch Waren. Wir haben 1992 im Europäischen Parlament den Binnenmarkt de facto beschlossen, 2001 mit dem Ersten Eisenbahnpaket auch die Voraussetzungen für den freien Binnenmarkt im Eisenbahnsektor geschaffen. Es wurde bereits gesagt: Wir haben jetzt 2010, und er ist immer noch nicht da. Es ist eigentlich beschämend, dass 21 Staaten noch Blockaden einbauen. Wir haben es mit Protektionismus zu tun – auch das wurde bereits erwähnt –, und es ist äußerst bedauerlich, dass das so ist.

Nun muss man natürlich überlegen, warum das so ist. Die verschiedenen Schienensysteme haben Sie angesprochen, Herr Kommissar, das kann aber nicht der einzige Grund sein. Tatsächlich ist es so, dass es immer noch viele Länder gibt, die denken, sie kämen davon, wenn sie einen Rückfall in alte Zeiten versuchen, indem sie sagen, alles, was jetzt die Trennung von Infrastrukturen und Dienstleistung angeht, müsse man nicht so ernst nehmen. Das ist der vollkommen falsche Weg.

Ich bin auch sehr gespannt, wann Sie diese Revision der Richtlinie eventuell in Angriff nehmen können. Ich möchte Sie auch ausdrücklich auffordern – das ist auch bei meinen Vorrednern schon angeklungen –, streng mit den Mitgliedstaaten zu sein. Wir kommen ja aus verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten, aber wir sind uns im Verkehrsbereich alle einig, dass es ganz wichtig ist, jetzt endlich einmal für Ordnung zu sorgen. Sie sind ein neuer Kommissar, Sie sind nicht schuld an dem, was bisher war, auch nicht an den Versäumnissen. Deswegen haben Sie die einmalige Chance, jetzt im Eisenbahnbereich relativ flott vorwärts zu gehen und den Binnenmarkt und damit auch sämtliche Europäerinnen und Europäer wirklich nach vorn zu bringen. Darauf setze ich, und ich freue mich schon auf das, was Sie demnächst tun.

2-444

**Isabelle Durant**, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, l'inspiration de ce premier paquet ferroviaire date d'il y a bientôt quinze ans. À l'époque, l'objectif prioritaire, que je partage bien sûr, était de faire gagner des parts de marché au rail. La libéralisation, qui était un des moyens pour y arriver, offre des résultats mitigés et pas toujours très concluants. On l'a dit, les parts de marché du rail en fret stagnent alors que la route gagne des parts de marché.

Dans le même temps, le nombre de voyageurs a considérablement augmenté, alors qu'il n'y a eu aucun processus de libéralisation et le réseau ferroviaire à grande vitesse, qui est construit sur la base de la coopération et non pas de la concurrence, est plutôt un succès.

En outre, vous avez parlé de nouveaux entrants. Ces nouveaux entrants sont très peu nombreux et beaucoup d'entre eux ont été absorbés par des grandes compagnies. Autrement dit, je ne suis pas sûre que le monopole de grandes compagnies était le but poursuivi.

En ce qui concerne l'application, si on se réfère au nombre de procédures d'infraction, il y a objectivement, c'est vrai, un fameux problème, en particulier concernant l'insuffisance d'indépendance des organes de régulation et de recours, y compris là où il y a une séparation fonctionnelle ou institutionnelle, une séparation qui peut d'ailleurs amener d'autres problèmes et des coûts en matière de coordination interne.

En attendant vos réponses, Monsieur le Commissaire, je ne peux que vous encourager à adopter une attitude prudente, qui ne force pas les choses, qui poursuit l'approche holistique que vous avez mentionnée, qui va au bout de l'évaluation des paquets précédents sans parti pris, mais qui va d'abord au bout de l'évaluation avant d'engager le pas suivant. Cette évaluation doit donc être sans complaisance, y compris en ce qui concerne les conditions de travail, la sécurité et la sûreté, les obligations de services publics, l'insuffisance d'internalisation des coûts externes, avant de s'engager plus avant dans le processus de libéralisation.

Je serais donc intéressée d'entendre quelles sont vos priorités en la matière, compte tenu de certaines avancées – il faut le reconnaître et d'autres l'ont dit –, à savoir une meilleure transparence dans le *reporting* comptable, des avancées en matière d'interopérabilité, d'harmonisation des formations, des licences, et en matière de signalisation et de sécurité. Mais il reste beaucoup à faire et je serais très demandeuse d'une évaluation prudente, sans complaisance et sans tabou, de manière à ne pas avancer trop vite sur les étapes suivantes.

2-445

**Oldřich Vlasák, za skupinu ECR.** – Vážené dámy a pánové, když se schvaloval evropský regulační rámec pro železnice, všichni jsme doufali, že dojde k větší průhlednosti financování tohoto sektoru ekonomiky a že se vytvoří nové příležitosti pro zapojení dalších subjektů. Zdálo se, že evropský sektor železniční dopravy stojí na prahu nové éry. Kýžená liberalizace trhu však ve skutečnosti nenastala. Jak všichni víme, v 21 členských státech včetně České republiky k řádné implementaci prvního železničního balíčku nedošlo, přičemž zůstávají nevyřešeny zejména otázky v souvislosti s otevřením železničních trhů hospodářské soutěži.

To, že se jedná o skutečný problém, dokazuje i situace v České republice. Přestože stát již učinil první kroky, které povolují vstup dalších železničních dopravců na trh, ve skutečnosti chybí politická vůle umožňující na kolejích skutečnou konkurenci. To potvrzuje i chování socialistických hejtmanů v čele jednotlivých krajů, kteří na konci loňského roku uzavřeli s Českými drahami desetileté smlouvy s opcí na dalších pět let na zajištění regionální železniční dopravy, a to bez jakéhokoliv výběrového řízení. Hejtmani, kteří ve volbách získali mandát na čtyři roky, tak fakticky na patnáct let uzavřeli železniční trh. Monopolní České dráhy teď nebude nic nutit ke zlepšení svých služeb, což bude mít pro železnici fatální důsledky.

V tomto kontextu je proto otázkou, zda současná debata o zdaňování zaměstnaneckých benefitů, kterou v České republice odboráři rozpoutali, a související vyhrožování stávkami ve skutečnosti pouze neodvádí pozornost od reálných problémů. Problémů, které způsobují, že se železniční doprava dostává stále více na periferii společenského a ekonomického zájmu a logicky naopak narůstá oblíbenost Zelenými tolik kritizované silniční dopravy. Rád bych proto vybídl Evropskou komisi k větší aktivitě při prosazování skutečné liberalizace železničního sektoru a k důslednému dozoru, zda je netržní chování jednotlivých aktérů v souladu s evropskými právy.

2-446

**Jaromír Kohlíček, za skupinu GUE/NGL.** – Úvodem bych řekl, že zcela nesouhlasím s panem Vlasákem, jehož vláda se také podílela na tom, co sám kritizuje. A teď k věci. Protože účelem toho železničního balíčku bylo otevření trhu železniční dopravy oddělením infrastruktury, přepravy osob a přepravy nákladu, lze poměrně snadno zjistit, zda členské státy po různě dlouhém přechodném období splnily formálně požadavky směrnice. Co tak snadno zjistit nelze a na co se směrnice nezaměřily, to jsou odlišné bezpečnostní předpisy jednotlivých států, alespoň elementární shoda pracovních podmínek osádek souprav a pracovníků zajišťujících fungování infrastruktury a řada odlišností technických předpisů. ERTMS má být tím zaklínadlem, které má technicky sjednotit infrastrukturu i soupravy. Těším se proto na jasnou odpověď, pokud jde o kompatibilitu železniční sítě Evropské unie se standardem ERTMS. Neslyšel jsem ji.

Snad s touto otázkou souvisí i logicky navazující dotaz, jak se v současné době využívá otevírání trhů železniční přepravy zahraničními a domácími subjekty v jednotlivých zemích. Nejde mi samozřejmě o majetkově propojené subjekty, které formálně nezávisle zajišťují regionální přepravu, jak je tomu např. v Německu, ale o nezávislé operátory na trhu.

Závěrem bych rád zdůraznil, že ani první, ani další železniční balíčky neřeší sociální podmínky zaměstnanců. To může být v blízké budoucnosti velkým problémem otevírání trhu na železnici. Nelze totiž přijmout jako řešení metodu nejnižšího možného standardu.

2-447

**Mike Nattrass, on behalf of the EFD Group.** – Mr President, to the disadvantage of the United Kingdom, the UK Government has implemented the EU rail package. This is mainly because, these days, the Lib-Lab-Con sit at Westminster and like to be told what to do, having given away control to the EU.

The separation of train operators and separation of the rail network is leading to major problems, courtesy of the EU. No wonder 21 countries are too wise to get caught in an EU rail web leading to mayhem on all stations to Brussels.

I am not a Socialist, but if you need an integrated transport system, then state ownership is best – and not separation into multiple private hands. Having six different companies on the network between Birmingham and Berlin will create a complete ‘dog’s breakfast’, or should I say a ‘*Dachshunds Frühstück*’.

When Eurorail is broken up to allow the surplus capacity to be run by different companies we will no longer have rolling stock, just laughing stock.

Brian Simpson, who is responsible for this debate, is a member of the Labour Party. Labour was once Socialist, and he was elected by people who still think Labour is Socialist. Yet here he is, hiding in the EU, away from his faithful supporters. What is he calling for? He is calling for privatisation. More than that, he is calling for an EU model which does not work and is against the wishes of his own voters.

He is in fact the ‘Fat Controller’, creating fat pay packets for fat cats. The one thing that we can be sure of is that there is fat chance that this EU directive will be accepted, as it will derail the EU rail network.

2-448

**Georges Bach (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Ich begrüße die Überprüfung der Umsetzung des Ersten Eisenbahnpakets und die geplante Neufassung. Ich bin der Meinung, dass diese Überprüfung längst überfällig war. Ich bedauere allerdings, dass die Kommission keine oder nur unzureichende Informationen aus den Mitgliedstaaten bekommt. Dies macht eine effiziente und ehrliche Bewertung extrem schwierig. Aber es gilt nicht nur zu bewerten, sondern es gilt ebenfalls, die Mitgliedstaaten anzuhalten, die notwendigen Schritte in die Tat umzusetzen.

Bei einer Bewertung muss unbedingt dem Thema Sicherheit Gewicht beigemessen werden. Wurden aus den negativen Erfahrungen der letzten Zeit Lehren gezogen und werden diese berücksichtigt? Das ist meine Frage. Die Kommission ist in dieser Frage viel zu zurückhaltend gegenüber der Öffentlichkeit, die sich große Sorgen macht. Dies gilt ebenfalls für die Qualität. Ich möchte die Kommission bitten, Überlegungen anzustellen, wie man allgemeinverbindliche Qualitätskriterien festsetzen kann. Es wird viel von mangelhafter Qualität gesprochen, aber verlässlich messen lässt sich diese nicht. Zu bedauern sind ebenfalls die mangelnden Investitionen, die Sie, Herr Kommissar, schon angesprochen haben. Trotz Ko-Finanzierung des Kohäsionsfonds sind in den meisten Ländern die Investitionen in die Straße immer noch bedeutend höher als in die Schiene. Hier möchte ich das Stichwort ERTMS nennen – dieses System muss unbedingt für das Netz, aber auch für den Fuhrpark flächendeckend eingeführt werden, um mehr Sicherheit auf der Straße zu erreichen.

Ich warne vor weiteren Schritten in Richtung geplanter Liberalisierung des nationalen Personenverkehrs. Die in diesem Zusammenhang bereits ergriffenen Initiativen haben gezeigt, dass noch viele Hürden zu überwinden sind und dass die Kommission gut daran täte, zunächst eine komplette technische Harmonisierung durchzuführen und für eine ausführliche Umsetzung der beschlossenen Richtlinien zu sorgen.

2-449

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D).** – Transportul feroviar trebuie să fie o prioritate a politicii comunitare pentru transport până în 2020, având ca obiective deschiderea competiției, îmbunătățirea interoperabilității și a siguranței rețelelor naționale și dezvoltarea infrastructurii de transport feroviar.

Creșterea competiției nu trebuie însă să se realizeze în detrimentul siguranței sau calității serviciilor feroviare. Consider că la revizuirea primului pachet feroviar trebuie identificate problemele pe care le au statele membre care au primit avizele motivate din partea Comisiei, precum și modul de soluționare a acestora.

Atrag atenția asupra faptului că, datorită crizei, în sectorul transportului feroviar au loc mii de disponibilizări, care pot afecta grav transportul feroviar european. Sistemul ERTMS era implementat până la sfârșitul anului trecut pe aproximativ 2 700 km în Uniunea Europeană, iar până în 2020, va fi implementat de-a lungul a 24 000 km de cale ferată. Asta înseamnă investiții imense și așteptăm, domnule comisar, soluții și instrumente financiare noi, capabile să asigure finanțarea necesară. La acestea se adaugă și investițiile în modernizarea corespunzătoare a materialului rulant.

2-450

**Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR).** – W moim kraju jest takie powiedzenie, takie przysłowie, że jeżeli jedna osoba mówi ci, że jesteś pijany, to możesz się tym nie przejmować, ale jak pięć osób mówi ci, że jesteś pijany, to lepiej idź do łóżka, połóż się spać.

Jeżeli tylko jedno czy dwa państwa nie wprowadziłyby tego pierwszego pakietu, to moglibyśmy obkładać się dzisiaj sankcjami i grzmieć na tej sali, ale jeżeli dwadzieścia kilka państw nie wprowadziło tego pakietu to być może ten pakiet –

delikatnie mówiąc – najlepszy nie jest. Może tutaj tkwi przyczyna, tu tkwi problem. Jeżeli ja słyszę przed chwilą od naszego kolegi z Wielkiej Brytanii słowa istotnej krytyki, a akurat ten kraj pakiet ten wprowadził, to można zastanowić się, czy rzeczywiście jego zastosowanie jest do końca właściwe.

Oczywiście jest druga strona medalu – w kontekście ostatnich wypadków, o których tutaj także była mowa dwie godziny temu, w czasie pytań do Komisji – chodzi o kwestię bezpieczeństwa. Pod tym względem rzeczywiście to bezpieczeństwo się zwiększa. Na istotny problem zwrócił uwagę pan przewodniczący, pan komisarz Kallas, który mówił o tym, że szereg państw członkowskich nie inwestuje w kolej, że te możliwości inwestycji w infrastrukturę nie są realizowane. Takim krajem jest np. mój kraj Polska, w którym w ostatnich dwóch latach nastąpiła swoista zapaść, jeżeli chodzi o finansowanie kolei ze wszystkimi tego skutkami.

Kończąc, uważam, że bardzo łatwe określenia, bardzo łatwe recepty są z definicji podejrzane.

2-451

**Jacky Hénin (GUE/NGL).** – Monsieur le Président, certains pleurent ici sur les difficultés et les lenteurs de mise en œuvre des directives du premier paquet ferroviaire. Pour ma part, je m'en réjouis. Dans mon pays, dans ma région, nous nous battons avec les syndicats de cheminots, avec les comités d'usagers pour que ces directives scélérates ne soient pas appliquées et rejoignent ainsi les poubelles de l'histoire.

En France, l'un des enjeux des élections régionales est justement le blocage par les conseils régionaux de la mise en œuvre du règlement OSP concernant l'ouverture à la concurrence du transport ferroviaire régional. Nous ne voulons pas d'un chemin de fer à deux vitesses. Aux firmes privées, les marchés des trains d'affaires à sillons prioritaires, confortables, rapides et accessibles par leurs tarifs aux seuls riches; au public, des trains de seconde zone pour les pauvres, vieillots, non sécurisés, inconfortables.

Chaque jour qui passe en fait la démonstration: la séparation entre l'infrastructure et l'activité de transport imposée par les directives pour permettre l'ouverture à la concurrence sauvage est une ineptie technique, organisationnelle, coûteuse pour le contribuable et l'utilisateur. Si elle sert les grands groupes, elle désorganise le transport public, elle est responsable de la dégradation de l'état du réseau et de la sécurité. Les directives évoquées sont par ailleurs destructrices d'emplois et constituent une spoliation de la propriété commune du peuple au profit d'intérêts privés.

2-452

**Jaroslav Paška (EFD).** – Prijatím troch balíkov smerníc upravujúcich premávku na železničných tratiach prevzala Európska komisia spoluzodpovednosť za organizáciu železničnej dopravy v Európskej únii.

Niet pochýb o tom, že implementácia nových železničných pravidiel do rôznych národných legislatív môže prinášať isté problémy a zdražovanie. Naším spoločným záujmom je však určite dobre organizovaná doprava a dobre fungujúca štruktúra pre železničnú dopravu ako zmysluplná alternatíva najmä k cestnej doprave, ktorá nesporne veľmi výrazne zaťažuje naše životné prostredie. Preto je iste na mieste otvorene hovoriť o problémoch, ktoré brzdia rýchlejší rozvoj železničnej dopravy. Avšak nielen pravidlá, ale aj pohľad do budúcnosti môže byť našim záujmom.

Európske železnice z troch svetových strán končia v prímorských prístavoch, smerom na východ však železničné trate pokračujú až k Pacifiku. Dobré prepojenie európskych železníc na východnej hranici EÚ otvára európskym dopravcom nové možnosti na prepravu tovaru. A preto, ak sa v dohľadnom čase podarí zrealizovať predĺženie trasy rýchlovlaku z Paríža do Viedne a Bratislavy a súčasne predĺženie širokorozchodnej trate z Čiernej nad Tisou pri ukrajinskej hranici do Bratislavy a Viedne, tak na úseku medzi Bratislavou a Viedňou sa stretnú tri rozličné železničné systémy – klasická železnica, rýchlovlak a širokorozchodná železnica. V spojení s dvoma letiskami – Viedňou a Bratislavou, dvoma riečnymi prístavmi na Dunaji – opäť Viedňou a Bratislavou, a diaľničnými križovatkami tak v strede Európy vznikne jeden nový významný logistický a dopravný uzol.

Je nesporné, že popri udržiavaní a spresňovaní pravidiel ešte máme značné rezervy aj v efektívnom zvyšovaní dynamiky železničnej dopravy. Treba sa len pozrieť na možnosti investície a možno cestou spresňovania pravidiel, ale aj investovania do nových projektov podporiť železničnú dopravu tak, aby bola výnosnejšia a aby lepšie slúžila občanom Európy.

2-453

**Antonio Cancian (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, in questo periodo stiamo parlando molto della programmazione dei trasporti e ne parleremo nel prossimo periodo. Credo sia scoraggiante partire con la revisione del primo pacchetto vedendo ciò che è successo finora; quindi dobbiamo avere ancora maggior coraggio per cercare di invertire questa rotta. Credo che il tutto si possa focalizzare e attestarsi su tre punti fondamentali.

Il primo, credo, sia la liberalizzazione del trasporto ferroviario, dove esso crea concorrenza e stimola la competitività, naturalmente con regole chiare e trasparenti per tutti, come già detto. Il secondo punto focale sarebbe l'interoperabilità tra gli Stati e tra le varie modalità interne al trasporto ferroviario. Naturalmente, il terzo punto è la sicurezza, esigendo la



certificazione di sicurezza quale preconditione per l'ottenimento della licenza di esercizio. Sempre sulla sicurezza, e nell'ottica del mercato comune, non basta sanzionare le inefficienze degli Stati relative agli organismi regolatori: bisogna ampliare le competenze dell'Agenzia ferroviaria europea, includendo poteri più incisivi di ispezione e di controllo.

Credo che sia questo lo sforzo che dobbiamo fare in questo prossimo periodo, in cui ci occuperemo del futuro sostenibile dei trasporti, della revisione delle reti TEN, del trasporto merci che, è già in essere nella nostra commissione e, non ultima, questa revisione che dobbiamo prendere per mano e fare in modo di invertire la rotta rispetto a ciò che è successo finora.

2-454

**Inés Ayala Sender (S&D).** – Señor Presidente, sí, mi país, como otros veinte, aparece en el aviso remitido en octubre de 2009, y puedo asegurar que se ha puesto, desde entonces, las pilas.

No en balde España lidera la lista de crecimiento de transporte ferroviario de viajeros en la Unión Europea en 2007-2008. Pero otra cosa son las mercancías.

Pero yo le pregunto, señor Comisario: en un país periférico separado del resto de Europa por una muralla montañosa de más de 500 kilómetros —los Pirineos—, que solo puede cruzarse ferroviariamente por los dos extremos y que necesita un cambio de ejes de cada uno de los trenes que cruzan la frontera debido al diferente ancho de vías que nos legó una larga historia de autarquías, ¿qué incentivo pueden tener otros operadores para cruzar con tantos obstáculos la frontera con Francia? Incluso DB acaba de comprar o ha comprado Transfesa pero lo sigue teniendo también muy difícil.

Por eso creo sinceramente que, además del palo de los avisos y sanciones que le piden mis compañeros, necesitamos también la zanahoria de las infraestructuras de ambición europea. Urgen las redes transeuropeas.

De ahí la urgencia de dar un impulso definitivo a proyectos ferroviarios transfronterizos de envergadura como la travesía central del Pirineo, con un túnel de baja cota dedicado al transporte de mercancías. Ello obligará a los Estados miembros más proteccionistas o reticentes a unirse al flujo ferroviario norte-sur y este-oeste que necesita Europa para su Estrategia 2020.

2-455

**Brian Simpson, author.** – Mr President, I was named by one of the Members opposite. Mr Natrass made some very personal remarks against me before sneaking out of the Chamber without listening to the debate. Of course, this is a man who would not know one end of a railway locomotive from the other and whose expertise is restricted to Thomas the Tank Engine.

I do appreciate that UKIP have no idea with regard to manners and parliamentary procedure; this was evident recently in Brussels. However, as a democrat adhering to democratic principles and procedures, I presented this oral question on behalf of the Committee on Transport and Tourism as its Chair, which it is my proud duty to do. That is why I delivered it as such, so I really do not think I should be subjected to abuse from the other side of the Chamber from that group of rogues.

As an aside, I just thought I would mention in passing that, under the Labour Government in the United Kingdom, railway patronage has increased 20% over recent years – even on the route from London to Birmingham!

2-456

**Herbert Dorfmann (PPE).** – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, Kollegen Abgeordnete! Ich erzähle Ihnen einfach eine persönliche Erfahrung. Ich lebe an einer wichtigen Eisenbahnstrecke, der Strecke über den Brenner nach Verona. Die italienischen Staatsbahnen vernachlässigen dort seit Jahren sowohl den Güter- als auch den Personenverkehr. Nun fährt die österreichische Eisenbahn fünf Mal am Tag diese Strecke. Sie finden aber auf italienischen Bahnhöfen keinen Fahrplan dafür, und Sie bekommen auch keine Fahrkarte. Nun ja, bedenkt man, dass diese Strecke derzeit für ungefähr 20 Milliarden Euro neu gebaut wird und auch die Europäische Union hier sehr viel Geld investiert, so sieht man, wie absurd die Dinge in diesem Bereich teilweise laufen. Es sind nicht immer die ganz großen Dinge, manchmal sind es auch die kleinen Dinge, die die Sache kompliziert machen.

Deswegen, sehr geehrter Kommissar, ersuche ich Sie dringend, hier durchzugreifen, Sanktionen zu finden und energisch vorzugehen, damit die Richtlinien der Kommission eingehalten werden.

2-457

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL).** – Senhor Presidente, é hoje evidente o real objetivo do chamado *pacote ferroviário*, lançado com o objetivo anunciado – louvável – de lançar as bases da transferência modal, a interoperabilidade. A real intenção, como então denunciámos, foi abrir o transporte ferroviário, nomeadamente de mercadorias, à concorrência e aos interesses privados, como primeiro passo para a liberalização total do sector ao nível da União Europeia.

Tal como em outras liberalizações, começa-se por utilizar o que corre mal em dado momento, escamoteando as reais causas para tais situações, nomeadamente anos de persistentes políticas de desmantelamento e atrofamento do sector

público, para justificar medidas liberalizadoras e apontar a dita concorrência, não se percebendo como nem porquê, como solução para todos os males. A experiência, como já aqui ouvimos hoje, demonstra-nos o contrário: a liberalização é causa, e não solução, dos principais problemas no sector, destacando-se a qualidade e acessibilidade dos serviços e os direitos dos trabalhadores.

Sem dúvida que é estratégico o investimento público no sector ferroviário – desde logo por razões de ordem energética e ambiental –, mas não para o entregar às lógicas de lucro dos grandes interesses privados, que ambicionam dominar este sector público fundamental de cada país através da sua liberalização ao nível do mercado interno da União Europeia.

2-458

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D).** – Aș vrea să revin asupra situației cu care se confruntă, pe perioadă de criză, resursele umane din sectorul feroviar, care sunt formate și certificate.

În România, în această perioadă, vor avea loc peste 6 000 de disponibilizări în sectorul transportului feroviar. Cu siguranță, Fondul Social European, Fondul European pentru Globalizare vor fi mobilizate pentru a-i sprijini pe cei afectați, dar acestea sunt soluții temporare. De aceea, domnule comisar, sper să reușim să construim împreună o strategie de dezvoltare sustenabilă a transportului feroviar, astfel încât să oferim atât servicii sigure și de bună calitate, cât și locuri de muncă pentru personalul calificat din sectorul transportului feroviar.

2-459

**Siim Kallas, Vice-President of the Commission.** – Mr President, I wish to thank the honourable Members for their remarks. We will have ample opportunity to discuss the recasting of the first railway package. I just want to reply to some remarks.

First, information about the 21 Member States and the concrete reasons why the reasoned opinion was sent is public information, so anybody who wants can get that information.

This first railway package has very good intentions: to remove barriers and to improve the conditions for better functioning of transport. We will pursue the same goal with the recasting of the package. The problem is not that the package was bad, but that implementation that was insufficient. Barriers still exist and resistance to removing barriers is still very strong. We must change the old system of state-owned monopolies with great privileges and no interoperability. We must change that system and improve interoperability. That is the purpose of developing this railway reform.

The problem is precisely that this has not been completed. We must, of course, always balance all the steps taken with quality control. That is also where the railway package has ideas, such as on how to strengthen the role of regulatory agencies. The problem is that the regulatory agencies remain very mixed in with the interests of state-owned companies. You cannot then expect a high level of quality control.

These issues must and will be addressed in the recasting of the railway package, and perhaps in other strategic documents as well. Adequate financing remains a very big problem, and we need to find innovative ways to finance the bottlenecks. Many Members mentioned the need for investment. We must combine all possible tools and find new tools to pinpoint resources for investment in railways, including modern traffic management systems, booking systems for buying tickets in the same way as for air transport, and also better connect eastern Europe to western Europe, which is another substantial problem.

The detailed list of all the elements in the process of preparing this recast railway package is very long. I would be very happy to come back to you with concrete proposals once we have the concrete legislative documents.

2-460

**Elnök.** – A vitát lezárom.

### *Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (149. cikk)*

2-461

**Ádám Kósa (PPE), írásban.** – Üdvözlöm, hogy az Európai Bizottság az első vasúti csomag meghirdetésével elindított egy folyamatot, amely a vasúti szolgáltatás európai szintű egységesítése felé tett első lépésként értékelhető. Aggodalomra ad okot ugyanakkor az a tény, hogy ezt a csomagot alkotó három irányelv tagállami átültetése 21 országnak komoly nehézséget okozott, ami hátráltathatja a további csomagok megfelelő átültetését. Felhívom az Európai Bizottság figyelmét egy ellentmondásra, ami egyrészt a vasúti hálózatokkal szemben támasztott európai szintű magas fokú gazdasági és hatékonysági követelmények, másrészt pedig a vasútnak a térségfejlesztésre, a vidéken élő és fogyatékos emberek mobilitási lehetőségeinek javítására, és a környezetre gyakorolt pozitív hatása között húzódik. Javasolom a Bizottságnak ezen ellentmondás kiküszöbölését a megfelelő egyensúly és kompromisszum megtalálásával, szem előtt tartva a költségmegosztás elvének pontosítását a tagállamok és az Európai Unió között, valamint az egységes közösségi közlekedés kialakításának fontosságát. Az ágazat minden résztvevőjét magába foglaló egészséges verseny kialakítására

van szükség, melynek során az igazi verseny nem az egyes közlekedési ágak, hanem az egyéni közlekedés és a közösségi közlekedés között alakul ki.

2-461-500

**Artur Zasada (PPE), na piśmie.** – Problemem dla właściwego funkcjonowania rynku kolejowego w nowych państwach członkowskich, a co za tym idzie czynnikiem ograniczającym liberalizację rynku, jest niewłaściwe finansowanie kolei, czyli brak wystarczających środków na utrzymanie infrastruktury kolejowej (co skutkuje wysokimi stawkami dostępu do niej, a w konsekwencji ogranicza konkurencyjność tej gałęzi transportu z uwagi na wysokie koszty przewozu), oraz niedofinansowanie usług o charakterze służby publicznej, czego wynikiem jest zadłużenie spółek pasażerskich świadczących te usługi o jednoczesne ograniczenie możliwości inwestycyjnych na przykład na nowy tabor. W kontekście właściwej regulacji europejskiego rynku kolejowego zachodzi konieczność wzmocnienia krajowych regulatorów rynku. Poprzez wzmocnienie rozumieć zwiększenie ich niezależności, skuteczności, poprawy poziomu kadr, itd. Zasadnym wydaje się być również utworzenie europejskiego regulatora rynku, który będzie monitorował właściwe wykonywanie funkcji przypisanych regulatorom krajowym i raportował na temat stwierdzonych nieprawidłowości wprost do Komisji Europejskiej.

2-462

## 15 - Hamisítás elleni kereskedelmi megállapodás (ACTA) (vita)

2-463

**Elnök.** – A következő pont vita a Carl Schlyter által a Verts/ALE képviselőcsoportja nevében, Daniel Caspary által a PPE képviselőcsoportja nevében, Kader Arif által az S&D képviselőcsoportja nevében, Niccolò Rinaldi által az ALDE képviselőcsoportja nevében, Helmut Scholz által a GUE/NGL képviselőcsoportja nevében, valamint, Syed Kamall által az ECR képviselőcsoportja nevében a Bizottsághoz intézett, az ACTA-ról (hamisítás elleni kereskedelmi megállapodás) szóló tárgyalások átláthatósága és jelenlegi helyzetéről szóló szóbeli választ igénylő kérdésről (O-0026/2010 - B7-0020/2010)

2-464

**Carl Schlyter, författare.** – Herr talman! Varje institution har sin roll att försvara. Parlamentet är folkets röst i EU och ska försvara medborgarnas intressen. Kommissionen kallar sig fördragets väktare, men i detta fall är det principen om insyn, mänskliga rättigheter och parlamentets rättigheter som ni måste värna. Om inte vi får tillgång till handlingarna lever ingen av EU:s institutioner upp till sin roll och medborgarnas förväntningar.

En del av kommissionsledamöterna betonade i sina utfrågningar att parlamentet ska ha tillgång till handlingar på samma villkor som ministerrådet, och parlamentet förväntar sig att kommissionen infriar sina löften. Många medborgare är oroliga för att de berövas sina fri- och rättigheter genom ständiga floder av integritetskränkande lagstiftning såsom den om datalagring, Ipred 1, Ipred 2, Swift osv. EU kan inte fortsätta att förhandla om Acta om inte invånarna får en möjlighet att vara med i processen.

Huvudfrågan i dag är transparens, men givetvis är även innehållet känsligt. Det krävs att EU tydligt markerar att villkoren för vårt deltagande i processen om Acta är transparens samt försvar av mänskliga rättigheter och friheter. Först när vi har slagit fast vad det fria och öppna samhället består av för okränkbara rättigheter kan man inom ramen för dessa rättigheter bedriva brottsbekämpning och diskutera hur olika avtal ska se ut.

Det är en fullkomligt absurd och oacceptabel situation där vi bakom stängda dörrar måste fråga kommissionen om innehållet i de avtal som vi förväntas fatta beslut om. Medborgarna vill ha garantier för att deras elektroniska utrustning inte genomsöks vid gränsen, att de har rätt att vara uppkopplade och att straffrättsliga sanktioner inte införs över deras huvuden. Vi förväntar oss att ni i dag lovar oss fullt deltagande i Acta, annars får jag avsluta mitt anförande med en klassisk replik: *See you in court.*

2-465

**Daniel Caspary, Verfasser.** – Herr Präsident, geschätzter Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Fälschungen, Schmuggel, Verletzung von Rechten aus geistigem Eigentum stellen zweifellos ein großes Problem dar, zum einen für uns als Europäische Union insgesamt, zum anderen aber auch für viele Mitgliedstaaten. Es ist ein Problem für Unternehmer, für Arbeitnehmer und Verbraucher, dass immer mehr gefälschte Produkte auch in den europäischen Binnenmarkt gelangen. Wir gehen mittlerweile davon aus, dass Fälschungen im Wert von rund 250 Milliarden Euro unseren Markt belasten. Im Idealfall, wenn ein Medikament gefälscht ist und die Antibaby-Pille nicht funktioniert – so wurde neulich auf einer Veranstaltung gesagt –, wird eben eine Frau schwanger. Aber im schlimmsten Fall, wenn das Medikament nicht funktioniert, geht es um Leben und Tod, und das kann nicht in unserem Interesse sein.

Wir müssen dringend etwas gegen die Verletzung der Rechte am geistigen Eigentum, gegen Schmuggel und gegen Fälschungen tun! Es kann nicht sein, dass wir im Jahr 2008 an unseren Grenzen 178 Millionen gefälschte Artikel beschlagnahmen, davon sind 20 Millionen gefährlich, und über 50 % dieser Artikel kommen aus China. Wir müssen also in diesem Bereich etwas tun. Das Problem ist zweifellos: Der Vertrag von Lissabon ist am 1. Dezember in Kraft getreten, ACTA wird seit drei Jahren verhandelt, und wir als Europäisches Parlament waren deshalb in der Vergangenheit bei weitem nicht so eingebunden, wie wir es künftig sein müssen.

Deswegen wünsche ich mir, dass wir in den nächsten Wochen und Monaten unbedingt mehr Transparenz in diesem Bereich bekommen. Wir brauchen Zugang zu Daten, die uns ganz klar sagen, worum es im Moment in den Verhandlungen geht und welche Positionen die Europäische Kommission vertritt. Die Verhandlungen müssen weitergehen, wir brauchen einen erfolgreichen Abschluss eines sinnvollen Abkommens. Die Kritikpunkte aus den verschiedenen Fraktionen sind im Haus hinreichend bekannt. Ich wünsche mir, dass wir im Interesse der Arbeitnehmer, der Arbeitgeber, der Industrie und der Verbraucher zu einem sinnvollen Abschluss kommen, dass wir aber bei einem solchen Abschluss unbedingt bei den Verhandlungen den bestehenden *aquis communautaire* beachten und nicht darüber hinausgehen.

2-466

**Bernd Lange, stellvertr. Verfasser.** – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, mich treiben drei Fragen um. Die erste Frage ist: Warum gibt es immer noch keine Transparenz, wenn doch der Vertrag von Lissabon seit 1. Dezember in Kraft ist und wenn wir seit dem 10. Februar eine Interinstitutionelle Vereinbarung mit der Kommission haben? Ich kann nicht verstehen, dass der Rat nach wie vor als Beobachter bei den Verhandlungen am Tisch sitzt, das Parlament nicht involviert ist und die Dokumente nicht öffentlich sind. Also warum ist das so, Herr Kommissar?

Die zweite Frage, die mich umtreibt: Wer handelt eigentlich das ACTA-Abkommen? Es ist ja nicht so, dass es im Rahmen der WTO als quasi TRIPS-Folgeabkommen verhandelt wird, sondern es wird nur von einzelnen Staaten und – wie man aus den Vereinigten Staaten hört – auch von mächtigen wirtschaftlichen Interessen verhandelt. Ich frage mich in der Tat, ob da nicht Standards gesetzt werden, die letztendlich dann für alle gelten, obwohl nicht alle am Tisch sitzen und mitverhandeln.

Die dritte Frage, Herr Kommissar, die mich umtreibt: Was wird eigentlich inhaltlich verhandelt? Sie haben auf meine Frage in Ihrer Anhörung geantwortet, dass der *aquis communautaire* gesichert wird. Aber wenn ich mir einzelne Papiere, die so durchgesickert sind, anschau, habe ich da leider meine Zweifel. Ich kann nachvollziehen, dass verhandelt wird, dass Internet-Sperren möglich sind, dass Provider quasi als Hilfssheriff für wirtschaftliche Interessen genutzt werden sollen, dass mitunter Restriktionen für Forschung und Wissenschaft möglich sind, dass sogar einige versuchen, generelle Überwachungssysteme einzuführen. Da frage ich mich: Wo bleibt der *aquis communautaire* dort?

Auch die Frage des Schadenersatzes, dass quasi *lost profit* in einen Schadenersatz mit hinein verhandelt werden soll, ist unserer Politik nicht angemessen.

Drittens natürlich die Frage, Herr Kommissar: Wie sieht das eigentlich mit dem Verhältnis von online und offline aus? Wenn ich lese, dass online und offline beides die digitale Welt darstellen sollen, heißt das im Grunde, dass es auch Restriktionen, Durchsuchungen von Laptops, I-Pods und MP3-Playern an der Grenze geben soll? Geben Sie mir doch bitte eine Antwort auf die drei Fragen.

2-467

**Niccolò Rinaldi, Autore.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, credo che ci sia un peccato originale nella questione di cui dibattiamo stasera, ossia la segretezza con la quale sono stati condotti i negoziati fino ad oggi. Segretezza, magari, anche aggravata da questa asimmetria, se è vero che industrie americane hanno avuto accesso a una serie di informazioni in base a un patto di confidenzialità, a differenza di quanto è accaduto con l'opinione pubblica e le istituzioni europee. L'opacità dei negoziati è un problema che riscontriamo anche in altri casi – ne abbiamo parlato in sede dell'accordo con la Corea – ed è qualche cosa che adesso, con l'entrata in vigore del trattato di Lisbona, deve finire.

Mi pare che questo peccato originale sia figlio anche di una deriva: quella di usare la lotta contro la contraffazione per condurre altre battaglie, come se diventasse una sorta di parola d'ordine in nome della quale tutto quanto è permesso. Del resto, questa è una battaglia sicuramente sacrosanta per una potenza commerciale come l'Unione europea. Io vengo da una città che Lei conosce bene, Commissario, Venezia, nella quale le norme per chi contraffaceva prodotti – penso ad esempio al vetro di Murano – erano severissime (si arrivava fino alla pena di morte). Quindi è sicuramente qualcosa che dobbiamo prendere seriamente in un'economia sempre più globale come la nostra.

Tuttavia, ci sono minacce serie che questo accordo sta provocando, creando allarme nell'opinione pubblica, e di questo naturalmente la Commissione deve essere consapevole. Tanto è vero che la questione, che dovrebbe essere un argomento eminentemente proprio della commissione per il commercio internazionale, lo sta diventando sempre di meno, mentre cresce il ruolo della stessa commissione per le libertà civili, la giustizia e gli affari interni.

Ci preoccupano le questioni che riguardano la libertà di informazione e di espressione attraverso Internet, il diritto alla privacy, le possibili conseguenze penali e civili per gli *Internet service provider*: c'è una sorta di linea rossa che non va valicata e sulla quale invito la Commissione a procedere con grande prudenza.

Dal punto di vista più strettamente commerciale, vorrei chiedere al Commissario rassicurazioni affinché l'ACTA non possa essere utilizzato per contrastare il commercio di medicine che sono accessibili a prezzi più competitivi, medicine sicure,

medicinali generici che non violano il copyright ma che hanno la grande colpa di essere prodotti da paesi emergenti come India e Brasile e possono disturbare industrie farmaceutiche occidentali.

2-468

**Helmut Scholz, Verfasser.** – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Herr Kommissar De Gucht, wenn Sie sich mit Vertretern von zehn Regierungen im kleinen Kreis in einem Hinterzimmer treffen, um dort eine weltweite Überwachungsregelung zu vereinbaren, die so sensible Kapitelüberschriften wie „Durchsetzung des Gesetzes“ und „Strafmaßnahmen im zivilen Rahmen bei Grenzkontrollen und im Internet“ enthält, dann müssen Sie sich nicht wundern, wenn Gerüchte aufkommen, wenn Fragen entstehen, die die Bürgerinnen und Bürger zu Recht beantwortet wissen wollen.

Ich schließe mich der Kritik meiner Kollegen gerne an. Sie müssen doch erkennen, welche Sorgen hinter den fraktionsübergreifend vereinbarten Fragen des Handelsausschusses stehen, nämlich, dass eine Vereinbarung, bei der es ursprünglich einmal um den Schutz von Ingenieurleistungen und Patenten gehen sollte, nun tief in den Bereich der Bürgerrechte, in die Demokratie der Kommunikation, in dezentrale Innovationspotenziale und Kulturschaffung und in den Schutz personenbezogener Daten hineinreicht. Aber die Artikel 7 und 8 der Grundrechte-Charta binden auch Ihre Verhandlungsführung, und wir werden Sie ständig daran erinnern.

Eine solche Vereinbarung wird sich auf die ganze Welt auswirken. Dennoch verhandeln Sie unter Ausschluss der Schwellen- und Entwicklungsländer und unter Ausschluss der Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft, der Gewerkschaften, unter Ausschluss der Parlamente – schlicht unter Ausschluss der Öffentlichkeit, in deren Dienst und unter deren Kontrolle Sie stehen sollten. Sie verhandeln auch ohne Mandat des Europäischen Parlaments. Sie speisen uns nach wie vor mit zweiseitigen Zusammenfassungen über die Ergebnisse ganzer Verhandlungsrunden ab. Sie weigern sich, dem neuen Recht Folge zu leisten und uns bei diesen Verhandlungen dieselben Dokumente offenzulegen, die auch die Mitgliedstaaten erhalten. Wenn Sie hier behaupten, die Sorgen meiner Fraktion seien unbegründet, dann beweisen Sie es. Legen Sie unverzüglich die Verhandlungsdokumente auf den Tisch. Wenn Sie auch nur davon träumen wollen, eines Tages die Zustimmung dieses Parlaments zu Ihrem Verhandlungsergebnis zu erhalten, dann sollten Sie aus der Erfahrung mit der demokratischen Entscheidung gegen das SWIFT-Abkommen lernen. Willkommen in der Demokratie, kann ich nur sagen. Dieses Parlament wird Hinterzimmerdebatten und -beschlüsse nicht länger zulassen!

2-469

**Syed Kamall, author.** – Mr President, I think the Commissioner can see the strength of feeling across Parliament, across all the parliamentary groups, where we are clearly calling, whatever our differences are on different aspects of ACTA and counterfeit trading and also the intellectual property rights, we are all agreed here on the need for greater transparency. I hope that has come across quite clearly.

Commissioner, we are all concerned that when you have negotiations where there is not sufficient transparency – we are not aware of the principles and what our negotiating position is in these talks – then what will happen is that you create a vacuum and, when you create a vacuum, we all know that rumours fill that vacuum. We have seen leaks purporting to be official documents. We have no way of knowing whether they are actually official documents or whether they are made up, but it just shows what happens when you do not have enough transparency and you do not share information.

I think some of us really also understand the need sometimes for a bit of confidentiality. Surely when we are in negotiations we do not want to give away all our negotiating positions; we do not want to give away our chips.

But what we are asking for is reasonable transparency. Why can we not have access to these documents? Why can we not have access to the texts? And if you feel that for reasons of transparency and for negotiations you cannot give us this, then at least give us summary positions and tell us what our basic principles are in these negotiations.

So, for example, are we going to support proposals that appear to be on the table, according to what is on the blogosphere, that MP3 players and laptops can be confiscated at borders? Will there be criminal sanctions? Is the EU position to support this? I think we need to know and I think it shows the strength of feeling across this Parliament that we have been able to come together on a broad compromise, even though we may have slight differences and nuances here, to agree on a common text.

So, Commissioner, it is over to you to demonstrate transparency and demonstrate that you recognise the democratic accountability that we all seek.

2-470

**Karel De Gucht, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I understand Members' concerns about the ACTA negotiations.

Let me first recall that we are negotiating this agreement in order to improve the protection of 'made in Europe' innovation in all areas where intellectual property rights can be breached. If we want to remain a competitive economy, we will have

to rely on innovation, creativity and brand exclusivity. That is one of our main competitive advantages on the world market. So we need the tools to ensure that this competitive advantage is adequately protected in our main export markets.

We have tried to raise this issue for several years in multilateral organisations like the WTO or the World Intellectual Property Organisation. Those attempts have been systematically blocked by other countries. So, despite our preference for a truly global solution, we have had no other choice but to engage with a coalition of the willing.

The final agreement will only be binding on those countries that have signed, although we would of course be happy if more countries, and especially emerging economies, could subsequently join.

As I said during my hearing, those international negotiations are confidential. That is not unusual. Negotiations are about seeking an agreed outcome and require a minimum confidentiality in order for each party to feel comfortable to make concessions and/or to try out options before finally settling on an agreement.

On the other hand, I agree that Parliament needs to be adequately informed about the evolution of the negotiations. We are doing our utmost in two areas: to inform Parliament, and to convince our negotiating partners to agree to more transparency. Firstly, as regards information to Parliament, we have provided you with the negotiating guidelines, full reports on the negotiating rounds and, in general, all the relevant documents originating from DG Trade that have been shared with the Member States through the Trade Policy Committee. We have done this in accordance with the framework agreement. Also, ACTA has been discussed several times in the Committee on International Trade in the last three years.

Let me add to this that the Commission organised two stakeholder conferences on ACTA in June 2008 and April 2009, which were open to all citizens, industry, NGOs and the media. Another public conference will be organised on 22 March in Brussels.

I understand that you may feel that this is not sufficient for you to have a clear picture on where we stand in these negotiations. I have instructed my services to provide dedicated briefings with interested MEPs on all aspects of the negotiations. They will be at your disposal for discussion before and after each further negotiating round.

Secondly, I realise that the best way for you to know what is going on in these negotiations would be to read the draft negotiating text. This would give you a very clear picture of where exactly we are in those negotiations. As you probably know, there is an agreement amongst ACTA parties that the negotiating text can only be made public if all parties agree. The Commission is in favour of releasing the negotiating documents as soon as possible. However, a few ACTA negotiating parties remain opposed to early release. I strongly disagree with their approach but I cannot unilaterally breach a confidentiality commitment. My credibility as a negotiator is at stake.

Nevertheless, I will see to it that, at the next negotiating round in April, the Commission vigorously pushes its negotiating partners to agree to releasing the text, and I will raise Parliament's concerns bilaterally with ACTA parties, like the US, whom I am scheduled to meet before then. It is in the interests of all that everyone has a clear idea of what exactly these negotiations are about and even more importantly, also of what they are not about.

Finally, as regards your concerns on the substance, I would like to recall the main principles that are driving the Commission in the negotiation of this agreement.

First, the objective is to address large-scale infringements of intellectual property rights which have a significant commercial impact. It will not lead to the limitation of civil liberties or harassment of consumers.

Secondly, ACTA is only about enforcement of intellectual property rights. It will not include provisions modifying substantive intellectual property law such as the creation of new rights, the scope of protection or duration. However, it should set minimum rules on how innovators can enforce their rights in courts, at the borders or over the internet. For example, a European fashion designer, when confronted with counterfeiting of his creations outside Europe, can ensure that his rights are adequately safeguarded abroad.

Thirdly, ACTA must and will remain in line with the *acquis communautaire*, including the current level of harmonisation of IPR enforcement, the e-Commerce Directive, the telecoms regulatory framework and, last but not least, the applicable EU legislation on data protection and piracy. There will be no harmonisation or changes to EU legislation through the back door.

In this sense ACTA will have no impact on European citizens, since it will not create new obligations for the EU and no need for implementing legislation. However, it will provide our innovators increased protection in overseas markets.

I am aware of the concerns expressed by some of you about the introduction of a compulsory 'three strike' rule or graduated response to fight copyright infringements and internet piracy. Let me be very clear on this so there is no room

for ambiguity. The three strike rule or graduated response systems are not compulsory in Europe. Different EU countries have different approaches and we want to keep that flexibility while fully respecting fundamental rights, freedoms and civil liberties. The EU does not support, and will not accept, ACTA creating an obligation to disconnect people from the internet because of illegal downloads.

Similarly, we will make sure that ACTA does not hamper access to generic medicines. I know there has been some controversy on the impact of EU customs legislation on trade in generic medicines. As I have already told you at my hearing, that problem will be addressed in the upcoming revision of our customs legislation.

Finally, you also asked about an impact assessment on ACTA. In fact, considering that the Commission will not go beyond the *acquis communautaire*, we took as our basis the studies made for the 2004 Directive on the enforcement of intellectual property rights and for the 2005 Proposal for a directive on criminal enforcement of IPR (which was not adopted).

We also considered the conclusions of the 2008 OECD study on the economic impact of counterfeiting and piracy. That study values the economy of physical internationally traded counterfeits at USD 250 billion, which is to say more than the individual GDP of 150 countries. It also contains an exhaustive analysis of the piracy of digital contents.

In short, I hear your concerns and will defend them to the best of my ability. Your confidence and support will help me carry this important task forward.

2-471

**Tokia Saïfi**, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, depuis l'entrée en vigueur du traité de Lisbonne, nous disposons de nouveaux pouvoirs que nous voulons voir dès à présent respectés. Aussi, nous vous avons écouté et nous vous demandons de mettre en place une procédure de consultation continue et transparente sur l'ACTA, en veillant à ce que le Parlement européen et les citoyens qui y sont représentés soient régulièrement et pleinement informés de l'état d'avancement des négociations, tout en respectant les clauses de confidentialité qui, comme vous venez de nous le signaler, sont liées à l'accord. Nous souhaitons aujourd'hui, afin d'être pleinement associés au processus législatif, avoir accès au texte et au résumé de négociation.

Par ailleurs, mon groupe et moi-même vous incitons à poursuivre les négociations afin d'obtenir un traité plurilatéral améliorant les standards d'application et de respect des droits de propriété intellectuelle auxquels, à terme, les économies émergentes comme la Chine pourraient souscrire. La contrefaçon est un fléau, une activité souterraine, facteur de concurrence déloyale qui, en plus d'être un danger pour le corps, la société et l'économie, l'est également pour l'esprit.

En privant les auteurs mais aussi les entreprises qui ont investi de longues années dans la recherche et le développement des fruits de leur travail, elle décourage les autres de poursuivre leurs efforts d'innovation et de créativité. Or, on le sait, c'est ici que se situe le cœur de la compétitivité de l'Union européenne.

Enfin, je crois qu'avec le développement de notre environnement numérique, nous ne pouvons nier que la contrefaçon est devenue immatérielle. Aussi, je reste persuadée qu'il est possible de responsabiliser les acteurs de l'internet, et particulièrement ceux qui détournent les droits d'auteur, sans compromettre le respect des droits fondamentaux et des libertés civiles. Trouvons ensemble cet équilibre entre droits et devoirs.

2-472

**David Martin**, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I thank the Commissioner for his contribution. Commissioner, you said at the end of your contribution that you have heard our concerns and you are responding to them. Well, I think, as they say, 'up to a point'. I am not convinced that you have entirely grasped all our concerns about the ACTA negotiations. It is true that there is common ground between us in terms of the fact that IPR right holders deserve a fair return on their rights, but counterfeit goods can and do sometimes pose a threat to human health.

So, like you, we are not against international cooperation to tackle piracy, to tackle counterfeiting and to deal with other abuses of intellectual property rights. But, we repeat, it has to be based on the existing *acquis communautaire*. If you are giving us an absolute assurance on that, then I accept it, but you said you were not going to do it through the back door – which it seemed to me still gave you the opportunity to do it through the front door – but if you are saying absolutely no move to the *acquis communautaire*, then I am pleased to hear that and I accept your word on that.

Similarly, you said you would not criminalise individuals for downloading from the internet, but then you talked about the external borders of the Community and what might happen with people going away rather than coming into the EU, so again we do not want anything in ACTA which criminalises anyone for individual use. Even though we might frown on it, nobody should be criminalised for personal use of copyright material.

Of course, any action through ACTA has to be proportional to the aims. It is not a blank cheque for copyright holders. The problem, as other Members have said, is that we do not know the situation because of the secrecy surrounding this.

I welcome the fact that you have given a strong commitment to get the draft negotiating text and that you will put pressure on the other parties. I think you have to tell the other parties, though, that this will not strengthen you as a negotiator: it will weaken you as a negotiator if you cannot release the draft text, because you will not have – as was very clear tonight – the support of this House if we cannot see the draft text on which you are working.

Finally, on a positive note, I welcome your comments on generic medicine and I look forward to seeing the review of the Customs Regulation.

2-473

**Sophia in 't Veld**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, when preparing for this debate about copyright, intellectual property rights and how we want to protect the creative and intellectual efforts of our fellow citizens, I had to think back to the theft a couple of years ago of a truck containing the new Harry Potter books, just days before their release. But today the thief would not bother stealing a truck; he would simply illegally download it on to his laptop or MP3 player and carry it across the border.

I welcome the Commission's commitment to transparency but, according to the briefing note kindly provided by your services, the assertion that negotiators were required to sign a non-disclosure agreement is incorrect. You have just said that you signed, or the previous Commission signed, such an agreement and that you are therefore bound by it. I would like to understand which of the two statements is true. If there is no such non-disclosure clause, all relevant documents must be made immediately and publicly available.

If, on the other hand, there is such a clause, we need to hear from the Commissioner what he will do to ensure full transparency and information of the public, not just of this House, because restricted access for Members of Parliament only, subject to confidentiality, is not enough. European citizens have a right to know about decisions that deeply affect their rights and freedoms. In any case, such non-disclosure agreements must become a thing of the past. The EU should in future insist that European standards of transparency apply.

The democratic legitimacy of these negotiations is weak. There has not been any debate to establish the aims and principles of the EU. The mandate has not received any parliamentary approval. You may argue that there is no legal requirement but that is beside the point because, if 27 individuals – national ministers – consider that they can give themselves a mandate to negotiate in secret on the fundamental rights and freedoms of European citizens, I can only conclude that their understanding of democracy differs fundamentally from mine.

Parliament means business. No 'three strikes out'; no warrantless searches and confiscation of laptops or mobile phones. Parliament needs to have watertight guarantees that such clauses will not be introduced via the back door of an international agreement.

Finally, I wish you an excellent trip to New Zealand next month, and please make sure that your iPod does not contain any illegally downloaded material!

2-474

**Christian Engström**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, first of all, I would like to congratulate the Commission on finally having achieved what EU leaders have been talking about for decades. They have actually managed to get ordinary citizens interested in EU politics.

ACTA is an issue that people on the net really care about. But, having said that, I still feel I must criticise the Commission for the method it has used. The reason so many citizens are following the ACTA issue is because they are furious. They are furious at proposals to limit their freedom and invade their privacy just because some big companies are asking for it.

They are furious because they see their fundamental civil liberties balanced against industry interests and coming up short. They are furious at the complete lack of transparency. This is not how it should be in a democracy.

Tomorrow we will be voting on a resolution that calls on the Commission to live up to the Treaty and put all ACTA papers on the table. I hope the resolution will be adopted by an overwhelming majority. The right to privacy, to information freedom and to fair and proper trial are the cornerstones of a free and open society.

Tomorrow we will show that this is a parliament that is prepared to stand up for those rights in the information age. We will demand the information that is both our right and our due as the elected representatives, and we will respectfully remind the Commission that this is Parliament, not a doormat.

2-475

**Edvard Kožušník**, *za skupinu ECR*. – Pane předsedající, já jsem původně chtěl poděkovat panu komisaři Karlu De Guchtovi za to, že prolomil přístup svého předchůdce, který obcházel Evropský parlament jako jedinou přímo volenou evropskou instituci a neinformoval o procesu vyjednávání této dohody, ale jsem trošku na rozpacích, protože jsem byl



vždy vychovávan k účtě k důležitým osobnostem, a proto se mě docela dotklo, že si pan De Gucht ostentativně čistil brýle, když tady vystupoval můj kolega Kamall. Nicméně teď k věci.

Osobně vítám, že tato dohoda vzniká, neboť duševní vlastnictví si zaslouží důslednější ochranu, než je tomu v současnosti. Přesto mě mrzí, že stranami dohody nejsou Rusko a Čína, které jsou hlavním zdrojem porušování autorského práva. Mám taky obavy o samotnou efektivnost této dohody. Protože obsah dohody je stále zahalen jakousi mlhou, jak o tom tady mluvili mnozí kolegové, rád bych si tedy dovolil apelovat na Komisi jako zástupce členských států, která dohodu vyjednává, aby dohoda nesloužila jako exportní nástroj francouzské digitální gilotiny do dalších států a zároveň se nestala importérem softwarových patentů do Evropské unie.

2-476

**Eva-Britt Svensson, för GUE/NGL-gruppen.** – Herr talman! Herr kommissionsledamot, jag är både förvånad och djupt upprörd över att kommissionen försvarar att man i vissa delar kan ha konfidentiella förhandlingar när det handlar om lagstiftning om medborgarnas friheter och grundläggande rättigheter, personlig integritet osv. Man kan aldrig försvara att man undanhåller medborgarna information om sådana förhandlingar.

Jag kräver att man omedelbart avbryter förhandlingarna, och vi kan återuppta förhandlingarna när Actas parter är överens om att det ska ske i öppenhet och på ett demokratiskt sätt. Jag vill ha alla papper på bordet genast, och det ska vara till alla medborgare. Det hör till de mest grundläggande principerna i en demokrati att man har öppenhet och information, speciellt när det handlar om grundläggande friheter och medborgerliga rättigheter. Vi begär alltså alla papper på bordet genast och till alla medborgare, för detta är naturligtvis vad som krävs i en demokrati.

2-477

**Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI).** – Voorzitter, als een dossier achter gesloten deuren bekokstoofd wordt, dan gaan bij mijn fractie alle alarmbellen rinkelen. ACTA is zo'n dossier. Velen in mijn land vroegen zich af waarom de Partij voor de Vrijheid in het Europees Parlement gekozen moest worden, en dit is dus de reden: het bestrijden van de Europese keuken die achter gesloten deuren allerlei onsmakelijke brouwsels zit klaar te maken, zonder dat de burger er iets over te zeggen heeft.

Deze keer is nog niet eens bekend wát er uit die Europese keuken komt. Het Europees Parlement moet dus een mening hebben over iets wat nog als geheim in de keuken staat. Kan het gekker? Dit is een volstrekt minachten van het Parlement en de burger. Wat tot nu toe is uitgelekt over dit ACTA-gerecht stemt ons erg somber. Doelwit zou de consument zijn, waarbij de mogelijkheid bestaat om de burger af te sluiten van internet, en dat is zeer ernstig.

Europa was altijd het werelddeel waar de vrijheid van mensen om kennis te vergaren voorop stond. Die vrijheid komt nu ronduit in gevaar. Dat kan en dat mag niet. Bovendien wordt het subsidiariteitsbeginsel geschonden. De nationale lidstaten hebben totaal geen zeggenschap meer in dit dossier. Mijn fractie staat voor volstrekte openheid van zaken en is fel gekant tegen het criminaliseren van de burger. ACTA kweekt een cultuur van verstikkend toezicht en verdachtmaking. De staat kijkt mee. ACTA gaat buiten alle bestaande internationale instanties, zoals de WTO, om.

Waar is de Commissie toch mee bezig in die geheime keuken? En waarom zitten er bijna uitsluitend Amerikaanse bedrijven bij het overleg? Wat doen zij eigenlijk in die keuken? Is het om hun commerciële belangen veilig te stellen? En hoe zit het dan met de belangen van de burgers in Europa? Zijn die soms minder belangrijk? Hier blijkt het belang van de PVV. Wij strijden voor het belang van de burger, daar waar geheimhouding en achterkamerpolitiek plaatsvindt.

Laat overigens duidelijk zijn dat de Partij voor de Vrijheid tegen vervalsing van medicijnen en producten is. Daarover gaat deze discussie ook niet. Het gaat over het feit dat de leden van dit Parlement zich niet goed kunnen uitspreken over dit dossier, louter omdat het geheim is en wij de inhoud dus niet kennen. Een grovere schending van het parlementaire mandaat kunnen wij ons niet voorstellen. Wat ons betreft wordt die hele stinkende en geheime keuken gesloten en hangt men een groot bord op de deur: 'gesloten wegens overtreding van de regels'.

2-478

**Zuzana Roithová (PPE).** – Vážení kolegové, pane komisáři, globalizace, a zejména vstup Číny do WTO, přinesly obrovský problém, to víme. Evropa je zavalena padělaným zbožím, které je stále více nebezpečné i lidskému zdraví a představuje také vysoké hospodářské ztráty pro firmy. Občané a firmy těžce nesou fakt, že na to kontrolní možnosti členských zemí absolutně nestačí, a právem volají po účinnějších opatřeních na evropské úrovni včetně vysokých postihů pro padělatele. Tato dohoda by měla zásadně zlepšit mezinárodní spolupráci při odhalování padělků, ale nemyslím si, že potírání středoškoláků, kteří si stahují z internetu hry, by mělo být naším cílem. Obsah dva roky vyjednávané dohody je tajný, a tak jen prosakují informace o kontroverzních článcích, které by se mohly dotýkat dnešních práv Evropanů, jejich soukromí a informací. K tomu jsme nedali Komisi mandát.

Obávám se proto, že ratifikace této vysoce potřebné dohody může být v Evropském parlamentu zamítnuta, podobně jako dohoda SWIFT, pokud Komise nebude Parlament průběžně informovat o struktuře a limitech vyjednávané dohody.

Nechci, abychom byli opět postaveni před hotovou věc, tj. akt schválit či zamítnout, aniž bychom mohli text podrobně prodiskutovat a rozptýlit i případné obavy našich občanů.

Dále považuji za strategickou chybu, že k vyjednávání o této dohodě nebyla přizvána právě Čína, která je největším zdrojem padělků. Proto kladu otázku: Můžete nám, pane komisaři, osvětlit, o jakou jde taktiku a zda jednáte s Čínou, aby se k dohodě později přidala? A věříte tomu?

2-479

**Gianluca Susta (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le ambizioni europee di rimanere la più grande economia del mondo vanno sempre più ancorate al rilancio della competitività europea, alla qualità del suo tessuto produttivo, alla capacità di conquistare nuovi mercati.

In questo quadro, la lotta alla contraffazione e alla frode commerciale assume un ruolo essenziale. La tutela dei marchi, dei brevetti e della proprietà intellettuale non sono solo però strumenti non finanziari per dare competitività al sistema: sono anche un esempio concreto di applicazione all'economia industriale di principi di democratica civiltà giuridica, fondata sul rispetto delle regole, di quelle regole che sono state calpestate negli scorsi anni sotto la spinta della speculazione finanziaria internazionale.

ACTA è uno strumento fondamentale per combattere un fenomeno, quello della contraffazione, che raggiunge l'incredibile fatturato di 500 miliardi di dollari l'anno, che ha rapporti con la criminalità organizzata, che tocca, minacciandoli, i diritti fondamentali dell'uomo, come quello della salute, se solo pensiamo alla vicenda della contraffazione dei farmaci. Per giudicare l'opportunità di ACTA occorre avere presente questo quadro mondiale.

Per contro, non possiamo però non invocare su questo trattato il rispetto, anche qui, di alcuni elementari, fondamentali principi di una convivenza ispirata al rispetto delle regole. Non possiamo nascondere la nostra preoccupazione sulla base giuridica del trattato, sul mandato negoziale e sulla sua trasparenza. Chi rappresenta, come questo Parlamento, 500 milioni di cittadini, deve essere ufficialmente, non confidenzialmente, informato. A questo Parlamento i negoziatori della Commissione esecutiva devono riferire lo stato di avanzamento dei lavori e occorre accedere alle carte e alle informazioni per esprimere una valutazione compiuta.

È nel difficile ma fecondo spirito collaborativo tra Parlamento e Commissione esecutiva che l'Unione europea può sviluppare al meglio le sue potenzialità. La risoluzione va in questa direzione e come tale merita il nostro voto.

2-480

**Alexander Alvaro (ALDE).** – Herr Präsident! Sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar De Gucht! Sie treten ein schweres Erbe an, und wenn das Thema nicht so ernst wäre, könnte man beinahe über die Spekulationen, die ACTA ausgelöst hat, schmunzeln. Aus zwei Gründen kann ich aber ganz und gar nicht darüber schmunzeln. Zum einen sind Produktpiraterie, Marken- und Urheberrechtsverletzungen Dinge, die sowohl die Integrität unserer Wirtschaft als auch die Gesundheit von Menschen gefährden.

Der weltweite wirtschaftliche Verlust, der durch Produktpiraterie, Marken- und Urheberrechtsverletzungen entsteht, liegt allein 2007 bei geschätzten 185 Milliarden EUR. Das ist deutlich mehr als der Haushalt der Europäischen Union. Dies gefährdet unsere Unternehmen, befördert die Kriminalität und vernichtet Arbeitsplätze. Das kann sicherlich nicht in unserem Interesse sein.

Darüber hinaus können Fälschungen von Medikamenten lebensbedrohliche Auswirkungen für die Menschen haben, die diese einnehmen, nicht wissend, dass es sich um Fälschungen handelt. Das ist ebenfalls ein nicht hinnehmbares Risiko.

Es liegt also auf der Hand, dass es in unserem ureigensten Interesse liegt, hier zu handeln. Zum anderen muss aber ohne Zweifel klar sein, dass das Verhandlungsmandat der Europäischen Kommission sich strikt am Rahmen des *acquis communautaire* ausrichtet, damit ACTA nicht zukünftig für *another crazy treaty agreed* steht.

Nach Inkrafttreten des Vertrags von Lissabon schließt dies die umfassende und Ad-hoc-Information des Europäischen Parlaments über den jeweiligen Verhandlungsstand des Abkommens ein. Letztlich werden wir um unsere Zustimmung gebeten werden. Mit anderen Worten: Das Europäische Parlament erwartet vollständige Transparenz und die Veröffentlichung der Verhandlungsdokumente sowie aller relevanten Papiere hierzu. Wenn die Kommission vermeiden möchte, dass sich um ACTA weiterhin Sagen und Vermutungen ranken, sehe ich keinen anderen Ausweg, als dass die interessierte Öffentlichkeit umfassend informiert wird.

Hieran anschließend stellen sich für mich drei wesentliche Fragen: Erstens, auch wenn Sie schon darauf eingegangen sind: Kann die Kommission garantieren, dass es keine Einführung einer *Three-Strikes-Out*-Regelung geben wird? Dies würde nämlich der neugefassten Rahmenrichtlinie zur elektronischen Kommunikation widersprechen.

Zweitens: Kann die Kommission garantieren, dass es keine Einführung einer Dritthaftung von Internet-Service Providern für durchgeleitete Inhalte geben wird? Dies widerspräche nämlich der E-Commerce-Richtlinie.

Drittens: Kann die Kommission versichern, dass es im Rahmen von ACTA keine Einführung strafrechtlicher Maßnahmen geben wird, die außerhalb der Kompetenz der Europäischen Union liegen, und ich weiß sehr wohl, dass es die Mitgliedstaaten sind, die dort die Verantwortung übernehmen. Aber ich gehe davon aus, dass Sie als Hüterin der Verträge Ihre Aufgabe wahrnehmen werden.

2-481

**Jan Philipp Albrecht (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident! Herr De Gucht, bereits vor über einem Jahr haben wir, das Europäische Parlament, Sie als EU-Kommission klar und deutlich aufgefordert, dass die Verhandlungen zum ACTA-Abkommen in Zukunft transparent und unter Einbeziehung der Öffentlichkeit und der Parlamente zu laufen haben und dass der enge Fokus der im Titel angekündigten Bekämpfung der Produktpiraterie auch beibehalten wird. Was haben Sie seitdem getan? Überhaupt nichts, gar nichts. Ganz im Gegenteil. Gemeinsam mit Ihrer so genannten unheiligen Koalition der Willigen, vor allem reicher Industriestaaten, verhandeln Sie in einer hochgradig undemokratischen, ja gar illegalen Geheimplomatie ein Abkommen, das in vielerlei Bereichen offenbar weit über die geltenden Regelungen zur Durchsetzung des Rechts am geistigen Eigentum in Europa hinausgeht. Genau wissen wir das natürlich nicht, weil wir ja keine Informationen von Ihnen bekommen.

Aber der eigentliche Skandal kommt ja erst noch. Seit dem 1. Dezember letzten Jahres können Sie uns in vielen Bereichen ja nicht mehr ignorieren und mit dem Rat gemeinsame Hinterzimmerpolitik betreiben. Denn die Bürgerinnen und Bürger haben – vertreten durch ihre Parlamente – ganz zu Recht dafür gesorgt, dass durch den Vertrag von Lissabon diesem Vorgehen endlich ein Riegel vorgeschoben wird. Da frage ich mich, was tun Sie hier eigentlich? Als Kommission sind Sie die Hüterin der Verträge. Sie haben dafür zu sorgen, dass der klar formulierte EU-Vertrag auch eingehalten wird. Und wenn Sie die Einhaltung des Vertrags nicht hundertprozentig garantieren können, dann wird es aus diesem Haus wieder ein Nein geben. Und wenn Sie der Meinung sind, dass Sie in diesen Verhandlungen die Einhaltung der Verträge nicht garantieren können, dann stoppen Sie doch bitte die Verhandlungen so lange, bis Sie es garantieren können. Wir als Grüne sagen deshalb: Handeln Sie jetzt. *Act on ACTA!*

2-482

**Patrick Le Hyaric (GUE/NGL).** – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous tous ici nous sommes contre la contrefaçon et la piraterie. Mais, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous venez tout à l'heure de nous raconter une fable pour petits enfants pour justifier le fait que vous discutez un accord international dans le dos des peuples et dans le dos des représentants des peuples.

Je vous rappelle, Monsieur le Commissaire, que l'article 218 du traité de Lisbonne dispose, je le cite: "Le Parlement européen est immédiatement et pleinement informé à toutes les étapes de la procédure", dans le cadre de la négociation ou de la conclusion d'accords internationaux. Avec l'accord ACTA, nous sommes exactement dans ce cas, alors respectez votre propre parole, votre propre traité! Nous ne pouvons qu'être inquiets pour les libertés fondamentales. En effet, l'interprétation d'une faute – le piratage – et sa sanction ne seraient plus demain déléguées à une autorité judiciaire mais aux entreprises qui fournissent des services aux internautes.

D'autre part, on permettrait demain aux services des douanes des pays signataires de l'accord de fouiller les téléphones, les ordinateurs portables, les baladeurs, sous le prétexte de lutter contre le piratage, comme SWIFT d'ailleurs qui prétendait lutter contre le terrorisme. Mais rappelez-vous, Monsieur le Commissaire, le Parlement vous a battu sur SWIFT et il le fera sur ACTA s'il le faut.

Ainsi, on veut mélanger lutte contre la contrefaçon et le piratage et atteinte à la vie privée, atteinte à la propriété intellectuelle, voire même, dans le cas du médicament, atteinte au droit à la santé. Mettez, Monsieur le Commissaire, immédiatement cet accord sur la table.

2-483

**Cristiana Muscardini (PPE).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, l'accordo ACTA è fondamentale per raggiungere una piena armonizzazione delle misure di difesa commerciale europea nell'ambito della contraffazione e della pirateria. I suoi negoziati riguardano materie delicate della legislazione europea, quali la garanzia d'applicazione dei diritti sulla proprietà intellettuale e la proiezione e protezione dei dati, e per questo, ancora una volta, chiediamo maggiore trasparenza.

La Commissione deve impegnarsi a fondo, nel rispetto del livello di confidenzialità. I testi negoziali attuali devono essere messi a disposizione del Parlamento in modo che esso possa seguire gli accordi e suggerire eventuali osservazioni ai partecipanti ACTA. Le parole del Commissario questa sera ci fanno sperare ma vogliamo che alle parole seguano i fatti.

Da sempre il Parlamento si è battuto per difendere i consumatori e i produttori europei da pratiche di contraffazione e da misure anti tutela della privacy in Internet ed è per questo fondamentale che la Commissione continui a essere attiva nelle

negoziazioni attuali, invogliando un maggior numero di partecipanti che purtroppo al momento si limitano solo a dodici. Auspichiamo che un numero sempre crescente di paesi – paesi in via di sviluppo ed emergenti – possa essere invogliato a raggiungere i negoziati e a firmare l'accordo finale, per permettere una visione più ampia.

I paesi si assumano e rispettino gli obblighi condivisi, per lottare con più efficacia contro la contraffazione e la pirateria, una piaga economica che uccide molti settori produttivi che operano nel rispetto delle regole. È necessario perciò garantire oggi ai consumatori, esposti a danni non irrilevanti anche per la propria salute, delle regole chiare, perché, Commissario, in assenza di regole chiare e applicate, anche per Internet, la stessa Internet diventa da opportunità un boomerang. E dobbiamo tutti impegnarci per impedirlo, perché non è soltanto una questione di privacy individuale, ma anche di sicurezza dei nostri paesi.

2-484

**Emine Bozkurt (S&D).** – Voorzitter, commissaris, een overeenkomst achter gesloten deuren is niet wat de Europese burgers verdienen, noch willen. De Europese Unie onderhandelt momenteel over een heel belangrijk handelsakkoord, ACTA, en dat gebeurt wederom in achterkamertjes. Op geen enkel moment hebben de nationale parlementen noch het Europees Parlement enige democratische controle kunnen uitvoeren op de inhoud en reikwijdte van de onderhandelingen. Nee, de onderhandelende partijen hebben een geheimhoudingsclausule afgesproken.

Het EP en de Europese burgers worden dus opnieuw buitenspel gezet. Het vertrouwen van de burger in Europa wordt weer geschaad. Deze keer gaat het niet over terrorismebestrijding, maar over handelsbelangen. Begrijp me niet verkeerd. De Europese economie moet gestimuleerd worden en het intellectuele eigendom is daar een belangrijk onderdeel van. Maar de onduidelijkheid die momenteel gecreëerd wordt door het geheim houden van de onderhandelingsdocumenten doet vele geruchten ontstaan.

Ik wil vragen hoe de communicatie loopt tussen de commissaris van Handel en de commissaris van Fundamentele Vrijheden in dezen. Gaat mijnheer De Gucht op enig moment zijn collega's inlichten over de inhoud van het akkoord? Gaat mevrouw Reding op enig moment haar collega van handel vragen openheid te verschaffen? Het Europees Parlement verlangt deze openheid. Nu is het moment om die te verschaffen, vooraleer er door het Europees Parlement ingestemd moet worden met dit handelsakkoord.

2-485

**Eva Lichtenberger (Verts/ALE).** – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, während der Anhörungen der neuen Kommissare war Transparenz eines jener Wörter, die am häufigsten verwendet wurden. Sie haben heute wieder davon gesprochen, dass ohnehin alles schon transparent sei, dass alles schon offen sei. Ich muss Ihnen ehrlich sagen, dieser Definition von Transparenz kann ich leider nicht folgen. Offensichtlich gilt das auch für eine große Zahl meiner Kolleginnen und Kollegen hier im Hause. Transparenz ist etwas anderes, als einige Informationsbissen hinzuwerfen und zu sagen: „Hm, den Rest können wir leider nicht offenlegen, weil wir irgendetwas versprochen haben, dass das Ganze geheim bleiben soll.“

Wir sind in eine neue Phase eingetreten. Es wird jetzt nicht mehr möglich sein, mittels internationaler Verträge blinden Nachvollzug mit Handelspartnern auszumachen, der die europäische Gesetzgebung dann für die Zukunft beeinflusst. Das ist seit dem Vertrag von Lissabon nicht mehr möglich. Das heißt, blinder Nachvollzug endet genauso wie Intransparenz und Geheimniskrämerei vor den Türen des Europäischen Parlaments. Wir brauchen Glaubwürdigkeit für einen Schutz von Innovation, den Sie hier als das große Argument ins Treffen führen. Glaubwürdigkeit werden Sie aber nicht erreichen, wenn Sie alles hinter verschlossenen Türen aushandeln und dann die Menschen zu beruhigen versuchen, dass es eh und ohnehin nicht so schlimm werden wird. Herr Kommissar, das ist der falsche Weg!

2-486

**Catherine Trautmann (S&D).** – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, disons-le clairement, la manière dont sont menées les négociations sur l'accord commercial anti-contrefaçon n'est pas acceptable pour le Parlement européen.

En tant que nouveau colégislateur sur ce sujet, le traité de Lisbonne nous garantit désormais le droit à une information complète et simultanée à celle reçue par le Conseil. Les documents ayant "fuité" jusqu'à maintenant nous ont prouvé que, sur la forme, cette dimension n'était absolument pas respectée.

Et que dire du fond? Le marché de dupes qui semble être proposé aux fournisseurs d'accès à Internet est le suivant: s'ils acceptent de collaborer à la surveillance systématique du contenu transitant par leur réseau, la non-responsabilité dont ils disposent en la matière serait maintenue. Sinon, ils s'exposeraient aux poursuites engagées par les ayants droit et seraient systématiquement sanctionnés.

Un tel renversement me paraît extrêmement dangereux, car il remettrait en cause l'acquis communautaire, non seulement sur le principe de *mere conduit*, de la directive e-commerce – en français "simple transport" – mais aussi pour ce qui est du respect des droits fondamentaux des citoyens, rappelé récemment lors de nos débats sur le paquet télécom.

Je conclurai en rappelant que notre Assemblée a déjà fait la preuve de son attachement à ces principes en rejetant l'accord SWIFT. Je n'ai aucun doute sur sa capacité à recommencer. Aussi, je tiens à souligner l'importance de la résolution débattue ce soir. Je salue le travail de notre coordinateur, Kader Arif, et de tous les négociateurs de la commission du commerce international, qui ont fait en sorte que le signal qui sera lancé demain par le Parlement européen soit extrêmement symbolique, car unanime.

2-487

**Γεώργιος Παπαστάμκος (PPE).** – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η παραποίηση προϊόντων δεν πλήττει μόνο την ανταγωνιστικότητα των ευρωπαϊκών επιχειρήσεων αλλά ενέχει και κινδύνους για την ανθρώπινη υγεία. Η απάντηση βρίσκεται στην ενίσχυση της εφαρμογής των δικαιωμάτων διανοητικής ιδιοκτησίας σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο.

Η προσχώρηση όσο το δυνατόν περισσότερων εμπορικών εταιρών στη συζητούμενη πλειομερή συμφωνία είναι ζητούμενο. Η υπό διαπραγμάτευση συμφωνία πρέπει να συμμορφώνεται πλήρως με το σχετικό κοινοτικό κεκτημένο, να σέβεται τις θεμελιώδεις ελευθερίες και την προστασία των προσωπικών δεδομένων, να διασφαλίζει την ελεύθερη ροή πληροφοριών και να μην επιβαρύνει αδικαιολόγητα τις νόμιμες εμπορικές συναλλαγές.

Τέλος, το Κοινοβούλιο θα πρέπει να έχει στη διάθεσή του πλήρη και ουσιαστική πληροφόρηση καθ' όλα τα στάδια της διαπραγμάτευσης, τηρουμένης της εύλογης εμπιστευτικότητας.

2-488

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL).** – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, deste obscuro processo que tem vindo a ser conduzido pela Comissão Europeia há algo que emerge com relativa clareza. A intenção de alargar o âmbito e os custos dos direitos de propriedade intelectual, providenciando ainda mais lucros às grandes corporações.

Para atingir este objectivo, se necessário, despezam-se elementares regras de procedimento democráticas e transparentes, sonega-se informação e foge-se ao escrutínio e ao controlo democráticos. Para atingir este objectivo, se necessário, limita-se mesmo o acesso global a bens essenciais, como medicamentos seguros, incluindo genéricos, ou viola-se o direito à privacidade e à confidencialidade da correspondência, à protecção de dados pessoais.

A omnipresença do mercado, a defesa de interesses económicos que visam atingir objectivos próprios necessariamente sectoriais, é incompatível com a defesa e salvaguarda do bem comum. Os resultados desta política estão bem à vista.

2-489

**Karel De Gucht, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, I must say that, listening to the speeches after I took the floor, it comes to my mind that a lot of you were not listening properly to what I was saying, because I made it very clear that we were going to respect the *acquis communautaire*, that I would try to make sure the other parties to the agreement give their OK to the disclosure of the text that is currently being negotiated; I made it clear that it would only apply to commercial infringement of intellectual property rights, and I could continue for some time like this. So I am not going to respond again to all these questions that have been put because, honestly, I think I already answered them in my first speech.

David Martin put the question, what happens when somebody is in fact leaving not only the European Union but leaving a country that is a party to the ACTA agreement? That is an interesting question because it depends, of course, on where he is going to. If he is going to a country that is not a party to the ACTA agreement, then it will depend upon the customs and police of the country concerned, but that is beyond our reach. As far as it is within our reach, we will make sure that this is not happening, but of course we cannot speak for others.

I do not quite agree with the whole of Ms in 't Veld's reasoning on parliamentary approval and parliamentary control, but let me just say very clearly what I think the case is in the Treaty of Lisbon. The case is that the Council gives a mandate to the Commission, and the Commission negotiates, and the Council has taken a decision on a mandate following their own rules of procedure. Whether or not a minister in the Council of Ministers needs the approval of his national parliament beforehand is not a matter of European law, but a matter of national law, and that differs from one country to another. I know that in your country, for example, for many positions of that kind, they need approval beforehand from the Parliament – OK, but there are other countries where this is not the case. We should not, I think, judge the way the Council takes a decision. Insofar as the Council respects the Treaty and their own rules of procedure, I think that it is their business and not directly ours.

You were, to a certain extent, protecting me in that they should not check my iPod. I have no iPod, so there is no problem yet. In fact, I have had one since yesterday, but I have not yet used it and I am not going to New Zealand. It is a little bit too far. For that you need officials who have a little bit more time to go there.

2-490

**Karel De Gucht, Lid van de Commissie.** – ... de ganse discussie over de keuken, die laat ik voor mevrouw Stassen ...

2-491

Interesting question, what about China? Well China is not, as you know, Ms Roithová, a party to the present negotiations. China is a serious problem because, as you rightly state, they are the number one source of counterfeiting.

Now we have several negotiations with them and discussions with them, also the high-level economic dialogue. Repeatedly, we put emphasis on intellectual property rights, which is one of the main problems, not only within internet trade but also in a lot of other activities. Once ACTA is concluded it will be open to all countries to sign it, and I hope that China will come to the conclusion that, for their own industry too, it would be beneficial if there were better protection of intellectual property rights, and sooner or later that will come. Look at other countries where this also happened in the past: now they have much more interest in intellectual property rights.

I do not quite agree on the interpretation by Mr Le Hyaric and Mrs Trautmann concerning Article 218. What Article 218 says is that Parliament should be informed about all steps in the procedure; well, you are, and even more than that. What we do by way of information goes far beyond what is mentioned in Article 218, far beyond, but I have no problem with that. I made it clear in my introductory statement that we will insist on other parties agreeing that we be in a position to disclose the present draft of the text, but it is not correct that we would not be respecting Article 218.

By the way, let me say to Ms in 't Veld, we sent you Annex 16 to the agreed statement by all ACTA participants about maintaining the confidentiality of documents. That was sent to you by the Director-General, Mr David O'Sullivan, on 21 January 2009. Of course, that was in the previous Parliament, but it is still the same person. Mr O'Sullivan is the same and Ms in 't Veld is the same, so you got it. So it is a little bit difficult then to question me as to what this is all about.

Finally, let me make it very clear that what I have been saying and what I said in the hearing should be taken seriously. I will do my utmost to have the agreement of the contracting parties that we can fully inform you. As long as that is not the case, I cannot disclose to you the drafts of the agreement because that would breach the confidentiality agreement and breaching such an agreement would have effects that are not limited to the ACTA negotiations but would spill over to a lot of other negotiations we have with these countries concerned. It would breach the confidentiality as such and that makes all negotiations very difficult, if not impossible, but I will do my best to see that you get the stuff.

2-492

**Elnök.** – Öt állásfoglalásra irányuló indítványt<sup>1</sup> juttattak el hozzám, melyeket az eljárási szabályzat 115. cikkének (5) bekezdésével összhangban nyújtottak be.

A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra szerdán, 2010. március 10-én kerül sor.

### *Írásbeli nyilatkozatok (149. cikk)*

2-493

**Françoise Castex (S&D), par écrit.** – Alors que le Parlement demande l'accès aux textes depuis des mois, l'ACTA est négocié dans le plus grand secret, dans le dos des citoyens et de leurs représentants, c'est inadmissible! La Commission elle-même en perd son latin. Elle nous dit qu'elle nous a déjà transmis les documents, et en même temps, qu'elle va demander au Conseil de tout publier: de qui se moque-ton?

Bien au delà de la question de la transparence, nous souhaitons ici rappeler à la Commission et au Conseil qu'ils devront obtenir du Parlement un avis conforme à la fin des négociations. Des fuites qui nous sont parvenues, on a l'impression d'un cheval de Troie: sous prétexte d'une lutte tout à fait légitime contre la contrefaçon, les États membres, au premier rang desquels le gouvernement français, veulent faire passer un texte qui pourrait porter atteinte à l'accès à la médecine, à la liberté d'expression, à la neutralité du net et à la responsabilité juridique de ses intermédiaires.

Or, le Parlement s'opposera à la remise en cause de l'acquis communautaire. Si la Commission et le Conseil ne changent pas de stratégie, nous protégerons les libertés individuelles de nos concitoyens en rejetant l'ACTA comme nous l'avons déjà fait avec l'accord SWIFT.

2-493-500

**Ioan Enciu (S&D), în scris.** – Salut întrebarea adresată Comisiei pe tema transparenței și a situației actuale a negocierilor privind Acordul comercial de combatere a contrafacerii. Sunt de părere că trebuie luată o măsură urgentă de rezolvare a situației în care ne aflăm. Nu este admisibil ca Parlamentul European să fie dat la o parte de către Comisie din cadrul negocierilor pentru stabilirea ACTA, dat fiind faptul că noi trebuie să ne dăm acceptul pentru prevederile acestui tratat. Comisia, așa cum s-a mai spus, trebuie să facă publice cât mai curând toate negocierile ce au avut loc pentru ACTA precum și perspectiva avută în vedere pentru întâlnirea din Aprilie. Probleme precum constrângerea Providerilor de

<sup>1</sup> Lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.

Internet de a supraveghea traficul și de a institui restricții în cadrul rețelelor lor pot avea un impact negativ asupra populației atât din punct de vedere al respectării dreptului la intimitate cât și datorită apariției unor costuri suplimentare pentru utilizatori. O astfel de problemă trebuie dezbătută deschis și trebuie consultată opinia publică. Poziția cetățenilor europeni precum și a industriei vis-a-vis de aceste măsuri trebuie cunoscută și respectată pentru a putea evita un comportament abuziv de natură anti-democratică.

2-494

**Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D)**, *na piśmie*. – Szanowni Państwo, Negocjowana obecnie przez Komisję Europejską umowa ACTA (Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement) wykracza ponad przyjętą w prawie unijnym zasadę proporcjonalności, która mówi, że działania Unii nie wykraczają ponad to, co jest konieczne do osiągnięcia celów Traktatu. Szczególnie zaniepokojenie budzi rozdział dotyczący Internetu. Umowa zawiera podobno zapisy, które mogą ograniczyć z jednej strony swobodę wypowiedzi, a drugiej działalność komercyjną w Internecie. Taki skutek będzie miało rozważane podobno wprowadzenie odpowiedzialności dostawców Internetu za przesyłane treści oraz sankcji karnych za ściąganie plików na użytek prywatny. Używam słowa "podobno", ponieważ informacje na temat zapisów umowy nie pochodzą ze źródeł oficjalnych, a jedynie z plotek i przecieków, Komisja bowiem nie informuje Parlamentu o postępach w negocjacjach. Tymczasem Traktat z Lizbony przewiduje już taką procedurę. Ponadto zgoda Parlamentu wyrażona większością głosów jest konieczna do zawarcia porozumienia przez Radę. Nowy Traktat wprowadza też kompetencję do podejmowania środków w dziedzinie własności intelektualnej, która należy w równym stopniu do Parlamentu i do Rady. Dlatego przyłączam się do głosu deputowanych, którzy domagają się większej przejrzystości w zakresie prowadzonych negocjacji i uważam, że współpraca międzyinstytucjonalna w kwestii umowy ACTA powinna potwierdzić, że wszystkie Instytucje traktują poważnie nowo obowiązujący Traktat. Na razie tak nie jest.

2-494-500

**Alan Kelly (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement has a mandate which is vital for the protection of Intellectual Property Rights. Post-crisis, there needs to be an incentive for intellectuals and artists to use their creativity and publish new material, without fear, online. This right needs to be balanced against an individual's right to access to information and furthermore sanctions should only be targeted at the larger commercial exploiters of copyright material. However that is an issue for another day. Right now I am most concerned about the level to which this house is being kept informed of negotiations. Under Lisbon, this agreement requires the approval of this house and I would guess from my colleagues that the way the agreement is developing it will receive a cold reception. Negotiations surrounding ACTA need to be more open, and the Commission and Council need to show their willingness in this by ensuring the Parliament has broad access to documents on the issue.

2-495

**Stavros Lambrinidis (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I hope that the written declaration on ACTA that I submitted two weeks ago together with my colleagues Castex, Alvaro and Roithová and today's debate will serve as a belated wake-up call to the Council and the Commission. This Parliament will not sit back silently while the fundamental rights of millions of citizens are being negotiated away behind closed doors. We oppose any 'legislation laundering' on an international level of what would be very difficult to get through most national legislatures – let alone the European Parliament. Here, of course, I refer to the infamous 'three strikes' laws. This Parliament firmly believes that intellectual property rights must be protected, but not by giving private companies sweeping rights to monitor indiscriminately every citizen's activities on the internet – something that we refuse to allow even our police to do when fighting terrorism – and certainly not through the disproportionate penalty of cutting whole households off from the internet. Access to the internet is itself a fundamental right. It must be treated and protected as such.

2-496

**Michael Theurer (ALDE)**, *schriftlich*. – Die Verhandlungen der Europäischen Kommission zum Abkommen zur Bekämpfung von Produkt- und Markenpiraterie (ACTA) werfen noch einige Fragen auf. Das Abkommen beinhaltet berechtigte Anliegen, nämlich die Bekämpfung von Fälschungen bei Produkten und Marken und deren Schmuggel, es muss aber noch stärker auf unsere europäischen Grundsätze ausgelegt werden. Es darf hierbei nicht zu einer Harmonisierung des Urheberrechts, Patentrechts oder Markenrechts in der EU kommen – im Gegenteil, das Subsidiaritätsprinzip muss oberste Prämisse bleiben! Handelsabkommen dürfen nicht dazu missbraucht werden, Grund- und Freiheitsrechte von Einzelnen zu beschneiden. Bevor das Parlament seine Zustimmung zu diesem Abkommen geben kann, muss jedoch nicht nur inhaltlich noch stark nachgebessert werden! Das Parlament muss stärker in die Verhandlungen einbezogen, und Verhandlungsdokumente müssen vollständig für uns zugänglich gemacht werden!

2-497

## 16 - Rendelet az általános preferenciális rendszer alkalmazásáról (vita)

2-498

**Elnök**. – A következő pont vita a Daniel Caspary által a PPE képviselőcsoportja nevében, Kader Arif által az S&D képviselőcsoportja nevében, Niccolò Rinaldi által az ALDE képviselőcsoportja nevében, Yannick Jadot által a Verts/ALE képviselőcsoportja nevében, Joe Higgins által a GUE/NGL képviselőcsoportja nevében, valamint Robert Sturdy által az

ECR képviselőcsoportja nevében a Bizottsághoz intézett, az általános preferenciális rendszer alkalmazásáról szóló rendeletről szóló szóbeli választ igénylő kérdésről (O-0022/2010 - B7-0018/2010)

2-499

**Daniel Caspary, Verfasser.** – Herr Präsident, geschätzter Herr Kommissar, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Mit dem APS-System gewährt die Europäische Union im Moment 176 Entwicklungsländern Marktzugang in Form von reduzierten Importzöllen. Das sind Vergünstigungen, die wir als Europäische Union anbieten, ohne dafür eine Gegenleistung von unseren Partnern zu erwarten. Zusätzlich gibt es APS+ für einige bestimmte Länder mit besonderen Herausforderungen und für solche, die besondere Bedingungen erfüllen.

Was ist die Ausgangslage? Wir brauchen ab dem 1. Januar 2012 eine neue Regelung, weil die alte ausläuft. Für ein geordnetes Verfahren, das uns auch für zwei Lesungen Zeit gibt, brauchen wir Zeit. Deshalb erwarte ich für meine Fraktion, dass die Kommission möglichst zügig einen neuen Vorschlag vorlegt. Wie gesagt, wir brauchen für ein Verfahren mit zwei Lesungen ausreichend Zeit, und es kann nicht sein, dass wir als Europäisches Parlament diese Entscheidungen im Zweifel unter Druck treffen sollen. Und wir brauchen eine Evaluierung des bestehenden Systems. Ich wünsche mir, dass wir sehr bald Zahlen, Daten, Fakten dazu bekommen, wie sich das bestehende System in der Praxis bewährt hat. Hat das bestehende System wirklich dazu geführt, Handelserleichterungen für die davon profitierenden Staaten auch zu schaffen? Sind die Exportzahlen auch gestiegen? Profitieren die richtigen Länder von diesem System? Ich werfe die Frage in den Raum: Stimmt alles in dem bestehenden System? Wenn beispielsweise Länder wie Katar, das ein Pro-Kopf-Einkommen hat, das höher ist als das Pro-Kopf-Einkommen von 25 Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union, unter das APS-System fällt, bin ich der festen Überzeugung, dass wir bei der Überarbeitung des gesamten Systems all diese Dinge unbedingt kritisch anschauen sollten.

Um eine Sache bitte ich die Kollegen aller Fraktionen im Hinblick auf die Abstimmung morgen: Wir sollten bei der Entschließung allgemein bleiben, wie es auch im ursprünglichen Entwurf vereinbart war. Ich wäre den Kollegen sehr dankbar, wenn wir Einzelfälle, die diskutiert wurden, nicht in der Entschließung erwähnten.

2-500

**David Martin, deputising for the author.** – Mr President, like Mr Caspary, I welcome the three preference regimes we have under the GSP – Everything But Arms, GSP and GSP+.

It is right that the 49 poorest countries in the world should get open access to our markets for everything but their arms. It is right, as Mr Caspary has said, that the 176 developing countries should be given preferential access to our market. It is also right that 16 countries should get even better access to our market, through GSP+, in return for setting up and implementing 27 specified international conventions on human rights, co-labour standards, sustainable development and good governance.

However, it is also right that we expect those 16 beneficiary countries to apply and respect their commitments under those conventions.

If we allow countries to get away with not applying their commitments or respecting the laws under those conventions, then we lose the incentive that GSP+ is supposed to give. That is not all, as we in effect punish the other GSP countries by eroding their preferences and giving preferences to 16 countries not respecting their rights.

That is why I welcome the fact that Sri Lanka has been investigated by the Commission, which has also proposed action against Sri Lanka. That is also why I believe strongly that the Commission should launch an investigation into Colombia's respect or otherwise of the 27 conventions. That does not mean that we would take action against Colombia. It simply means that we would investigate it, as we did with El Salvador but decided that there was no need for action.

I have three questions for the Commissioner.

Does the Commission accept that, in the future, Parliament should be given the right to call for investigations under GSP+?

Secondly, in the mean time, will the Commission present to Parliament the requested report on the status of the ratification and implementation of the conventions by the existing GSP+ beneficiaries?

Finally, when does the Commission plan to transmit to Parliament the revised regulation for the next phase of GSP? We were promised it by June and we would like to see it delivered by June.

2-501

**Niccolò Rinaldi, Autore.** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, poco dopo la costituzione di questo Parlamento siamo stati confrontati subito con la questione della sospensione GSP+, in particolare con l'applicazione, o la non applicazione, di questo meccanismo, lo Sri Lanka e la Colombia.



Nel primo caso abbiamo assistito a una a una serie di errori, anche gravi, commessi da un paese come lo Sri Lanka, che comunque ha l'attenuante di uscire da una lunghissima guerra civile contro una terribile organizzazione terroristica. Da parte della Commissione in questo caso abbiamo assistito, a mio modo di vedere, a una certa fretta, che ha portato rapidamente alla proposta di sospendere il GSP+. Nel Consiglio, invece, non ci sono stati, come dire, padrini dello Sri Lanka, e la decisione è stata presa. Per quanto riguarda il Parlamento europeo, esso non ha svolto nessun ruolo: nessuno ha chiesto la nostra opinione.

Nel secondo caso, abbiamo un paese che deve combattere contro una temibile guerriglia interna e dove vi sono serie violazioni dei diritti dell'uomo, compreso l'omicidio frequente di sindacalisti. La Commissione fino ad ora non si è espressa sull'opportunità di aprire un'indagine e, anzi, prosegue la pista dell'accordo di libero scambio, sulla quale personalmente concordo. Nel Consiglio, sappiamo che vi sono governi assai attivi nel proteggere gli interessi delle autorità colombiane e, ancora una volta, il ruolo del Parlamento europeo è stato zero: nessuno chiede l'opinione del Parlamento, che pure, quasi quotidianamente, deve ascoltare le voci degli uni e degli altri.

In entrambi i casi non abbiamo avuto alcuno studio di impatto sulle conseguenze occupazionali ed economiche della possibile sospensione ma, in tanta incoerenza, c'è questo elemento comune: il ruolo marginale del Parlamento europeo. Eppure, queste sono decisioni eminentemente politiche, non tecniche, e questo trovo sia inaccettabile. C'è dunque necessità di un nuovo regolamento, approfittando della scadenza di fine 2011, come questi due casi concreti credo dimostrino. Tuttavia, nel frattempo sarebbe bene discutere anche di quanto sta accadendo in questi mesi in questi particolari paesi.

Sarebbe ad esempio interessante sapere qual è la soglia di violazione dei diritti dell'uomo che la Commissione ritiene da sorpassare per aprire un'indagine in Colombia o in altro paese, oppure quali passi concreti il governo dello Sri Lanka, come ad esempio la sospensione della legge marziale, dovrebbe compiere per non eseguire la sospensione.

Quello che noi chiediamo, Commissario, è dunque questo: una nuova proposta, possibilmente entro giugno; dei chiari criteri per l'eleggibilità dei paesi beneficiari, tenendo conto che il GSP è uno strumento di sviluppo e che nella lista dei paesi beneficiari abbiamo alcuni paesi che francamente non sono poi così tanto in via di sviluppo; la firma e l'applicazione delle 27 convenzioni dell'Organizzazione internazionale del lavoro nei paesi beneficiari; la trasparenza delle norme per la loro condotta; un sistema di valutazione dell'impatto delle GSP e una comunicazione al Parlamento e, come il collega Martin ricordava, il ruolo del Parlamento in caso di sospensione, che deve essere pieno, trattandosi – lo ripeto – di una decisione eminentemente politica.

2-502

**Nicole Kiil-Nielsen**, *auteur suppléant*. – Monsieur le Président, notre débat aujourd'hui est motivé par trois aspects concernant le système de préférences tarifaires généralisées.

Premièrement, l'actuel règlement expire le 31 décembre 2011. Pour que le Parlement européen puisse exercer les pouvoirs qu'il a, grâce au traité de Lisbonne, il faut que la Commission nous donne un projet de nouveau règlement au plus tard au mois de juin 2010.

Deuxièmement, le fonctionnement du SPG+ est tout sauf parfait. Qui décide de la liste des pays bénéficiaire, sur la base de quels critères? Miracle! Qui contrôle effectivement la mise en place des 27 conventions internationales, en matière sociale et environnementale, obligatoires pour être bénéficiaire du SPG+? Nous ne le savons pas.

Quels ont été les résultats du SPG+? S'agit-il de développement durable, de diversification de la production, de création d'emplois dignes, ou au contraire de prolifération de contrats à courte durée, d'augmentation de fermes abandonnées, de concentration de la grande propriété destinée à l'exportation? Nous n'en savons rien.

Donc, il faut une réforme profonde du règlement pour garantir un contrôle démocratique et s'assurer que les mesures prises atteignent bien les objectifs recherchés.

Mais la vraie raison du débat de ce soir, c'est le cas lamentable de la Colombie. Jusqu'à aujourd'hui, la Commission a refusé d'entamer une enquête sur les très graves violations des droits humains dans ce pays. Cette enquête est pourtant prévue par le règlement.

Il est inconcevable, en raison des valeurs prônées par l'Union européenne, qu'en quête de profit dans le secteur laitier, automobile, pharmaceutique, télécom, bancaire, pour nos propres multinationales, l'UE abandonne la conditionnalité du SPG et qu'elle se précipite, ces jours-ci, dans un accord de libre-échange avec la Colombie. C'est un coup mortel porté aux syndicats, aux paysans, aux consommateurs colombiens, à la production industrielle nationale colombienne.

2-503

**Joe Higgins, author.** – Mr President, the system whereby the EU gives preferential treatment in trade to some countries has been in place since 1971. It is supposed to be a mechanism to resolve trade imbalances between developed capitalist countries and the poorer countries of the world and to contribute to sustainable development.

Commissioner, will you agree that in that respect it has been really a dismal failure and that EU trade agreements have mainly benefited EU-based transnational corporations who use their superior resources to batter small local producers in many poorer countries, causing serious dislocation, including loss of local employment and environmental destruction? Is that not the real meaning of the EU Commission's document strategy paper on 'Global Europe: competing in the world', published only three years ago?

And, Commissioner, what hope have the working people of Africa, Asia and Latin America when your Commission, only in recent weeks, cravenly bent the knee to the criminal speculation of free-booting hedge fund merchants seeking massive quick profits through outrageous speculation against the euro and Greece in particular? And you handed over the working class of Greece and the poor of Greece to the tender mercies of these parasites – criminals in fact. What hope have the poor and working people outside the borders of Europe in view of that situation?

Now the question asks how the EU Commission evaluates whether the states that benefit from preferential trade agreements with the EU protect workers' rights and protect human rights. Please tell us that.

And how can you continue relations with the Government of Colombia, where quite clearly government-controlled agencies, especially the army, are ongoingly guilty of the most heinous crimes, as only recently shown in the horrific discovery of the mass grave of innocent murder victims in La Macarena.

And, finally, what is the Commission's up-to-date view with regard to continuing GSP+ with Sri Lanka, considering that after the election the policies of Mr Rajapaksa's government continue to be against human rights and workers' rights in that country?

2-504

**Syed Kamall, deputising for the author.** – Mr President, I think we all understand that one of the aims of the GSP system was to integrate the poorer countries into the global trading system. Granting preferential treatment was seen as a positive way of tackling some of the trade imbalances between the richer countries and the poorer countries.

As someone who has many friends and relatives in many of these poorer countries, I think we have to look no further than the governments of many of these countries: poor governance issues; state monopolies and corrupt governments that are preventing entrepreneurs in these countries from creating wealth; the fact that they find it difficult to import the materials that they need to add value and create wealth; also the fact that many citizens of the countries are denied access to goods and services that we take for granted here in the EU and in many richer countries.

Let us also recognise that the best way to help people out of poverty is to help the entrepreneurs. The entrepreneurs will create the jobs, they will create the wealth and they will take poor people out of poverty.

During recent negotiations on the economic partnership agreements, many Members right across the political spectrum were concerned about the Commission's one-size-fits-all approach to the EPAs.

In one case in which I was concerned, the Commission official, when questioned in committee, said that the EPAs are not only about trade; they are also about regional integration and exporting the EU model. But when we asked whether some of the ACP countries that had specific concerns could be given GSP+ as an alternative, we were told this was not possible because they violate certain of the conventions and therefore do not qualify for GSP+.

Going forward, surely we should look to be more flexible in our application of GSP+, perhaps as an alternative to the EPAs. We can treat this in a number of ways. We can either impose sanctions on countries that do not meet standards or we can engage in ongoing dialogue to ensure that conditions in these countries are improved, and understand that Rome was not built in a day and neither were Europe's superior high standards. It is time to engage and to help entrepreneurs in developing countries rather than to over-politicise the issue.

2-505

**Karel De Gucht, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, the current GSP scheme expires on 31 December 2011. The Commission is already working on a substantive updating and review of the current scheme. Later this month, I will launch a wide public consultation on possible improvements and changes followed by a thorough impact reassessment. The Commission proposal for a successor regulation can therefore be expected to be ready during the first quarter of 2011. This proposal will of course be subject to the ordinary legislative procedure, which may well last beyond the expiry date of the current scheme, 31 December 2011.

You will all agree that we must avoid a situation whereby GSP beneficiaries lose all their preferences on 1 January 2012. We will therefore submit, in parallel with the launch of this essential preparatory work for a new GSP scheme, a proposal to extend the current regulation granting continuity until the new scheme is in place. This should give you the time to work in earnest on the successor scheme whilst ensuring that GSP beneficiaries are not left out in the cold. You should receive this document in April.

I have noted your question on all concerns as regards the way in which the Commission monitors beneficiary countries' compliance with the current criteria for GSP+ treatment. The basic criterion for GSP+ is the ratification and effective implementation of 27 international conventions in the fields of human rights, core labour standards, sustainable development and good governance. It is the Commission's task to closely monitor all beneficiary countries' compliance with these criteria.

The Commission is obliged and determined to operate GSP in a fair, objective manner. In this respect, we base our monitoring and evaluation of effective implementation of the GSP+ arrangements as much as possible on the findings and reports of international organisations such as the United Nations, the ILO and other relevant agencies, as well as on the monitoring mechanisms envisaged in the conventions themselves.

This provides for an unambiguous and impartial review process. The monitoring is also supported by the Commission's bilateral dialogue with the GSP+ countries on implementation issues. If such reports contain information that GSP criteria are not being fully respected, the GSP regulation provides for the possibility that the Commission undertake an investigation to clarify the factual situation and propose appropriate action.

This investigation tool is a serious instrument that should be deployed when the situation justifies it, but launching an investigation is not a step to be taken lightly as it may impact on our wider relationship with the partner countries. Think, for example, of the recent case with Sri Lanka.

As the objective of the GSP+ scheme is to incentivise countries to adhere to international good governance standards, GSP+ countries should first be given the opportunity to prove their commitment to the GSP+ objectives, their willingness to cooperate with international monitoring bodies and to address the shortcomings identified.

This approach gives credit for the steps already taken by those countries and is in line with the general incentive-based approach that underpins the GSP+.

I am eager to engage with you in a debate on the future of the GSP scheme and of the GSP+ in particular. In preparing the review of the current scheme, which will also concern the GSP+ criteria and the monitoring of respect, the themes raised by the European Parliament will be carefully looked at.

Since this review will now follow the ordinary legislative procedure, the European Parliament will be in an equal position with the Council in determining the final shape of the new GSP scheme.

2-506

**Laima Liucija Andrikiienė**, *on behalf of the PPE Group*. – Mr President, following on from what has been said by our colleague Daniel Caspary, whom I fully support, I would like to stress a few points. First of all, the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon in many ways reshapes the role of Parliament in the formulation of EU trade policy. The GSP is one of those areas where Parliament will have a bigger say and more leverage.

Commissioner, I would also like to urge you to look favourably on the increased role of Parliament in the domain you oversee. I therefore urge you to consult Parliament when it comes to the conclusion or the review of the GSP and GSP+ beneficiaries list.

Thirdly, Parliament should also be drawn into the process of monitoring whether the GSP beneficiaries uphold – not only ratify but also effectively implement – the 27 ILO and United Nations conventions. The Commission should at least consult Parliament on this issue and it is, of course, our duty in Parliament to make sure that we develop mechanisms inside our relevant bodies, our committees, to contribute to such monitoring. On a final note, I would like to reiterate the call expressed in the draft resolution we will be voting on tomorrow. The Commission should draft the new regulation on GSP as soon as possible.

Last but not least, I disagree with what has been said by some colleagues on Colombia. Colombia is a country like many countries in the region and we cannot ignore positive developments, achievements in the field of human rights and on the situation of human rights defenders in this country. There is no need to name and shame this particular country, as our resolution is on the new regulation and the need to have a new regulation.

2-507

**Vital Moreira**, em nome do Grupo S&D. – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, é agradável ouvir a garantia do Comissário De Gucht de que, em breve, a Comissão enviará a este Parlamento a iniciativa legislativa destinada a rever o sistema de preferências generalizadas de modo a que o processo legislativo possa ser ultimado a tempo de evitar a caducidade do actual sistema de preferências generalizadas, que termina no final do próximo ano.

Esse sistema deve ser renovado. Primeiro, porque constitui um instrumento de ajuda ao desenvolvimento, conferindo aos países acesso ao mercado europeu em condições privilegiadas sem qualquer reciprocidade. Em segundo lugar, porque esse esquema constitui também um instrumento de melhoria da situação dos direitos humanos e do bom governo nesses mesmos países, visto que a sua concessão está sujeita a condições a preencher por esses países beneficiários.

Por essas duas razões, a União deve renovar a utilização desse instrumento, que põe o comércio ao serviço do desenvolvimento e dos direitos humanos. Todavia, a renovação deveria tirar proveito de uma avaliação dos resultados no período antecedente.

Por outro lado, o novo regulamento deveria observar os seguintes requisitos tirados da prática até agora. Em primeiro lugar, manter a natureza temporária da concessão do sistema de preferências generalizadas de modo a permitir a sua retirada logo que desnecessário. Em segundo lugar, aprofundar e refinar a diferenciação e selectividade dos países beneficiários, de acordo com o nível de desenvolvimento de cada um e a sua competitividade externa. Em terceiro lugar, e finalmente, melhorar os mecanismos de monitorização do cumprimento das condições associadas ao sistema de preferências generalizadas, especialmente no que respeita à observância dos direitos humanos.

E, finalmente, Sr. Comissário, era conveniente que a opinião do Parlamento fosse tida em conta desde o início do procedimento legislativo.

2-508

**Γεώργιος Παπαστάμκος (PPE)**. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η μεταχείριση που απορρέει από το σύστημα γενικευμένων προτιμήσεων, ως μία εξαίρεση της αρχής του μάλλον ευνοουμένου κράτους του ΠΟΕ, οφείλει να είναι στοχευμένη, να έχει δηλαδή αποδέκτες τις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες, που έχουν μεγαλύτερη ανάγκη. Ο νέος κατάλογος των δικαιούχων χωρών οφείλει να αντανakλά την πραγματική οικονομική κατάσταση και την ανταγωνιστικότητα των αναπτυσσομένων χωρών.

Άλλωστε, η έλλειψη διαφοροποίησης μεταξύ των αναπτυσσομένων χωρών λειτουργεί εν τέλει εις βάρος των λιγότερο αναπτυγμένων χωρών. Της πρότασης αναθεώρησης είναι λογικό να προηγείται η αξιολόγηση του αντικτύπου που είχε το σύστημα κατά την προηγούμενη περίοδο εφαρμογής του επί των δικαιούχων χωρών.

Η εμπορική πολιτική, ειδικότερα η εμπορική αιρεσιμότητα, μπορεί αναμφίβολα να συμβάλει σε μία αποτελεσματικότερη παγκόσμια διακυβέρνηση μέσω άσκησης ήπιας ισχύος. Μπορεί να συμβάλει μέσω της παροχής κινήτρων στην προώθηση της κοινωνικής διάστασης της παγκοσμιοποίησης εν ευρεία εννοία: αξιοπρεπή εργασία, βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη, δημοκρατική λογοδοσία.

Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο θα πρέπει να έχει τη δυνατότητα δημιουργικής συμμετοχής στο πλαίσιο του νέου αναθεωρημένου συστήματος αλλά και της αποτελεσματικής παρακολούθησης της εφαρμογής των συμβάσεων από τις δικαιούχες χώρες.

2-509

**Bernd Lange (S&D)**. – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar! Wir wissen alle, dass das APS-System ein gutes System und APS+ ein sehr gutes System ist. Wir müssen auch die Verlängerung sicherstellen, und deshalb brauchen wir Ihren Vorschlag, damit wir ordentlich im Parlament beraten können. Also Gas geben, Herr Kommissar!

Auch beim APS+-System können wir vielleicht noch ein paar Verbesserungen einführen. Fünf Punkte würde ich da anführen, bei denen man vielleicht noch einmal nachbessern kann. Erstens: Wer stellt fest, wie eigentlich die 27 Normen umgesetzt werden, nicht nur real anerkannt, sondern formal umgesetzt werden? Ist das allein Aufgabe der ILO, oder braucht man nicht ein *assessment committee*, das wirklich konkret die Umsetzung begleitet?

Zweitens: Wie wird die Zivilgesellschaft eingebunden? Ich würde mir wünschen, dass bei der Bewertung der Umsetzung von APS+ eine zivilgesellschaftliche Koordinierung in dem jeweiligen Land möglich ist, wie wir es jetzt auch im Südkorea-Abkommen vereinbart haben.

Drittens: Wer erteilt eigentlich einen Untersuchungsauftrag, wenn irgendwelche Probleme festgestellt werden? Das Parlament muss hier einbezogen werden, weil nach meinem Gefühl im Rat andere Interessen mitspielen, als wirklich eine Untersuchungsaufgabe zu veranlassen. Das Parlament sollte hier auch einen Untersuchungsauftrag erteilen.

Wir brauchen sicherlich auch noch klare Strukturen für die weiteren Schritte und auch klarere Strukturen für eine Aussetzung, aber darüber können wir vielleicht noch einmal im Detail reden.

2-510

**Thomas Mann (PPE).** – Herr Präsident! APS räumt vor allem den Entwicklungsländern und Schwellenländern Handelsvergünstigungen ein. Diese moderne Art der Entwicklungshilfe von Zollermäßigungen bis Zollbefreiungen auf den Absatzmärkten der Industriestaaten hat viel erreicht. Durch die Sonderregelung APS+ sollen Sozial- und Umweltnormen verwirklicht werden. Sie ist Ursache dafür, dass immer öfter auch die Konventionen der UNO und der ILO unterzeichnet wurden.

Nur, Herr Kommissar, wie kontrolliert die Kommission die Umsetzung dieser Kriterien? Wird die Rücknahme der Präferenzen konsequent eingehalten, wenn Waren exportiert werden, die in Zwangsarbeit oder Sklaverei entstanden sind, wenn unlautere Handelspraktiken vorliegen und wenn die Kontrolle der Ursprungserzeugnisse nicht gewährleistet ist? Und sollte der durch APS+ erzielte Gewinn an Menschenrechten nicht auch endlich größere Staaten umfassen? Ich denke beispielsweise an China. All unsere Entschließungen, die Demonstrationen, die bilateralen Verhandlungen zwischen der EU und China haben keine Verbesserung bei den Menschenrechten gebracht. Deshalb gehen morgen, am Internationalen Tibet-Tag, Hunderttausende auf die Straßen, und in zehntausenden Städten und Gemeinden der Europäischen Union werden Tibetfahnen gehisst. Wir bekunden Solidarität mit den Menschen, die um ihre kulturelle, sprachliche und religiöse Autonomie kämpfen.

Teilen Sie, Herr Kommissar, die Ansicht, dass Menschenrechtsnormen, Sozialnormen und Umweltnormen aus den Spezialregulierungen herausgenommen werden müssen und in den Kriterienkatalog von APS integriert werden? Die Zusammenarbeit mit unseren Handelspartnern darf sich nicht auf rein wirtschaftliches Denken beschränken.

2-511

**Gianluca Susta (S&D).** – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa occasione è importante per riaffermare innanzitutto l'importanza del Sistema di preferenze generalizzate. Sia il sistema di base GSP che il sistema GSP+, entrambi legati all'accordo "Tutto, tranne le armi", contribuiscono a ridurre la povertà, in stretta sintonia col primario dovere di rispettare i diritti umani. È la violazione di questi elementari principi di convivenza che recentemente ha portato l'Unione europea a revocare i benefici delle tariffe preferenziali allo Sri Lanka, a seguito di una minuziosa indagine della Commissione esecutiva.

Il nuovo quadro istituzionale deve vedere però il Parlamento coinvolto a pieno titolo nel processo legislativo volto a modificare la legislazione vigente. Auspichiamo quindi che si tratti di una profonda revisione, secondo le procedure ordinarie della normativa, che presenta parecchie lacune, ad esempio proprio sul tema delle indagini. Da qui la risoluzione comune.

L'efficacia del regolamento dipende dalla sua credibilità, dall'oggettività dei criteri su cui si fonda e dal rigore con cui viene applicato. In un'Europa in cui la stragrande maggioranza dei cittadini non condivide l'esportazione della democrazia con la punta delle baionette, il commercio e l'aiuto al commercio sono un veicolo essenziale per la diffusione dei principi di convivenza fondati sul rispetto dei fondamentali diritti dell'uomo. Questo dovere ci richiama all'esigenza di non abbandonarci a un colpevole lassismo ma anche a evitare di cadere in frettolose sentenze verso alcuni, che suonano come inappellabili condanne: è il caso della Colombia.

È per questo che non mi sento di condividere atteggiamenti rigorosi a senso quasi unico nei confronti di questo o quello Stato ma richiamo con forza l'esigenza di un rafforzamento di un monitoraggio di tutte le situazioni problematiche, nello spirito della normativa vigente e secondo le linee di quelle che vogliamo porre a base della revisione legislativa che invochiamo.

2-512

**Christofer Fjellner (PPE).** – Herr talman! Det allmänna preferenssystemet som debatteras i dag är ett väldigt bra och viktigt verktyg, eftersom det gör det något lättare för några av världens kanske fattigaste länder att exportera till och handla med Europa. Många av Europas länder har byggt sitt välstånd på det sättet, och därför är det viktigt att vi försöker att utöka det till fler länder.

I en debatt som den här och i det kommande arbetet med att se över det allmänna preferenssystemet måste vi fundera över och fokusera på den grundläggande uppgiften och det grundläggande målet med det allmänna preferenssystemet, eftersom detta är att bekämpa fattigdom. Handel är det absolut effektivaste sättet att bekämpa fattigdom och skapa ekonomisk tillväxt och det är viktigt att vi kommer ihåg det.

Självklart är det allmänna preferenssystemet också ett bra sätt att sätta press på länder, för att få dem att följa internationella avtal och konventioner och åtaganden om mänskliga rättigheter osv. Men vi får inte glömma att det syftar till utveckling. Självklart ska EU kunna stryka eller neka länder som inte lever upp till sina åtaganden att få dessa förmåner, men det är viktigt att tänka på den svåra balansgången. Det är ju inte så att ett land som nekas friare handel och nya exportmöjligheter får det lättare att leva upp till de åtaganden och de krav som vi ställer på dem.

Det finns ett samband: Korruption, dåliga arbetsvillkor och dålig respekt för mänskliga rättigheter bidrar till fattigdom, men fattigdom gör det också svårare att bekämpa korruption, problem med mänskliga rättigheter och dåliga arbetsvillkor. Jag skulle vilja höra hur kommissionsledamoten ser på detta moment 22, det vill säga risken för att ett tillbakadragande av handelspreferenser försvårar länders möjlighet att ta sig ur t.ex. dåliga arbetsvillkor.

Sedan skulle jag också vilja notera att vi nu ställer krav på att ett antal länder ska ratificera 27 ILO- och FN-konventioner och fullt ut genomföra dessa. Jag skulle vilja se en rejäl analys om huruvida alla EU-länder fullt ut har genomfört och ratificerat alla dessa FN- och ILO-konventioner. Jag håller det åtminstone för osannolikt att allt är fullt ut genomfört och det är viktigt att komma ihåg det nu när vi ställer krav på andra.

2-513

**Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE).** – O întrebare simplă pentru domnul comisar: potrivit Regulamentului (CE) nr. 732/2008, statele care doresc să obțină condițiile preferențiale în cadrul sistemului SGP+ au posibilitatea de a depune cereri până la sfârșitul lunii aprilie a acestui an. Având în vedere că termenul final se apropie, doresc să îl întreb pe domnul comisar, în măsura în care dispune de această informație, ce state au aplicat până în prezent, dacă este oportun să acordăm condiții preferențiale unor noi state când ne pregătim să schimbăm criteriile necesare și, de asemenea, mă asociez colegilor care au subliniat că Parlamentul European ar trebui consultat în aplicarea Sistemului Generalizat de Preferințe.

Mulțumesc.

2-514

**Karel De Gucht, Member of the Commission.** – Mr President, several questions have been asked on Sri Lanka and on Colombia, and on why in one case we decided to have an enquiry and take a decision and in the other case we did not.

In the case of Sri Lanka, the Commission's attention was drawn to publicly available reports and statements from the United Nations as well as to other relevant sources, including non-governmental organisations, indicating that Sri Lanka was not effectively implementing various human rights conventions, in particular the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

However, unlike Colombia, Sri Lanka's general approach was to deny the existence of any problems and not to cooperate with the Commission at any stage of the investigation.

In the case of Colombia, the United Nations and ILO monitoring results show that there are question marks on the degree of effective implementation of certain UN and ILO Conventions, but it is also clear that Colombia has engaged with the ILO and the United Nations bodies and has made substantial changes to its legal system, and that steps are being taken by the Government to amend its legislation and improve its implementation on the ground. There is an ongoing dialogue in cooperation with the United Nations and the ILO.

With regard to the question put by Mr Moreira, I would like to say that in the review of the GSP regulation we are working to find a balance between the different requests that have been made here. We have been asked to do that as soon as possible, and will do so. We were asked to have an impact assessment and will receive the 2009 GSP data only in July this year, which will be followed, of course, by consultation of Parliament.

I would also like to recall the commitment I made to the Committee on International Trade at the time of my hearing and subsequently to provide a timetable for our legislative proposals that will be submitted to that committee in the coming months. As you will know, we are scheduled to meet tomorrow. We will try to work something out together that gives Parliament the maximum possibility to discuss in all openness the different dossiers, including the new GSP new regulation and the roll-over system, which we should introduce as early as April.

2-515

**Elnök.** – Két állásfoglalásra irányuló indítványt<sup>1</sup> juttattak el hozzám, melyeket az eljárási szabályzat 115. cikkének (5) bekezdésével összhangban nyújtottak be.

A vitát lezárom.

A szavazásra szerdán, 2010. március 10-én kerül sor.

2-516

**17 - A következő ülésnap napirendje: lásd a jegyzőkönyvet**

2-517

<sup>1</sup> Lásd a jegyzőkönyvet.

**18 - Az ülés berekesztése**

2-518

*(Az ülést 23.40-kor berekesztik)*