

**СРЯДА 6 ФЕВРУАРИ 2013 Г.**  
**MIÉRCOLES 6 DE FEBRERO DE 2013**  
**STŘEDA 6. ÚNORA 2013**  
**ONSDAG DEN 6. FEBRUAR 2013**  
**MITTWOCH, 6. FEBRUAR 2013**  
**KOLMAPÄEV, 6. VEEBRUAR 2013**  
**TETARTH 6 ΦΕΒΡΟΥΑΡΙΟΥ 2013**  
**WEDNESDAY, 6 FEBRUARY 2013**  
**MERCREDI 6 FÉVRIER 2013**  
**MERCOLEDI' 6 FEBBRAIO 2013**  
**TREŠDIENA, 2013. GADA 6. FEBRUĀRIS**  
**2013 M. VASARIO 6 D., TREČIADIENIS**  
**2013. FEBRUÁR 6., SZERDA**  
**L-ERBGĦA, 6 TA' FRAR 2013**  
**WOENSDAG 6 FEBRUARI 2013**  
**ŚRODA, 6 LUTEGO 2013**  
**QUARTA-FEIRA, 6 DE FEVEREIRO DE 2013**  
**MIERCURI 6 FEBRUARIE 2013**  
**STREDA 6. FEBRUÁRA 2013**  
**SREDA, 6. FEBRUAR 2013**  
**KESKIVIIKKO 6. HELMIKUUTA 2013**  
**ONSDAGEN DEN 6 FEBRUARI 2013**

3-002-000

**VORSITZ: MARTIN SCHULZ**

*Präsident*

## **1. Eröffnung der Sitzung**

3-004-000

*(Die Sitzung wird um 9.05 Uhr eröffnet.)*

3-005-000

**Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE).** - Monsieur le Président, j'ai régulièrement attiré votre attention sur l'absence des relations politiques que notre Parlement avait avec le président du Conseil européen. J'ai écrit pour suggérer qu'il soit invité à cette réunion préparatoire pour que nous puissions scinder les aspects législatifs avec le Conseil des aspects politiques avec le président du Conseil européen.

Il y a longtemps que le président du Conseil européen ne vient plus rendre compte devant le Parlement européen, en application de l'article 15 du traité, et je le regrette parce que l'exercice que nous avons fait avec le président de la République française, hier, en vérité, c'était avec le président du conseil européen que nous aurions dû le faire. Je regrette qu'il n'ait pas accepté – mais peut-être n'a-t-il pas été invité – de venir débattre à la veille d'un Conseil européen important et qui doit négocier avec notre Parlement des perspectives financières.

Je vous serais très reconnaissant, Monsieur le Président, d'adresser au Président du Conseil européen la requête de venir nouer des relations politiques avec le Parlement européen. J'espère d'ailleurs qu'un jour vous pourrez, vous-même, assister à toutes les réunions du Conseil européen et que le président du Conseil européen vienne assister à nos réunions du Parlement.

3-006-000

**Der Präsident.** – Herr Audy, der Präsident des Europäischen Rates – ich nehme an, Sie reden von Herrn Van Rompuy – ist immer eingeladen ins Europäische Parlament. Aber der Präsident des Europäischen Rates ist der Auffassung, dass seine Ansprechpartner die Regierungschefs sind und nicht das Europäische Parlament.

Ich habe ihm mehrfach mitgeteilt, dass wir da entschieden anderer Auffassung sind. Aber ich kenne in Ihrer Fraktion eine Reihe von Leuten, die Herrn Van Rompuy relativ nahestehen. Möglicherweise können Sie da noch einmal etwas den Druck verstärken, beim nächsten Treffen dort zu sagen: „Herman, komm ins Parlament, das ist besser.“ Ich selbst dränge ihn permanent und fordere ihn auch auf. Ich muss Ihnen allerdings auch mitteilen, dass rein rechtlich nicht Herr Van Rompuy der Ansprechpartner des Europäischen Parlaments ist, sondern Premierminister Kenny als amtierender Ratsvorsitzender. Nichtsdestotrotz sind die Regierungschefs aber der Auffassung, Herr Van Rompuy sei ihr Ansprechpartner. Sie sehen, wir haben noch viel Aufklärungsarbeit, auch über den Vertrag, im Europäischen Rat zu leisten.

3-007-000

**Hannes Swoboda (S&D).** - Herr Präsident! Abgesehen davon, dass ich diese Initiative wieder einmal voll unterstütze, heißt das, dass dann die Verhandlungen, die wir über das Budget zu führen haben, mit der irischen Ratspräsidentschaft geführt werden? Wenn Herr Van Rompuy nicht unser Ansprechpartner ist, dann ist eigentlich die irische Präsidentschaft unser Ansprechpartner für das Budget. Darf ich das so daraus schließen?

3-008-000

**Der Präsident.** – Herr Swoboda, die Vertragslage ist eindeutig. Der Europäische Rat morgen und am Freitag beschließt eine politische Willensbildung. Die rein formale Beschlussfassung über den mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen erfolgt auf der Grundlage von Artikel 312 des Vertrags im Rat für Allgemeine Angelegenheiten – dessen amtierender Vorsitzender gerade den Saal betritt –, und dann wäre unser Verhandlungspartner Herr Premierminister Kenny. Sie sind darüber informiert, Herr Swoboda, ich habe das auch in der Konferenz der Präsidenten mehrfach gesagt. Ich habe übrigens auch bei den sogenannten Vierertreffen immer wieder darauf hingewiesen, dass der Ansprechpartner des Europäischen Rates eigentlich die irische Präsidentschaft ist. Die Verhandlungen mit den Regierungschefs

führt aber Herr Van Rompuy. Das ist sicher eine nicht geklärte vertragliche Situation, über die man reden muss.

## **2. Durchführungsmaßnahmen (Artikel 88 GO): siehe Protokoll**

## **3. Delegierte Rechtsakte (Artikel 87a GO): siehe Protokoll**

## **4. Vorbereitung auf die Tagung des Europäischen Rates (7.-8. Februar 2013) (Aussprache)**

3-012-000

**Der Präsident.** – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zur Vorbereitung auf die Tagung des Europäischen Rates am 7. und 8. Februar 2013 (2012/2801(RSP)).

3-013-000

**Lucinda Creighton, *President-in-Office of the Council*.** – Mr President, the European Council which begins tomorrow evening has a very heavy agenda. First and foremost it must reach agreement on the all-important multiannual financial framework or MFF. This is essential if the EU is to have the resources and to provide a solid basis on which to plan and deliver the Union's programmes. But there are other important issues on the agenda such as trade, the EU's relations with our Southern Mediterranean partners in the context of the Arab Spring and of course the situation in Mali.

Let me begin with a few words on the MFF. The European Council will pick up the discussions on the future multiannual financial framework where they left off last November. We made good progress then, but not enough to reach a deal. We must reach agreement this week, and that will mean everyone having to make compromises.

A failure would risk undermining the stability of the Union because it would introduce considerable and unnecessary uncertainty with regard to future planning. It would set us back in terms of our capacity to do business at a time when we welcome some return in confidence.

President Van Rompuy has been working since November to see where differences can be bridged and compromises made. He will present the adjustments which he considers necessary to reach a deal. He has the full support of the Irish Presidency in doing so.

This takes place of course against the background of unprecedented circumstances. Europe has been experiencing one of its severest ever crises. We cannot escape the fact that we are trying to reach agreement on a future budget when every line of expenditure, both at European and at national level, is the subject of intense scrutiny. That is the reality facing the European Council.

And it is, of course, not just the European Council which is concerned. The Presidency, as well as the President of the European Council, is fully aware of the critical importance of this Parliament in these negotiations. It is a view which – contrary to what is sometimes claimed – is fully understood by those sitting around the European Council table. This is not just a matter of good institutional cooperation. There are concerns here in this Parliament which will have to be reflected in any agreement, if there is to be an agreement at all.

We know the importance you attach to a number of areas, some of which are factored into the draft currently on the table. Our understanding of the importance of your views is because we have been listening to you. There were regular close contacts with Parliament representatives throughout the Cyprus Presidency, and the Irish Presidency has continued that practice only this week in the margins of the General Affairs Council when the Tánaiste Eamon Gilmore and I met with Parliament's MFF team on Monday, ahead of the meeting of the Council. In addition there were contacts on Monday at the highest level when President Schulz, Presidents Van Rompuy and Barroso, and the Taoiseach Enda Kenny also met on Monday morning. So no one can claim that we have not been listening.

Even if, as I think we should all want, the European Council reaches an agreement this week, our work of course does not stop there. As Presidency of the Council we will intensify our work with Parliament to try to ensure, in accordance with the Treaty, that the final legislation on the MFF is something to which Parliament is prepared to give its consent. Thereafter, we will be far from finished as we will need to continue our cooperation for the timely adoption of the relevant legislative instruments, in line with the procedures enshrined in the Treaty.

The MFF is probably the most important and urgent issue on this week's agenda, but the European Council will also be addressing several other key topics, which I would like to mention briefly.

Firstly: trade. If the MFF is ultimately about delivering jobs and competitiveness, so is trade. So we must promote free, fair and open trade whilst at the same time asserting our interests. We need to work with global partners so that in the Round we secure mutual advantage.

An ambitious trade agenda can open up the prospect of a 2 % increase in growth and potentially the creation of over two million jobs in the medium term. Therein lies the obligation to pursue these opportunities.

While we remain committed to the further development of the multilateral trading system, our immediate focus has to be on developing bilateral trade relations. These can – and must – make a positive contribution to the multilateral system. By building on WTO rules and by promoting openness, the EU's bilateral agreements will help pave the way for further progress at the multilateral level.

Given the need to prioritise those measures which have the potential to provide the most benefit in terms of jobs, the Union's trade relationship with the United States is towards the top of the Irish Presidency's agenda. We are eagerly awaiting the final completion of work by the EU-US High Level Group for Jobs and Growth, which is due to issue its recommendations shortly. There are strong expectations that we should aim high and that the level of ambition on both sides should be reflected in a recommendation for a comprehensive trade and investment agreement or FTA. It remains our firm intention to have a negotiating mandate approved by the Council, if possible during the period of our Presidency.

The European Council will also be assessing the momentous events which have taken place in our southern neighbourhood over the last two years. They will be looking at how to enhance EU support for the democratic and economic transition process in the region, and to explore further ways to strengthen the political dialogue with those countries in transition towards democracy. We share so much with our Southern Mediterranean partners. We must use the full range of tools at our disposal to ensure that we work together

to establish an area of shared prosperity, based on the adherence to universal values, such as democracy, respect for human rights, the rule of law and gender equality.

In order to sustain our commitment to our Mediterranean partners, it is important that the High Representative and the Commission keep relations with our Southern Neighbourhood under review. The Council is expected to be invited to assess the effectiveness of the EU's policies and instruments in assisting the political and economic transition of the region, and to report back by June 2013. During that time, we will, of course, continue to take account of the views in this House.

Finally, the European Council will take stock of developments in Mali, in particular the decisive action taken by Malian and African troops, supported by France, to restore the country's territorial integrity and the authority of the Malian state. With regard to the political process, which is vital to finding a long-term solution to the crisis, the adoption of a roadmap for the transition by the Malian National Assembly is a fundamental and a very encouraging step. It is essential that the roadmap be implemented as quickly as possible.

Any one of these issues would constitute a heavy agenda for the European Council. Together they mean that we begin this year with a meeting which is charged with particularly significant responsibilities, both for the EU internally, its prospects for economic growth and stability, as well as its relationship with the wider world.

3-014-000

**José Manuel Barroso**, *President of the Commission*. – Mr President, before it was decided to focus this European Council meeting on the multiannual financial framework (MFF), following the failure to reach agreement in November, it was originally intended to be devoted to two issues of strategic importance to the European Union – first, our external trade policy and second, our Southern Neighbourhood.

Trade is making a vital contribution to our economic recovery. In 2012, external demand was the main source of growth for the European economy. It contributed almost an extra 1% of EU GDP, with about 30 million jobs in Europe depending on our exports. We are by far the world's largest trading power and we use our weight to shape world trade so as to reap the maximum benefits from globalisation, but if we are to benefit as fully as possible we must pursue a strategic, forward-looking approach to our international trade relations. If we are to achieve this, we must be proactive and ambitious. We must preserve and reinforce the multilateral system that has served Europe and the world for 60 years but, as a complement to it, we must also look to deepen our bilateral trade and investment relations.

We have concluded many bilateral agreements and are working towards others. To mention a few: we have already implemented a landmark Free Trade Agreement with Korea; negotiations with Singapore have been completed; and we expect to complete negotiations with Canada in the near future, with, we hope, India to follow. We will shortly start negotiations on a free trade agreement with Japan and we are looking at the possibility of such an agreement with the United States. I have been exploring this directly with President Obama and the United States administration for some time and I am sure that a transatlantic free trade agreement will bring even greater benefits from our single most important economic relationship.

These strategic partnerships are vital to our economic future, but realising the opportunities will require a clear vision of our long-term interests, as well as the capacity to manage

complex negotiations, and the necessary trade-offs. All this can be done effectively, but it requires the ability to speak with one voice and to engage our partners constructively.

Of course, while the European Union as a whole is doing well in terms of global trade, some Member States and regions are doing better than others. We need to address these issues in our economic and structural policies, particularly in the framework of the ongoing reforms for competitiveness. We must also ensure that our commitment to open markets will continue to be underpinned by our capacity to act against anti-competitive trade practices via the appropriate trade instruments.

Yesterday we spoke with President Hollande about the situation in Mali. I will not go over that ground today, but I would like to say a few words about our Southern Neighbourhood because delivering on our commitments to our Mediterranean partners remains a top political priority. Let me be very clear: our external credibility will largely be judged by our capacity to act with our partners in the region to jointly shape the common neighbourhood.

The situation on the ground varies. Democracy will not come overnight and the path to achieving it will not be a straight one. The mass movements across the region were about desire for democracy and freedom. We will continue to support these ideals so as to prevent extremist forces hijacking the political transitions that are under way. We will be especially attentive to the observance of fundamental rights, notably the rights of women.

Directly after the outbreak of the uprisings, the European Union adopted a comprehensive and ambitious support package. In the past two years we have mobilised EUR 600 million of fresh funding for programmes in the region. We have enlarged the European Investment Bank mandate and modified that of the EBRD, opening up an additional EUR 2 billion in funding. We have proposed an ambitious trade and mobility agenda and concrete sectoral support.

However, the political uncertainty has limited our partners' capacity to benefit from the full potential of what we are offering. Tunisia has held elections and approved a new Constitution without major turmoil – the President of Tunisia will be with you in this House later today to discuss the progress his country has made – but in Egypt the process of transition continues to be polarised. In Libya there are still security concerns and, of course, we have the extremely dramatic situation in Syria. Syria remains a stain on the world's conscience. In response to the humanitarian crisis there, the Commission has increased its support by EUR 100 million, bringing the total to EUR 200 million, but humanitarian aid is not enough. As I have said before, the international community has a responsibility to stop the bloodshed.

In the months to come, the Commission will seek to deepen our economic relations by launching negotiations for a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt and Jordan, and by signing Mobility Partnerships with Morocco, Tunisia and Jordan. We will also draft a roadmap for the establishment of an EU-Southern Mediterranean Energy Community and we will develop projects with the region on transport, environment, water and rural development.

Nor will we neglect civil society. We will intensify our support and extend measures which directly touch people's lives, for example by doubling the Erasmus Mundus and Tempus scholarships for the countries in transition among our southern Mediterranean partners. This is a joint endeavour that can only be successful if the European institutions – this

Parliament and the Commission, together with its European External Action Service – work hand in hand with our Member States.

This is a historic opportunity for democracy and freedom. We can try and fail, but we should not fail to try.

The discussions in the European Council tomorrow and on Friday on the MFF mark an important moment for Europe, but so too does our debate here in Parliament today. The Lisbon Treaty changed the way the MFF is decided, requiring the consent of the European Parliament, given by a majority of its competent Members. This point – the role of the European Parliament – is one which I highlighted at the last European Council discussion on the MFF and also in my bilateral contacts in the run-up to this week's meeting. Just last Monday, at a meeting I organised in Brussels and to which I invited EP President Schulz, European Council President Van Rompuy and also Taoiseach Enda Kenny, as President-in-Office of the Council, I made this point in a very clear way.

The Commission hopes that the Heads of State and Government will be able to come to a political agreement that will form the basis from which the Council can obtain the consent of the European Parliament. So today, I appeal to all Heads of State and Government to bridge their differences and come to Brussels in a spirit of compromise and European responsibility, so that this political agreement can be found. Further delays will send out a very negative message at this time of fragile economic recovery. The risk is that positions will harden and that the differences will be even more difficult to overcome. That is why we are actively working for an agreement which addresses the needs and priorities of the European Union and ensures that the financial means are made available for it to fulfil its legal obligations.

We must not forget that the European Union budget – despite its relatively small size at around 1% of EU GDP – is the most important instrument at European level for investment, and investment is a vital and integral element of our agenda for growth and competitiveness, notably but not only in the most vulnerable countries and regions. Yes, we need stable public finances and, yes, we need deep structural reform for competitiveness, but European investment is also needed, especially in areas where a euro invested at European level adds more value than a euro invested nationally.

The crisis is far from over and our MFF is also an indispensable part of our response to both the economic and the social crisis. For many of our Member States the support they receive from the Union budget is essential if they are to have a chance of beating the crisis – in other words, it determines whether those countries will have a real opportunity to invest for growth and jobs.

The MFF is also an expression of solidarity. There are Member States that simply do not have the resources to support their local workers when a company decides to move its plant elsewhere. There are some Member States which do not even have the resources to take care of the most deprived. Do you want these people and these societies to turn their backs on Europe?

The same goes for the 25 million young unemployed people in the European Union. I want to make an appeal to the Heads of State and Government not to miss this opportunity of using the European budget to fight youth unemployment. We have a chance to take the right decisions, to offer our young men and women the prospect of a life in dignity. I want us to build on various Commission initiatives to fight youth unemployment: for instance,

the orientation and reprogramming of the structural funds in eight Member States most affected by youth unemployment, and also our proposal for a Youth Guarantee. We should use the MFF to support these and similar measures.

Last month, I mentioned this idea in the joint meeting with the European Parliament and national parliaments. I expressed the hope that Member States meeting this week in the European Council could support our ambition to identify tangible measures that can be rapidly implemented and will make a difference. A youth employment initiative would be a powerful signal of solidarity and of value added at European level. It is critically important that such an initiative enters into force as soon as possible.

The MFF is also of vital importance in enabling the European Union to remain one of the most competitive regions in the world by implementing Europe 2020 which – let us not forget – was agreed by all our Member States. For this, we need to provide financial resources for world-class research and innovation, and we need to have in place the most modern infrastructure so as to exploit to the full the potential of our single market.

Most Heads of State and Government will naturally be focusing on their national priorities and on what they see as their national envelopes, and I have to tell you that, in my experience, most of the governments have more to say about their national envelopes than about the European perspective. Since that is the case, I will fight hard to preserve the European dimension of our budget: for instance, Horizon 2020 for research, the Connecting Europe facility, the programme for the Competitiveness of enterprises and SMEs (COSME), and ERASMUS for All. Of course, I will also underline the need for the social dimension, with appropriate funding not only for the European Social Fund and the youth employment initiative but also for the Globalisation Adjustment Fund and the programme of aid for the most deprived.

For all these reasons we believe it is important to have an MFF, but not every agreement is a good agreement. We need a constructive agreement reflecting the commitments that Heads of State and Government have made in the past to growth and investment at European level, to competitiveness and to implementing our agreed Europe 2020 agenda.

At the same time, we need to respect the commitments we have made to strong support for cohesion – territorial, social and economic cohesion – and also to the common agricultural policy.

Last, but certainly not least, for thousands and thousands of people in the poorest parts of the world, the MFF, with its development and humanitarian aid funds, is the difference between life and death. Moreover, our external relations budget goes a long way to determining the leverage the European Union will have in many parts of the world. That is another reason for paying attention to the external relations part of our budget – at least for those who believe that the EU should be present and strong in the world of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Mr President, honourable Members, my position has always been to strike the right balance between ambition and realism: and that is what the original proposal by the Commission stands for. I will do all I can to retain a level of ambition in the final agreement. However, it is clear that any agreement between the Heads of State and Government will, unfortunately, be less than the Commission and this Parliament would hope for.



Under these circumstances it is even more vital that the quality of the budget is ensured. To achieve that, the agreement must address a number of concerns on issues such as flexibility, own resources and a robust review mechanism. I am sure these things are very important in view of the required consent of this Parliament.

Flexibility can apply in many different ways. Most importantly, we need to have the possibility of moving unspent amounts from one year to the next, and also to have flexibility between the various budget headings. Nobody can predict the kind of challenges the European Union will be facing in two, three or four years from now, and for which it might need to mobilise funding.

Moreover, it would be only logical, within a seven-year financial framework, to have a clause in the MFF allowing us to take stock at mid-term and to see whether adjustments are necessary. Finally, I hope – and I will make a strong case for this at the European Council – that the next MFF will pave the way for, and launch the process towards, reform of our own resources system.

Mr President, honourable Members, I have set out the very difficult and challenging environment in which we are discussing the next MFF. I continue to believe that an agreement is possible. I still hope that, with the spirit of European responsibility, it will be possible to have an MFF which responds to the challenges that the European Union faces. Let us work together for this to happen.

3-015-000

**Joseph Daul**, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, cher Martin, Madame la Présidente du Conseil, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, hier, lors du débat avec le président Hollande, nous avons dit très clairement ce que nous attendons du Conseil.

Ce que nous voulons, d'abord, c'est un budget réaliste, qui continue d'être un ressort d'investissement et de croissance qui maintienne nos politiques communes. Nous sommes dans une enceinte réaliste, constructive et responsable. Nous avons besoin de la flexibilité entre les années et entre les lignes budgétaires. C'est une approche de bon sens qui doit nous permettre d'utiliser nos ressources financières.

Nous tenons aussi à une clause de révision, qui doit nous permettre de revoir le cadre financier dans deux ou trois ans. Il est très clair que nous n'accepterons jamais un budget d'austérité pour sept ans. Le faire, ce serait baisser les bras et croire à une crise sans fin. Je n'ose croire que les États membres soient pessimistes à ce point.

C'est forts de ce même sens des responsabilités que nous appelons à doter le budget européen de ressources propres. Nous en avons longuement débattu hier. Nous ne pouvons pas continuer à passer d'une mauvaise négociation à une autre. En tant que responsables politiques, nous comprenons et nous vivons les réalités économiques. Mais notre responsabilité, elle est aussi surtout vis-à-vis de nos concitoyens et à l'endroit de nos traités.

Les États membres transfèrent toujours plus de compétences à l'Europe. Dans leurs déclarations, ils sont très ambitieux pour l'Europe et, dans le même débat, ces mêmes États gèlent et diminuent les moyens qui permettent à l'Union européenne d'exercer ses missions. C'est le meilleur moyen de détruire à petit feu l'Union européenne et ça, nos concitoyens ne nous le pardonneraient pas.

Ce Parlement est colégislateur et responsable. Nous n'avons pas uniquement le droit de dire "oui". Nous avons le droit de dire "oui" ou "non" à ce budget. Et si les propositions

chiffrées – et je l’ai expliqué dans le détail technique hier – dont nous disposons en ce moment sont celles qui sont adoptées par le Conseil cette semaine, je dirai ”non”. Non, parce qu’elles sont un mauvais choix pour les Européens. Certes, j’entends déjà ceux qui crieront à l’irresponsabilité. Je leur répondrai simplement que ce qui est irresponsable, justement, c’est de prévoir des crédits de paiement inférieurs aux crédits d’engagement.

Je pense que quand même, là, nous avons vraiment une bonne raison de dire non. Ce schéma nous conduirait à un déficit budgétaire. Nous n’allons tout de même pas demander à l’Union européenne de reproduire les erreurs qui ont plongé nos différents pays dans une crise économique. Ce n’est pas une question de plafonnement. Je crois vraiment que, sur ce sujet, nous avons, dans ce Parlement, le devoir de dire ”non”.

Mon groupe croit en la méthode communautaire. L’Europe, c’est un projet politique pour plusieurs générations qui, en plus des États, garantit la sécurité. Nous sommes responsables et je voudrais le rappeler. Je ne critique pas les chefs d’État et de gouvernement mais, autour d’eux, leurs services, qui nous traitent d’irresponsables. J’en ai encore eu les preuves hier. Nous sommes aussi responsables que les fonctionnaires qui sont dans les différents gouvernements.

Je voudrais vous dire aussi que le Conseil devra respecter le traité et l’article 310. Ces décisions prises derrière des portes closes, pardon de le dire, me donnent parfois l’impression qu’elles méprisent la valeur ajoutée européenne et le bien commun. Quand j’entends les négociations actuellement en cours, j’ai l’impression d’être au marché. Ma chère Lucinda, tu dois en souffrir fortement. Quand je regarde cela, ce n’est pas une politique ni une vision européenne, c’est un marché où chacun vient chercher sa carotte et son petit pois.

Nous sommes déterminés. Nous sommes des gens responsables et capables de discuter avec vous des enjeux de l’avenir. Nous sommes prêts à la négociation, mais à une véritable négociation. 890 milliards de paiements, ce sont 890 milliards qui sont réellement garantis par les chefs d’État et de gouvernement. Cela ne correspond pas à 960 milliards d’engagements. Avec les 16 milliards qui ne sont pas encore trouvés pour équilibrer 2012, cela fait 86 milliards de déficit sur les sept ans. On est où?

Si c’est la seule chose qui ressort du sommet, ce sont des rabais non négociables et cela non plus, nous ne l’accepterons pas. Ce sont des politiques communes, ce sont des investissements, c’est la sécurité. Là, je répondrai à M. Cameron: chiche! Gardons le budget annuel, mettons tout sur la table et discutons de quelle politique européenne nous voulons pour les cinquante prochaines années. Et pendant un an ou deux, nous allons rediscuter ensemble, entre le Parlement, le Conseil et les États-nations, des politiques et du financement dont nous avons besoin. Je fais ce pari et le Parlement participera.

Comme vous le savez, les États ne peuvent pas tout mais, il y a soixante ans – et c’est pour cela que je me bats –, les pères fondateurs se sont battus pour faire de l’Europe un projet de paix durable. Soyons aussi visionnaires qu’eux et n’hésitons pas, au niveau du Parlement, à relancer ce vrai débat. Nous en avons le pouvoir et nous devons l’exécuter, ce pouvoir, avec le Conseil. La négociation, nous la privilégions d’abord, mais pas en dessous de certaines conditions.

Je vous remercie de votre attention et je crois aussi que les citoyens sont beaucoup plus réalistes que nombre d’entre nous, politiques, et je crois profondément que les citoyens pensent que l’Europe les protège, à la suite de la crise que nous venons de subir.

3-016-000

**Hannes Swoboda**, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich kann dem, was Präsident Barroso gesagt hat, zustimmen und auch dem, was Kollege Daul heute und gestern gesagt hat, voll zustimmen. Aber leider, lieber Joseph, gibt es in deiner Fraktion Leute, die immer wieder das Klima vergiften. Wenn ich beispielsweise denke, was Frau Gräßle über die vielen überblähten Beamtenapparate in Brüssel sagt – das ist genau das, was Stimmung macht. Natürlich gefällt das Herrn Cameron und Herrn Callanan, und ich bin Vizepräsident Maroš Šefčovič sehr dankbar, dass er das korrigiert hat. Wir haben hier eine Berichterstatteerin. Man kann ja sagen, wir wollen noch mehr haben. Aber die Regierungen, die kritisieren, kommen ja nicht einmal an den Verhandlungstisch, weil sie nicht bereit sind, zu verhandeln. Das ist der Skandal, den man hier bekämpfen muss.

(Beifall)

Weil ich Cameron erwähnt habe:

I shall now switch to English to address perhaps some of the few friends of Mr Cameron who are present here today. Mr Cameron had a vision. The vision was not the same as when the Conservatives were pleading to join the European Union, because at that time it was not the vision merely of a big market. If you only have the vision of a big market you do not need a budget, or only a very small budget. You do not need investment, you do not need to fight unemployment – that is not for the internal market; but we have a vision of solidarity, of a Europe of solidarity, and not everybody in Britain shares Mr Cameron's vision.

I was in Nottingham where I met young people who have been unemployed. I met 17-year-old Leigh. He has already been in prison, he is from a broken family. How did he get a job? It was through European money, through European support, and he was not the only one, there were many others as well. The Mayor of Dover recently said that we can only get out of the crisis with European money. The British Academy is sending us letters saying, 'please fight for a budget for research and innovation because we need that also in Britain'.

I was recently in Italy visiting the people in the area of the earthquake. They said 'thank you' to Europe for helping them but they knew also about the shameful way in which many Finance Ministers wanted to block the money going to them. I was recently in Craiova in Romania and they told me there that Europe is the only way to get investment in their poor region. This is our Europe. This is another vision of Mr Cameron's, but this is a vision which is closer to the citizen.

Therefore, we need a budget. It is not a big budget – do not exaggerate, do not be so scandalised, it is a very small budget – but it must be an efficient budget.

I can therefore only agree with what Mr Barroso said. First of all we need adequate financing for the job we have to do, jobs for young people. Yesterday Mr Hollande was here and Mr Barroso made a reference to him. I fully agree that this is the future of our Europe and we are letting them down, we are not giving them the means for jobs, for education and for research. Therefore, we need an adequate budget.

But we need to close the gap between commitments and payments – it is like a game: big commitments and small payments afterwards. Every year, we have to fight for that. We need more flexibility because money which is not spent should not go back home as a surplus for the Finance Minister, but should be used for those important issues we have to

do. We want a strong Europe, strong internationally – globally – but we do not provide enough money for a global economy and a global foreign policy.

Finally, we also need own resources. We need some steps towards own resources because this shameful game – country against country, rebate against rebate – this should stop. Therefore I think we need, and this is in the interests of our governments and our citizens too, own resources.

Now how will Parliament react? I want to address the Council and the Minister. Tell your colleagues in the Council that we will react responsibly, but that does not mean we will accept anything that comes. The principle of ‘take it or leave it’? It may be that we will leave it. Therefore it is important to tell the Council that we take this seriously because we are responsible. We will act in a way which is responsible to our citizens. President Hollande and Mrs Merkel are meeting tonight in Paris; I think they will watch the football match. I do not know who will win or should win – Europe will win anyway; this is football, either Germany or France.

But as for the budget, I do not know who will win. For the budget to be agreed in this Parliament, Europe must win in the talks tonight and the talks at the weekend. A responsible Parliament will reject any agreement which does not respond to citizens’ demands and because we are responsible, we will say ‘No’. We can say no and we will say no if we do not get a budget which meets the demands of our citizens. Be sure of this: this is our answer today and will be the answer after the meeting this weekend.

*(Applause)*

3-018-000

**Guy Verhofstadt**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, Mr Barroso has said that an agreement is possible. Let us be honest, Mr Barroso. An agreement is possible, and I think there will be an agreement, but not on the terms you put in your introduction. You talked about a real mid-term review, flexibility between headings and between years, real own resources and no cuts in spending for the future, and you also agree not to create a big debt or deficit in Europe because of that difference between commitments and payments.

Let us be honest. There will be no real mid-term review in the proposal. There will not be any flexibility between headings. The Member States do not accept flexibility between headings because they say that this is impossible for them. I am afraid that even the Commission’s good proposal will fall on own resources, on the FTT. I hear rumours that Germany does not want it and that, in the final conclusion they do not want this FTT in this budget, as envisaged by the Commission. The same goes for the additional cuts. Where will we see additional cuts? In heading 1A again? The new 25? We have to ask the Irish Presidency about that. We need to know. What will the final proposal be in order to make a deal in the Council? More additional cuts in heading 1A so that in the end we can go back to the 2013 Budget? We would be better off continuing with the 2013 Budget than discussing what to do with this budget – this MFF – for the next year.

So I am afraid that, while we totally agree with the Commission on the next MFF, the reality is that there will be another deal, as there was seven years ago with 42 exceptions, rebates and derogations in the budget. What will happen is that this decision by the European Council will not be a formal decision. It will only be a political decision. A discussion will then start in the General Affairs Council and we will only be consulted here in this Parliament to say ‘yes’ or ‘no’, not next week but in three months time. And in three months

time the Presidency and the Member States will try to buy a number of delegations here in the Parliament in order to find a majority for that budget. Exactly the same thing happened seven years ago.

So we have to be very clear. If we say today that our conditions are a mid-term review, flexibility, real own resources, no cuts in spending for the future and no real deficit, as we are creating now with this MFF, we have to continue to stand by that in one month, in two months and in three months' time when we will have to give a formal 'yes' or 'no' on this MFF for the coming years. That is the political power play. For me it is not about figures; it is a power play between the Council and Parliament.

Who is in fact the budgetary authority in a democratic system? Is it the Heads of State or Government or is it the European Parliament? That is what it is about. In every democracy it is the parliament which is the budgetary authority and not the Council, not the Head of Government or the Head of State. It is about debts, so it is not only about figures. It is not just about what we will spend in the next seven years, but it is also about the balance of power inside a democratic European Union. Is it Parliament that has the last say, or is it the Council?

My proposal, Mr Barroso, is that in the discussion – and I am also saying this to the Irish Presidency – we talk not only about the mid-term review. My proposal is to have a sunset clause after two or three years. Why not? We are now talking about a budget for seven years. Anything could happen. We could have an enormous crisis in Europe so that this MFF might no longer be applicable, so why not have a sunset clause that, after three years – Mr Daul said after two years and I agree with that, but I think three years is more realistic – obliges us to give a new consent to go further with this budget for the next three or four years.

Finally I think that we need to return to annual budgets. What country sets a budget for seven years and sticks to that? That does not exist anywhere. In fact it lowers the power of Parliament. The only other example that I know of was the Soviet Union. There it was for five years. We do it for seven years. We think that we can we make a plan for longer than that. That is the reason why Mr Farage also agrees with me that we should go back to annual budgets. Thank you, Mr Farage. That is the first sensible and positive reaction that I have had from you in nearly three years. Things are getting better and better with you. You are becoming a normal Member of the European Parliament, which is a good development.

3-019-000

**Rebecca Harms**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Ratspräsidentin, meine Damen und Herren Präsidenten! Ich habe gestern in der Rede von François Hollande die Erinnerung an die Frage von Präsident Mitterand als sehr gut empfunden, nämlich die Frage beziehungsweise die Aufforderung: Was müssen wir und wie müssen wir es tun, damit die Bürgerinnen und Bürger Europas Europa wirklich lieben? In der Antwort unterscheide ich mich ein Stück weit von François Hollande. Ich bin nämlich nach meiner Erfahrung auf vielen Reisen durch Europa davon überzeugt: Die Europäerinnen und Europäer lieben Europa. Aber sie begegnen den europäischen Institutionen und ihren Auseinandersetzungen mit einem wachsenden Unverständnis, mit wachsendem Befremden, und ich finde, es ist wirklich nicht erstaunlich, was da passiert.

Ich glaube auch, dass die Auseinandersetzung um den Haushalt und um den MFR, diese mittelfristige Finanzplanung, schon zeigen kann, warum es schwer ist, in Europa und seine

Institutionen Vertrauen zu haben: *No deal, good deal, bad deal* – worauf sollen sich die Europäer da einlassen? Mit dieser Art der Auseinandersetzung glaube ich, dass wir es unseren Bürgern schwer machen, sich mit diesem großen Projekt der Europäischen Union zu identifizieren.

Der Haushalt, meine Damen und Herren, ist eigentlich der Ausdruck eines gemeinsamen Willens zu einem gemeinsamen politischen Projekt. Wenn ich die letzten Monate Revue passieren lasse, die letzten Gipfel, an denen ich für das Europäische Parlament, für meine Fraktion als Zuschauerin immer wieder einmal beteiligt war, dann kann ich mich an reihenweise Absichtserklärungen der Staats- und Regierungschefs erinnern, die immer wieder bekannt haben, wie wichtig das ist, den Zukunftsherausforderungen nicht nur wegen der Krise des Euros, sondern wegen der Krise des Klimas, wegen der wachsenden globalen Wirtschaftskrise gemeinsam besser zu begegnen. Aber wenn es dann zum Schwur kommt, wenn es ums Geld geht, dann haben wir es im Rat permanent mit Staats- und Regierungschefs zu tun, die dann zu Hause offensichtlich zeigen müssen, dass man an Europa besser spart und dass man außerdem zu Hause immer noch ein Projekt hat, das man selber wichtiger findet als das gemeinsame Fortschreiten, das gemeinsame Arbeiten an einer Zukunft, an einer besseren Zukunft für die Europäische Union.

Alle Kürzungen, über die geredet wird, werden zulasten von Zukunftsbereichen gehen. Alle Kürzungen werden diejenigen treffen, die Innovationen wollen, die nachhaltige Entwicklung wollen, die mehr Forschung, mehr Bildung, mehr Inklusion für arbeitslose Jugendliche wollen. Ist das wirklich zu verantworten? Ist das zu verantworten im Zusammenhang mit einer Agrarreform, der die Mehrheit dieses Hauses zumindest im Ausschuss schon zugestimmt hat? Wollen wir die Agroindustrie päppeln, oder wollen wir eine nachhaltige Entwicklung ländlicher Räume?

Ist es wirklich richtig, solche Prestigeprojekte wie den milliardenschweren ITER, den Fusionsreaktor in Südfrankreich, in einem Erdbebengebiet zu fördern, statt jetzt endlich mal zu sagen, welche Energieforschung und Entwicklung wir brauchen, damit wir zukunftsfähig werden in unserem Energiesektor? Ich könnte diese Liste fortsetzen. Ich glaube, dass in unserem Haus zum Teil dieses Selbstbezogene der Nationalstaaten aufgegriffen wird und nicht genügend kritisiert wird.

Meine Fraktion ist bereit, den harten Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Rat auch beizutreten. Wir haben von Anfang an klar gemacht, dass wir für eine zuverlässige mittelfristige Finanzplanung eintreten. Wir wollen, dass die Mittel, die da verankert werden, unseren Aufgaben und Zielen entsprechen. Wir wollen, dass wir durch eigene Einnahmen aus dieser unwürdigen Auseinandersetzung darüber, wie viel Geld Europa den Staats- und Regierungschefs denn nun wirklich wert ist, herauskommen.

Wir wollen durch diese eigenen Einnahmen tatsächlich auch ein stabiles Europa untermauern. Wir sind für Flexibilität, das haben wir oft deutlich gemacht. Aber tatsächlich: Mir geht es darum, deutlich zu machen, dass diese Europäische Union gegenüber ihren Bürgerinnen und Bürgern nur bestehen kann, wenn die Sonntagsreden, die mit großem Tremolo von Staats- und Regierungschefs aller Orten zu Europa gehalten werden, auch in ein Bekenntnis zu einem guten Haushalt münden.

*(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 149 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)*

3-020-000

**Godfrey Bloom (EFD)**, *blue-card question* . – Thank you for taking the question. I just thought that as we are talking about waking up and we are talking about climate change, I would draw it to your attention – you keep missing the point I think – that there is no scientific institution now in the world which does not accept that there has been no significance statistical climate change since 1995. I am just wondering when you are going actually to wake up to that fact?

3-021-000

**Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE)**, *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte* . – Ich weiß nicht, was in Großbritannien als Fakt anerkannt wird. Ich kenne die wissenschaftlichen Veröffentlichungen des IPCC seit vielen Jahren. Da sind Globalwissenschaftler für die UNO organisiert und beobachten aus unterschiedlichen Perspektiven die negativen Entwicklungen des Klimawandels. Ich empfehle den Briten, die ja gerne sparen wollen, die Auseinandersetzung mit Sir Nicholas Stern, der vor Jahren als Ökonom sehr gut vorgerechnet hat, was Nichthandeln gegen den Klimawandel uns alle kosten wird. Ich glaube, Sie sollten wirklich Herrn Stern konsultieren.

3-022-000

**Martin Callanan**, *on behalf of the ECR Group* . – Mr President, this debate has a weary familiarity about it. I think we have been here before. I thank Ms Creighton for coming here, and it is good to hear her contributions, but of course the key player is our old friend Herman who has not bothered to turn up himself and actually inform us what is actually really going on, so I cannot help thinking that this debate is essentially fairly pointless today.

Nevertheless I hope that a deal can be reached on the MFF this week. It seems that one thing is now clear – and to this extent I agree with many of the other speakers – once again the EU is going to miss the opportunity to fundamentally reform its spending. It looks like any agreement, if we get one, will be a fudge, a muddle, a botch as usual: a continuation of funding schemes that belong in another century. The continuation of the principle that first we set the budget and then we find ever more imaginative ways to spend taxpayers' money and to spend that budget.

Our leaders should, of course, have seized the opportunity to sit down, have a serious discussion about where the EU delivers value, where it spends money badly and where money we all know is being blatantly wasted. The reality is that today's budget would be remarkably familiar to people like Roy Jenkins, Gaston Thorn and Commissions of the past. If we had asked those presidents where they thought the EU budget would be spent by 2020, would they honestly say that we would still be spending 40% of it on agriculture? I doubt it. The debate around the EU budget is symptomatic of all the things that need to change in the EU, and we need to stop thinking that only a bigger budget will solve the many problems of Europe. Instead we need a better budget, which prioritises our challenges at the expense of the enormous amount of fat that can be very easily trimmed from the budget.

Now many people in this debate this morning have said that this is a growth budget and I suppose it is, provided you are a French cow. That will grow enormously with the European budget and we cannot in all seriousness stand here in Strasbourg – this icon of EU profligacy – and say that there is no money that can be saved in the EU budget. Yet the issue of

Strasbourg does not even get raised in the European Council! Yet again I call on our President to raise it in his speech to EU leaders this Thursday, and perhaps with his new best friend, President Hollande.

Of course I know that the costs of coming here and maintaining this building are a drop in the ocean in the context of the total EU budget, but it would do us an enormous amount of credit if we can show that we can really shake off this expensive relic of the past. And that is the crux of the EU's budget. We are continuing to fund policies that may have made sense in the 20th century, as well as trying to spend money on the problems of the 21st century. If we focus on the problems of today and tomorrow instead, we could freeze the budget and still see significantly better results for our taxpayers.

What could be worse than just maintaining the status quo in spending? It would be to leave the EU spending unreformed and then give ourselves new tax-raising powers and own resources. Thankfully it looks as though that is not going to happen, and we have seen in France – the country we are in now – what happens when politicians think that the best answer to their problems is more state intervention, more government-funded programmes and more government and state administration.

But I fear that whatever is agreed will fail to achieve any kind of meaningful reform. Instead we will probably come away with the result that most of Heads of Government feel that they can sell: most likely with a freeze on payment. That would not be the best outcome, but it would be far better than allowing the kinds of increases that this Parliament wants to see without any reform to our spending priorities.

Now we have heard as usual a lot of vitriol thrown at the Council today, not least by Joseph Daul, who I think, as President Hollande reminded us yesterday, seems to forget that it is many of his own Prime Ministers from the EPP Group that are pushing for reductions in the EU budget. The matriarch of his own political family, Chancellor Merkel, is asking for budgetary restraint. I know it is popular in this place and it gets a cheap laugh to have a go at David Cameron constantly, but he is not the only head of government who is calling for reductions in the EU budget. This kind of war rhetoric really needs to stop, particularly in a time of crisis when we should be working together with our national governments and not throwing bricks at them.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-023-000

**Joseph Daul (PPE)**, *Question "carton bleu"*. – Monsieur Callanan, je ne suis pas là pour défendre le gouvernement français, vous le savez bien. J'ai simplement une question. Si mes souvenirs sont exacts – je regarde la Commission –, jamais dans cette discussion et négociation, le Royaume-Uni n'a demandé une baisse de son enveloppe dans le cadre de la politique agricole. Jamais!

Alors, ne reprochez pas aux autres de ne pas demander ce que vous ne demandez pas vous-même! Je prends à témoin les personnes présentes à cette table car je suis ces négociations de très près. Pourquoi ne demandez-vous pas une diminution de votre enveloppe? Parce que vous ne le voulez pas! Vous voulez que le budget baisse, que la PAC reste et que le chèque reste! Vous êtes très bons au niveau financier, et je vous félicite, mais jamais, vous n'avez demandé une baisse du budget de la PAC!

*(Applaudissements)*



3-024-000

**Martin Callanan (ECR),** *blue-card answer* . – Mr President, I think the UK has a long and proud tradition of standing behind those many Member States which believe that we need fundamental reform of the common agricultural policy. That was the reason for the British rebate being established in the first place, and I think everybody accepts that if there is fundamental reform in the system then of course all Member States could do with a reduction. We need to move farming over to a more market-orientated system. That is also the best thing we could do for the Third World. Beyond giving them aid, giving them more subsidies, the best thing we could do would be to reform or scrap the common agricultural policy and allow them to sell their food products in the European market. Do not try and defend the indefensible, Mr Daul.

3-025-000

**Nigel Farage,** *on behalf of the EFD Group* . – Mr President, the highlight today of this debate was the Liberal leader, Mr Verhofstadt, comparing the seven-year EU economic plan with the Soviet Union's five-year economic plan – and it was said without any sense of irony at all, which I thought was delicious.

Well, as the leaders meet tomorrow to discuss this budget, what a curious position David Cameron finds himself in. He made the big speech; he talked about a referendum in the future, and yet he has been criticised at home for making us wait for perhaps up to five years before we can have our say. Most people doubt his Eurosceptic sincerity, indeed he emphasised in that speech how pro-European Union he is, and yet here today he is met with a sort of venomous attack as if he is some terrible wrecker. I would have thought his chances of renegotiating very much look pretty limited, so I feel a bit sorry for him. He is like piggy in the middle, and you all remember from childhood what a frustrating and difficult place that is to be.

But he has made the speech, and we are going to have a proper debate in Britain about EU membership; but it is a debate that is changing. You see, the budget is not our top line issue. We pay in GBP 53 million a day. Whether that goes up to GBP 60 million or not, many of us are saying: why pay in a penny piece? Mr Barroso's idea that a pound or a euro spent at European level is worth more than a pound or euro spent at national level – well, perhaps he has invented nuclear money, I have no idea. What perhaps we should recognise is that unemployment is actually being caused by Europe's policies, in particular the mistaken euro project.

The debate in Britain has changed and now it is about immigration. People in Britain are shocked at the change in every single city and market town since we opened the doors to eastern Europe in 2004. I have nothing against Bulgarians or Romanians, but it is unacceptable that we should open our doors to them unconditionally from 1 January next year. If Mr Cameron does not get a substantial renegotiation on the free movement of peoples then Britain will leave this Union.

3-026-000

**Gabriele Zimmer,** *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion* . – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Wir wissen alle, dass die EU zur Sicherung ihrer Handlungsfähigkeit, also insbesondere mit Blick auf die Erweiterung, die Kohäsionspolitik, den Kampf gegen Armut, soziale Ausgrenzung, aber auch die Frage der internationalen Kooperation und auch mit Blick auf den Kampf gegen den Klimawandel, das sage ich auch noch mal ausdrücklich,

und zur Nachhaltigkeitsstrategie, auf der einen Seite ein größeres Budget braucht, aber eben auch eine Reform innerhalb der Struktur des Budgets, sowohl hinsichtlich der Einnahmen als auch der Ausgaben.

Aber schon der Vorschlag, den die Kommission unterbreitet hat, sich darauf zu beziehen, nur 1,05 % des EU-27-BNE als Ausgangspunkt zu nehmen, ist für diese Aufgabenstellung ja schon viel zu gering. Damit hat die Kommission ja von vorneherein schon eingestanden, dass die Eigeninteressen der Mitgliedstaaten inzwischen größer sind als das gemeinsame Interesse an der Entwicklung der Europäischen Union. Und hier liegt die Crux. Das wird sich auch nicht verändern lassen, indem über neue Kompromisse nachgedacht wird und indem nachgedacht wird, wie die unterschiedlichen Gruppierungen bei den Eigeninteressen der Mitgliedstaaten zusammengefasst werden, ausgeglichen werden können und dem einen das gegeben wird und dem anderen jenes.

Um einmal ganz ehrlich zu sein: Mein Eindruck ist, dass genau jene Staaten, die am meisten von Rabatten profitieren und das in ihren eigenen Mitgliedsländern überhaupt nicht erklären, also gar nicht mitteilen, dass zum Beispiel auch Länder wie Deutschland vom Rabattsystem profitieren, dass diese am meisten die öffentliche Auseinandersetzung führen, um den Haushalt der Europäischen Union zu senken. Das halte ich für scheinheilig, das halte ich für falsch, das halte ich für sehr national geprägt, und das ist kontraproduktiv für die Entwicklung der Europäischen Union.

Meine Erwartungshaltung an den bevorstehenden Gipfel, auch an Sie, Herr Präsident Schulz, ist, dass noch einmal klar gesagt wird: Wir bestehen auf der Einhaltung der Verpflichtung, die hier abgegeben worden ist, die Defizite für das laufende Jahr 2013 aus frischen Mitteln zu sichern und diese Defizite zu schließen. Und zweitens, klar und deutlich zu machen, dass es nicht geht, dass wir als Europäische Union für die Ebene der Europäischen Union von vorneherein Defizite einplanen für jedes der kommenden Haushaltsjahre. Das ist ein Bankrott der Europäischen Union, wenn wir das zulassen, auf der einen Seite Druck auf Mitgliedsländer machen, die in Schwierigkeiten geraten, und auf der anderen Seite für die Europäische Union etwas in Anspruch nehmen, was nicht funktionieren kann, was rechtswidrig ist, was Vertragsbruch ist und was letztendlich dazu führt, dass die Menschen nicht mehr verstehen werden, worum es hier überhaupt geht. Das kann nicht funktionieren. Das lehnen wir ab!

Mein Eindruck ist: Die Mitgliedstaaten sind zuerst an den Rückflüssen interessiert, ohne zu erklären, dass sie diese Rückflüsse auch bekommen. Und zweitens, dass Scheinheiligkeit vorherrscht, das sage ich noch einmal, auch mit Blick auf die Diskussion, die vorhin ja auch schon von meinem Kollegen Swoboda angesprochen worden ist, über das, was Die Welt veröffentlicht hat. Ich halte das für problematisch. Ich fordere auch die Journalisten auf, sich künftig nicht nur auf die Abgeordneten hier im Europäischen Parlament zu beziehen, die offensichtlich ihre eigene Strategie für ihre Wiederwahl populistisch formulieren, sondern auch zu bedenken, dass es innerhalb des Europäischen Parlaments eine Bandbreite von Positionen gibt, und diese eben auch einmal widerzuspiegeln.

*(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 149 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)*

3-027-000

**Charles Tannock (ECR),** *blue-card question* . – The British Prime Minister has put on record that he would like to see cuts, particularly in the 6%, or EUR 6 billion, spent annually

on administrative costs paying for extremely large salaries: 2 000 members of the Commission apparently earn larger salaries than the British Prime Minister. I would be interested to know how the GUE/NGL Group can describe cuts as nationalist and wrong, when surely there is room for cuts in the salaries of some of our fat-cat bureaucrats who are earning huge amounts of money. I would like to know why such cuts would be wrong. Why is David Cameron wrong in demanding some cuts in the administrative budgets of the European Union? The 6% that is spent at the moment is far too much. It should come down to 5%.

3-028-000

**Gabriele Zimmer (GUE/NGL),** *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte*  
 . – Es wäre vielleicht gut, wenn Sie sich eben nicht nur auf die Aussagen von einzelnen Abgeordneten, die dann wieder von den Medien aufgegriffen werden, reduzieren würden, sondern wenn Sie sich tatsächlich die Gehalts- und Entlohnungssysteme genauer anschauen würden. Wenn Dinge miteinander verglichen werden, sowohl beispielsweise für die Entlohnung von hohen Beamten in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland als auch in der Europäischen Union, werden Sie feststellen, dass hier unfairerweise wichtige Punkte aus diesen Vergleichen herausgelassen worden sind, und zwar immer zugunsten des besseren Dastehens der Beamten in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland oder im Vereinigten Königreich. Ich finde, wenn verglichen wird, dann sollte es sehr konkret und sehr genau sein. Dann sollten alle Leistungen auf den Tisch, auch das, was beispielsweise an Abschlägen, an Beiträgen zu zahlen ist, damit wir hier eine faire Diskussion bekommen.

Im Übrigen bin ich immer dafür, dass – auch was EU-Beamte betrifft – vor allem die Sozialpartner miteinander verhandeln. Ich habe etwas dagegen, wenn per Medien in solche Bereiche eingegriffen wird und einseitig Schuldzuweisungen gegeben werden. Also wenn, dann bitteschön Sachlichkeit, Klarheit, Transparenz! Das ist das, was beispielsweise – auch seitens der EU – nachgeliefert werden könnte. Die Transparenz ist dringend notwendig!

3-029-000

**Der Präsident.** – Frau Zimmer, ganz kurz zu Ihrer Bitte. Was mich im Europäischen Rat angeht, will ich – weil ich auch in den letzten Stunden hier hinsichtlich meiner Haltung im Europäischen Rat angesprochen worden bin – hier noch einmal wiederholen: Ich werde keinen Haushalt unterschreiben, der nicht ausgeglichen ist, und auch keinen Nachtragshaushalt, der das 16-Milliarden-Defizit, das wir haben, nicht abdeckt. Ich sage Ihnen, dass ich das selbst dann nicht tun würde, wenn das Parlament es beschließen würde, weil es ein rechtswidriger Beschluss wäre. Die Artikel 310 und 323 des EU-Vertrags verpflichten uns zum Ausgleich des Haushalts. Ich kann keine Defizithaushalte akzeptieren.

Ich möchte Ihnen zu der Frage der Besetzung hoher Positionen nur eins sagen, auch als Vorsitzender dieser Abgeordnetenversammlung: Wann immer es um die Besetzung dieser Positionen geht, wird auf mich oder Herrn Barroso von exakt den Regierungen, die die Besetzung dieser Posten kritisieren, ein enormer Druck ausgeübt, dass diese Positionen möglichst mit Beamten aus diesen Ländern besetzt werden. Das will ich hier einmal zu Protokoll geben!

3-030-000

**Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI).** - Vanaf morgen gaan de onderhandelingen verder over de meerjarenbegroting van de Europese Unie, of beter gezegd, over het verdelen van de

belastingcenten van de Europese burger. U roept hier in koor: er moet geld bij! Maar de burger vraagt zich af: welk geld eigenlijk? Er is namelijk helemaal geen geld. Waarom denkt u anders dat alle landen zo hard moeten bezuinigen? Door de crisis zijn wij blut!

Wat de Europese Unie wil, is geld afpakken van de hardwerkende burger en van toekomstige generaties, die met enorme schuldenbergen worden opgezaald. U noemt dat solidariteit. Ik noem dat immoreel. Deze hele begroting van de Europese Unie is een gedrocht, waarvan het gros wordt verspild aan het achterhaalde cohesiebeleid en het verschrikkelijke landbouwbeleid. En wat te denken van het Europese ambtenarenapparaat? Er lopen liefst 5000 ambtenaren rond die meer verdienen dan onze Nederlandse minister-president. Het is een schandaal! Er moet helemaal geen cent bij, er moet zoveel mogelijk van het budget af. Hoe minder geld er naar de Europese Unie gaat, des te beter het is voor de burgers in de lidstaten.

3-031-000

### **PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. GIANNI PITTELLA**

*Vicepresidente*

3-032-000

**Gay Mitchell (PPE).** - Mr President, I would like to say a few words in relation to the word 'solidarity', which has been used a lot here during the debate this morning. I feel an obligation, as coordinator for the European People's Party on the Committee on Development, to speak about solidarity with citizens in the developing world.

Mr Cameron's name has been mentioned here several times this morning. Can I say that I am a great admirer of Mr Cameron and his government for their actions in committing to meeting their 0.7% contribution to the developing world. Indeed the rest of us could learn, in terms of solidarity with the developing world, from the actions of the British Government. That is said by somebody who does not share a lot of Mr Cameron's views.

The reality of the matter is this: while we are talking about our own constituents – and they do face difficulties and we do need to have solidarity with them – that solidarity should not end within the European Union. By 2050 the population of the world will have increased by two billion people, 90% of whom will be born into what is now the developing world, where 23 000 children die each day. That is 23 000 children today and 23 000 children again tomorrow and 23 000 children every single day while the budget negotiations are going on.

Mr Barroso had to propose an emergency food regulation about two years ago. I was the rapporteur dealing with it and we had to get it through Parliament. Our humanitarian budget makes up something like 0.62% of the budget, yet we are proposing to cut that money. It is petty cash as far as we are concerned. It is life-giving as far as these children I am speaking of are concerned. In heaven's name, do we have to cut our development budget further? When our GNI goes down, fine, our contributions go down, but we should not bring down the payments even further than that.

I make a special plea, not for me, not for my constituents, not for votes, but for the people who are dying each day. Please fight for this budget for the developing world.

3-033-000

**Göran Färm (S&D).** - Mr President, Mr Van Rompuy said yesterday 'we will this week, for the first time ever, decide on a real-terms cut compared to the current budget'. I welcome the fact that he admits to a real-terms cut, not a freeze, which some leaders and Mr Callanan still try to make us believe.

We hear rumours of an extra EUR 15 billion cut on top of what was announced in November. In that case, ceilings will be cut down to 2005 levels. This also means that Mr Van Rompuy's justification for the cuts is, I quote: 'the budget must be a budget of moderation, reflecting the savings efforts in our Member States'.

But that is false! No Member State calling for these cuts has reduced its own budget down to 2005 levels, and has certainly not taken any decision to maintain that level up to 2020.

Some blame us for an extreme spending policy. It is not true! We could live with a real-terms freeze. Still, my Group has five modest claims. Firstly, an overall level that corresponds to our responsibilities, decided by the Council itself, the Lisbon Treaty, the EU 2020 strategy, the Millennium Development Goals and the jobs and growth pact.

Secondly, a solution to the mountain of unpaid bills we have before us. We cannot turn the EU budget into a deficit budget. Thirdly, a modernisation programme able to address our priorities like research, youth unemployment, infrastructure and climate policies. Fourthly, a more flexible budget; a binding mid-term revision is a minimum requirement. Fifthly, progress on the financing of the budget, a move towards creating more own resources.

Without progress on these points I do not think our Parliament can accept the Council's proposals. But we are not unreasonable. If we do not accept, let us see it as an invitation to serious negotiations. In this tough situation, let us find a common way to strengthen the Union, not weaken it.

3-034-000

**Anne E. Jensen (ALDE).** - Tak, hr. formand! Hvis rygterne taler sandt, vil EU-landenes statsledere i de kommende dage blive enige om at beskære de foreslåede investeringer i forskning, transport og energi uden på nogen måde at tage stilling til, hvilke projekter, der så ikke skal gennemføres. De vil krampagtigt holde fast i et uigennemskueligt, uforståeligt og uretfærdigt system for egne indtægter med rabatter og rabat på rabatterne. Derfor siger jeg: ingen aftale er bedre end en dårlig aftale om den flerårige budgetramme. Vi kan sagtens arbejde videre med årlige budgetter under loftet for 2013, sådan som traktaten foreskriver det, hvis der ikke er en aftale. Det forudsætter, at både Parlamentet og Rådet arbejder sammen om at levere et lovgrundlag for budgettet. Det vil vi gerne arbejde positivt for her i Parlamentet, og jeg håber også, at Rådet vil gøre det, uanset om der foreligger en aftale om den flerårige budgetramme eller ej. Tak.

3-035-000

**Helga Trüpel (Verts/ALE).** - Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! An die irische Ratsvertreterin: Sie haben verlangt, wenn die Nationalstaaten sparen müssen, dass dann auch die europäische Ebene sparen müsste. Erstens möchte ich noch einmal deutlich machen, was Kollege Färm eben schon sagte: Der Vorschlag, der jetzt auf dem Tisch liegt, bedeutet einen Haushalt wie im Jahre 2005. Kein Mitgliedstaat macht eine solche vehemente Sparpolitik.

Zweitens: Die Kommission hat mit ihrem Haushaltsvorschlag de facto ja schon einen Sparvorschlag gemacht, hat sich also ausgesprochen verantwortlich gezeigt in den schwierigen Zeiten, aber gleichzeitig deutlich gemacht, dass wir ein gemeinsames europäisches Interesse haben, nachhaltig zu investieren, mehr für Bildung zu tun, für soziale Inklusion und für Forschung, denn das sind die wirklich nachhaltigen Wachstumsfelder der Europäischen Union.

Also ich begrüße ausdrücklich, was Präsident Schulz angekündigt hat, dass er für das Haushaltsjahr 2013 keinen Defizithaushalt unterschreiben wird. Denn der Rat – und daran kann man schon die Schizophrenie im Rat sehen – verlangt von uns einen Haushalt, den er selber anmeldet, und ist dann nicht bereit, die entsprechenden Mittel zur Verfügung zu stellen.

3-036-000

**Peter van Dalen (ECR).** - Morgen begint de top over de Europese meerjarenbegroting en ik roep de staats- en regeringsleiders op te bouwen aan vertrouwen. Dit is dé kans om de geloofwaardigheid van de Europese Unie te herstellen. Een geloofwaardige Europese Unie is een toekomstbestendige Europese Unie. Een Unie die innovatie en versterking van de concurrentiekracht voorop stelt. Dat zijn immers dé voorwaarden om de werkgelegenheid weer te bevorderen.

Ik noem twee concrete toekomstbestendige en toekomstgerichte voorbeelden:

1. De Europese Unie gaat investeren in een nieuwe zeesluis bij Terneuzen. Prima!
2. De Europese Unie gaat miljarden investeren in een nieuw programma voor de ontwikkeling van grafeen. Zo hoort het, dat is toekomstgericht denken, dat is een geloofwaardige Europese Unie met een toegevoegde waarde.

De vraag is alleen of dat bij alle staats- en regeringsleiders zo zal doordringen. Want sommigen zien de Europese Unie toch als een soort reservepot naast hun eigen nationale begroting. Landbouw- en structuurfondsen worden vaak gebruikt om eigen wensen aan te vullen en dat helpt de Europese Unie niet vooruit.

Te vaak wordt op die manier met de budgetten omgegaan. Dat versterkt het vertrouwen van de burgers in Europa niet. Dat het Parlement daar bovenop dan ook nog overweegt om 2 miljoen euro communicatiebudget te gebruiken om twitterdiscussies over de Europese Unie positief te beïnvloeden, werkt in dit verband contraproductief. Kritiek op de Europese Unie en het Europees Parlement moet niet worden weerlegd door een bombardement van positieve propaganda, maar door lessen te trekken en gemaakte fouten te erkennen en te verbeteren. Dat is bouwen aan vertrouwen. Dat is nodig!

3-037-000

**Matteo Salvini (EFD).** - Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, perché i cittadini non hanno più fiducia in quest'Europa? Gli italiani sono quelli che pagano più di tutti in Europa. Gli agricoltori italiani rischiano di perdere 4 miliardi di euro nei prossimi anni, i lavoratori del tessile e del calzaturiero in Italia ringraziano per aver tolto tutti i dazi che ci fanno invadere di merce da ogni parte del mondo, prodotta anche da bambini, i lavoratori dell'agricoltura ringraziano per gli accordi col Marocco e con tutti gli altri paesi del mondo che ci fanno mangiare qualcosa che arriva da migliaia di chilometri di distanza e chiudono tutta quella che è la nostra produzione. Si parla di risparmio e siamo l'unico Parlamento

che ha due sedi, perché questa sede dove veniamo una volta al mese ci costa 400 milioni di euro. Pretendete che i comuni paghino a trenta giorni e col Patto di stabilità lasciate miliardi di euro nelle casse dei comuni del nord che non possono pagare per coprire i debiti di qualcun altro. Non vi serviranno 2 milioni di euro per convincere tramite Twitter e Facebook che è questa l'Europa che fa bene ai nostri cittadini.

3-038-000

**Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL).** - Senhor Presidente, nos próximos dias 7 e 8 vai decidir-se o nosso destino para os próximos 7 anos. Vai-se decidir se os nossos jovens terão ou não um futuro, se terão ou não acesso a uma universidade ou a um emprego, se os nossos netos terão ou não escolas, se os nossos velhos terão ou não acesso a cuidados de saúde e a medicamentos. Nos próximos dias vai-se decidir se teremos ou não um futuro juntos, um futuro com futuro para todos ou se, pelo contrário, só haverá futuro para alguns porque outros ficarão na berma da estrada.

Há países nesta Europa, como já foi aqui dito pelo Presidente da Comissão, que hoje não têm meios para cuidar dos mais vulneráveis e carenciados e para integrar os seus jovens. O Presidente da Comissão já não está, mas eu gostaria de perguntar ao representante da Comissão o que é que acha que a Troica tem feito por essas pessoas mais vulneráveis?

Senhor Presidente, o Presidente da Comissão referia que o orçamento da União Europeia tem de ter ambição e realismo, mas parece que o que iremos ser chamados a votar vai ser a ladainha que o Sr. Van Rompuy nos anda a cantar que é pretender combinar austeridade e investimento. Ora, as duas coisas não rimam uma com a outra. A Sra. Creighton dizia no início da manhã que a proposta do Sr. Van Rompuy tem o apoio da Presidência irlandesa. Gostaria de lhe perguntar se se evita a incerteza, se se traz esperança com a imposição de um quadro financeiro plurianual que, se até aqui só nos dava uma Europa mínima, com esta proposta vai-nos passar a dar uma Europa de refugio. Sejam responsáveis! É nossa responsabilidade trabalhar para o futuro da Europa. A crise está longe do seu fim e só teremos futuro se houver a coragem e a ambição de implementar decididamente uma taxa sobre as transações financeiras.

(O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta "cartão azul" (n.º 8 do artigo 149.º)).

3-039-000

**Peter van Dalen (ECR),** "blauwe kaart"-vraag . – Onze tolken leveren altijd uitstekend werk en ik neem aan dat ik het dus goed gehoord heb in de vertolking, nl. dat mevrouw Sousa hier bepleit dat in de begroting moet worden geregeld dat bejaarden toegang moeten krijgen tot de gezondheidszorg. Dat heb ik gehoord als stuk van uw tekst.

Europa moet zich niet overal mee bemoeien, laten wij ons richten op de dingen die Europa moet doen. De toegang regelen van bejaarden tot gezondheidszorg lijkt mij geen taak voor Europa, hoe moeilijk bejaarden het ook kunnen hebben, dat erken ik meteen. Maar dat moeten wij niet hier met elkaar regelen.

3-040-000

**Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL),** Resposta segundo o procedimento "cartão azul". – Senhor Deputado, gostava de lhe responder que é verdade que as questões da saúde são, em geral, questões que são decididas, que estão na competência dos Estados-Membros, mas o problema é que a Europa não tem uma dimensão social e cada vez lhe falta mais essa dimensão social.

3-041-000

**Bruno Gollnisch (NI).** - Monsieur le Président, deux observations seulement avant ce Conseil européen qui est destiné à fixer les finances de l'Union pour les sept prochaines années.

J'ai entendu avec beaucoup d'intérêt M. Swoboda, pour les socialistes, M. Daul, pour le groupe démocrate-chrétien, M. Verhofstadt, pour le groupe libéral, demander à cor et à cri des ressources propres pour l'Union, c'est-à-dire – car il faut appeler les choses par leur nom – un nouvel impôt européen.

J'allais dire un de plus car, mes chers collègues, vous avez déjà des ressources propres et, notamment, les droits de douane sur les produits qui sont importés de pays extra-européens. Mais vous n'avez cessé d'approuver les politiques qui ont constamment abaissé ces droits de douane, provoquant ainsi un libre-échange au niveau mondial, qui n'a rien à voir avec le libre-échange qui était prévu initialement, entre pays européens seulement, à l'intérieur d'un marché protégé.

Enfin, une dernière chose. On veut financer la démocratie et la liberté dans les États du sud de la Méditerranée. C'est très louable mais ne faudrait-il pas commencer par ce Parlement et par ne pas vouloir priver les groupes de la minorité des droits que se reconnaissent les groupes de la majorité, ainsi que le font M. Verhofstadt et M. Swoboda?

3-042-000

**Herbert Reul (PPE).** - Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Kein Politiker wird in diesen Zeiten mehr Geld verlangen, sondern jeder weiß, dass man sparsam und vernünftig mit dem Geld umgehen muss. Wenn Mitgliedstaaten das tun, dann müssen wir als Europäische Union das auch tun. Aber es macht keinen Sinn, wie der Rat ständig neue Aufgaben hierhin zu übertragen und gleichzeitig Sparen zu organisieren. Das geht nicht. Wenn man sparsam mit dem Geld umgehen will, dann muss man auch die Frage beantworten: Welche Aufgaben stellt man dann in Frage? Wo ist man bereit, dann auch Aufgaben zurückzudrängen? Ansonsten kommt man nämlich genau zu dem Punkt, der nicht akzeptabel ist, nämlich dass man immer mehr Aufgaben platziert, gleichzeitig weniger Geld gibt und damit die Europäische Union in eine Verschuldungspolitik treibt. Das kann nicht sein. Ich finde, darauf hat der Präsident eben zu Recht hingewiesen: Es kann nicht sein, dass wir dieselben Fehler machen, die Mitgliedstaaten gemacht haben, systematisch uns in die Verschuldung hineinzutreiben, weil wir nicht das nötige Geld haben und gleichzeitig mehr Aufgaben haben.

Wer diese Frage entscheiden will, der muss bereit sein, sowohl zu sparen als auch gleichzeitig Aufgabenkritik in Gang zu setzen. Aber nur einfach zu sagen, wir reduzieren die Mittel, ist eine relativ einfallslose und intellektuell nicht besonders kluge Antwort.

Drittens: Wir brauchen dann auch hier eine Debatte – und die hat ja auch begonnen – über Schwerpunkte. Kollegin Harms hat es gesagt: Da wird es Streit geben zwischen dem, was einem wichtig ist, und dem, was einem weniger wichtig ist, dem, was notwendig ist, und dem, was weniger notwendig ist. Dem können wir uns mit ziemlicher Sicherheit nicht entziehen. Aber das heißt nicht einfach nur weniger Geld. Das ist zu simpel.

*(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 149 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)*



3-043-000

**Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE)**, *Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte*. – Herr Kollege Reul, damit ich Sie richtig verstehe: Sind Sie einverstanden mit dem, was Herr Kollege Färm vorhin vorgetragen hat, dass es völlig unakzeptabel ist, wenn vonseiten des Rates jetzt versucht wird, das Niveau des europäischen Haushaltes so weit zurückzuschrauben, dass es dem Niveau des Jahres 2005 entspricht?

Zweitens: Sind Sie einverstanden mit dem, was der Präsident angekündigt hat, dass er, wenn der Rat sich nicht bereit erklärt, die aufgelaufenen Schulden zu bezahlen, diese Unterschrift verweigert?

3-044-000

**Herbert Reul (PPE)**, *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte*. – Erstens: Es kann keinen Haushalt geben, der über die Verschuldung hinausgeht. Da bin ich hundertprozentig bei Ihnen und bei dem, was eben vorgetragen wurde.

Zweitens: Ich bin hundertprozentig der Meinung: Aufgaben, die da sind, müssen erfüllt werden. Und das notwendige Geld muss zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Wenn man weniger Geld zur Verfügung stellt, muss man auch entsprechende Aufgaben zusammenstreichen. Beides geht nur zusammen.

3-045-000

**Ivailo Kalfin (S&D)**. - Mr President, I would very much expect the European Council to take a decision this week on the MFF because any further delay will jeopardise all the programmes that are supposed to start next year. Any delay would mean that the European budget could not be disbursed from the beginning of next year and that the European regions would not receive funding for whatever programmes they are working on.

Parliament is ready to accept the European Council position only as an opening negotiating position, because all the signals that we are hearing are negative. The November European Council give us a very negative picture of the agreement which is about to be reached in the Council. Nevertheless there should be an agreement and there should be further negotiations with the European Parliament. We are very clear, as we have been over the last year, about what Parliament's requirements are. They have been set out many times by the colleagues here.

The European budget does what national budgets cannot do. This is very important to understand. Public investments create jobs for young people and help the Member States and their economies to exit from the crisis. The Member States' and the Union's international duties and competitiveness are areas of spending that national budgets in many countries are not covering at all. We really want to close the gap between payments and commitments. We are accumulating a huge amount of unpaid invoices. You cannot blame the Member States for having extensive deficits if the European Commission is not paying the bills for them.

So it is not acceptable for us. We want proper own resources, not in order to make a bigger European budget, but to make it more independent and to alleviate the burden on the national budgets.

We want a unified budget because we do not want to be ambiguous with the citizens and ask them to contribute to two or three budgets, depending on whether their country is in

the eurozone or not. So we will accept only a negotiating position and are ready to start immediate negotiations on it.

3-046-000

**Jan Mulder (ALDE).** - Het is al door een aantal mensen gezegd, niet alleen de hoogte van de begroting is belangrijk. Ik ben wel van mening dat wij niet voor de eeuwigheid een begroting mogen hebben die elk jaar een tekort vertoont. Dan doen wij precies wat de lidstaten niet doen, of op het ogenblik bezig zijn te repareren in hun eigen lidstaat op aandringen van de Europese Commissie.

Daarnaast zijn een aantal punten belangrijk die geen geld kosten. Ook ik ben van mening dat er een nieuw systeem van eigen middelen moet komen. Het huidige systeem, dat wij verplichtingen aangaan en dat vervolgens de lidstaten weigeren om het geld beschikbaar te stellen om die rekeningen te betalen, is niet acceptabel.

Ieder jaar geeft de Europese Rekenkamer een negatieve verklaring af over de betrouwbaarheid van de rekeningen. Dat moet veranderen. Dat kan alleen als er meer politieke verantwoordelijkheid wordt genomen in de lidstaten en dat betekent dat er een lidstaatverklaring moet komen opdat het geld beter besteed wordt.

3-047-000

**Isabelle Durant (Verts/ALE).** - Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, nous vivons une session un peu particulière. Hier, nous avons applaudi M. Hollande, qui nous proposait d'investir dans un développement plus durable et dans la jeunesse. Or, le budget, dernière version, de M. Van Rompuy nous propose 15 % de coupes dans les domaines de la recherche et de la jeunesse.

Tout à l'heure, nous allons écouter le président tunisien, M. Marzouki, qui va nous parler de ce qui se passe en Tunisie et nous allons lui apporter tout notre soutien pour la transition démocratique. Or, on propose dans ce budget une réduction de 13 % pour la politique extérieure et de 11 % pour le Fonds de développement.

Nous avons discuté, hier, du semestre européen et de l'importance d'avoir un volet social et emploi, en particulier dans nos régions. Or, on nous propose ici une réduction de 20 % pour les régions en transition.

Alors, je vous demande ou, en tout cas, je demande aux plus sceptiques parmi nous de réfléchir à la question de savoir s'il est possible, oui ou non, à ce Parlement de s'inscrire dans une stratégie budgétaire plus porteuse et une stratégie qui permette au Conseil d'honorer ces engagements.

Ces engagements doivent être payés, nous ne pouvons pas nous permettre le retard actuel et nous ne pouvons pas nous permettre, comme cela a été très bien dit hier, le déficit annoncé.

Par conséquent, franchement, les plus sceptiques n'ont plus qu'à rejoindre ceux qui, aujourd'hui, veulent un vrai budget.

3-048-000

**Morten Messerschmidt (EFD).** - Tak, hr. formand! Forud for dette topmøde har vi hørt to centrale taler. I går hørte vi præsident Hollande stå her i parlamentssalen og tale for mere landbrugsstøtte, mere strukturstøtte, mere EU, herunder EU-skatter og generelt flere penge

– altså sammen initiativer der peger bagud i retning af protektionisme, planøkonomi og recession. For 14 dage siden holdt den britiske statsminister, David Cameron, en helt anden tale – en tale, der betonede demokrati, mindre EU, troen på markeds kræfterne og generelt tanken om, at et EU, der i 18 år i træk har fået underkendt sine egne budgetter af sine egne revisorer, selvfølgelig ikke skal have flere midler. En tale, der pegede ind i fremtiden. Jeg håber, at det topmøde, der skal afholdes her i de kommende dage, vil fokusere på Camerons tale og på fremtiden og ikke rette blikket bagud mod fortiden.

3-049-000

**Nicole Sinclair (NI).** - Mr President, I really do have to admit I would love to be a fly on the wall in this Friday's EU Budget talks in Brussels. I would like to see the discomfort of Mr Cameron as he walks into the room, the tension in his neck at the thought that he has to confront Mr Hollande and his colleagues throughout Europe. He has put referenda back on the agenda and he is going to have to sit down and fight for the British interest. He says he wants a renegotiation, but President Schulz has already told this Parliament that renegotiation is not possible. Mr Verhofstadt told the BBC renegotiation is not possible, so who is going to give? Are they going to be shown to be fools, or is Mr Cameron going to be shown to be a fool? I think Mr Cameron is trying to pull a Houdini act here. He is trying to appease the Eurosceptic majority in the UK, while trying to appease the European Union. This Houdini act is bound to fail and he will be shown to be more like Tommy Cooper.

My constituents tell me they do not want GBP 53 million spent in the EU. That money is better spent at home.

3-050-000

**Giuseppe Gargani (PPE).** - Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, noi questi dibattiti che facciamo alla vigilia del Consiglio li sottolineiamo e li enfatizziamo. Io credo che il Consiglio che si tiene domani e dopodomani abbia davvero un'importanza particolare perché è a una svolta: o continuiamo in quella che chiamiamo la politica del rigore, oppure facciamo un passo in avanti e diamo inizio ad una strategia, una strategia politica e una strategia di sviluppo economico.

Jean Paul Fitoussi, che è un notista acuto e intelligente, ha detto ieri che una politica di rigore per il rigore è insopportabile. Io credo che l'Europa finora abbia sostanzialmente fatto così. La Cancelliera tedesca quando venne e parlò ai deputati europei disse che la strategia politica non era più possibile e che tutto dipendeva dal pareggio dei bilanci.

Io ritengo che, a parte le cifre, che non possono essere naturalmente discusse da me in un minuto e mezzo, e a parte le diminuzioni o i risparmi nel bilancio, noi abbiamo bisogno di una strategia che porti allo sviluppo, quindi di un bilancio che abbia questa significazione. Per questo io approfitto per chiedere una cosa formale alla signora Presidente del Consiglio, che interessa tutta l'Europa e interessa anche gli italiani. Noi italiani siamo contributori netti, ma quando parliamo di risorse proprie – una cosa che sento dire spesso – a che cosa alludiamo? Quali sono le risorse proprie? Quelle che derivano dalle tasse, oppure attraverso i *bond* che possono avere una dinamica europea diversa? Questo credo che sia fondamentale per poter capire anche se il bilancio potrà avere certamente un'ipotesi di sviluppo.

3-051-000

**Véronique De Keyser (S&D).** - Monsieur le Président, je voudrais revenir sur les aspects de politique commerciale.

Nous avons parlé d'ouverture, de mondialisation, de croissance, etc. D'accord, mais faisons tout de même attention. Le cas tragique de Mittal, dont les travailleurs sont d'ailleurs tout près aujourd'hui, en train de défiler près du Parlement, appelle au moins trois réflexions.

Premièrement, l'Europe, si craintive quand il s'agit de défendre ses frontières contre l'immigration, n'est-elle pas trop naïve quand il s'agit, par exemple, d'investisseurs, de prédateurs, qui n'obéissent qu'à une logique financière? Nous sommes totalement impuissants, aujourd'hui, devant ces agissements.

Deuxièmement, dans nos politiques commerciales, ne devrions-nous pas scruter plus attentivement les agissements de nos partenaires sur le plan, par exemple, des aides d'État et d'autres avantages? Nous préparons un accord avec les États-Unis et nous abandonnons la surveillance rapprochée de ces accords, de ces possibilités de distorsions de la concurrence. Il en est de même pour la Russie et la Chine. Cela nous rend particulièrement vulnérables.

Troisièmement, il n'est pas normal que nos accords commerciaux ne tiennent pas davantage compte des contraintes sociales et environnementales. Cette brèche permet à des prédateurs de vider l'Europe de ses productions industrielles et, puis, de venir réimporter des produits réalisés dans des conditions plus dérégulées, parfois par leurs propres filiales. C'est ce que fait Mittal, qui ferme les sites en Europe puis se sert de ses filiales étrangères pour venir réapprovisionner ceux-ci.

"Il y a quelque chose de pourri au royaume du Danemark", comme aurait dit Shakespeare mais, sans tomber dans le protectionnisme, il faut insister sur la juste réciprocité des accords commerciaux en y incluant des critères sociaux et environnementaux. Sans cela, il n'y aura pas de politique industrielle en Europe.

3-052-000

**George Lyon (ALDE).** - Mr President, this debate feels a little like Groundhog Day. We have heard it discussed so many times. However, I welcome Minister Creighton's reassurance in her contribution. The Council understands the priorities of the European Parliament. I speak for my colleagues when I say that we realise the European budget must reflect the real financial pain that all our citizens are suffering today as a result of the financial crisis across Europe.

We are prepared to accept a smaller budget, but the *quid pro quo* must be, firstly, greater flexibility to switch money between headings and roll over underspends at the end of the year. That will allow us to spend a smaller budget more effectively and more efficiently.

Secondly, a proper mid-term review of the budget in 2017, when hopefully economic times will be improving. There is no national government around Europe or around the world that sets a budget, an austerity budget, for seven years. We must have the opportunity to look at it again. Therefore, that is our main requirement, along with the prioritisation of spending on jobs and growth. I hope that the Council will reflect on that before they come back to negotiate with us.

3-053-000

**François Alfonsi (Verts/ALE).** - Monsieur le Président, à la veille du prochain sommet européen, le débat sur les perspectives financières 2014-2020 entre dans sa phase décisive.

Dans 48 heures, nous serons fixés sur les intentions des chefs d'État. Il faudra que le Parlement décide ou non d'approuver le cadre financier pluriannuel qui lui sera proposé. Cette décision, il faudra la peser sur la balance de l'Europe. Ce budget sera-t-il encore un budget européen, c'est-à-dire un budget qui permette, malgré la crise économique, de poursuivre les politiques de développement de l'Union européenne? Ou bien sera-t-il un budget anti-européen, c'est-à-dire une perspective sur sept ans qui programme la régression des politiques européennes les plus emblématiques? Il faudrait alors le rejeter.

Notre groupe espère que ce Parlement sera à la hauteur des responsabilités qui sont les siennes depuis que le traité de Lisbonne lui a conféré le pouvoir de codécision en matière budgétaire.

L'absence de cadre financier pluriannuel sera, à tout prendre, moins grave que l'adoption d'un cadre financier anti-européen.

3-054-000

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD).** - Pirmoji šiais metais Vadovų Taryba galėtų būti ta pavasario kregždė, kuri išpranašautų ne tik svarbiais sprendimais turtingą politikos vasarą, bet ir gerą derlių subrandinsiantį rudenį. Tikiu, kad tas pavasaris prasidės atsigręžimu į Europos žmones, įtvirtinant jų lygiateisiškumą bei vadovaujantis išmintimi vienodai teisingai paskirstant 2014–2020 metų daugiametės finansinės paramos lėšas.

Taip kalbėdamas, aš turiu omenyje du klausimus. Pirma, trijų Baltijos valstybių pastangas įtikinti Europos institucijas iki 2015 metų suvienodinti išmokas žemės ūkiui. Manau, kad toks susitarimas valstybių vadovų lygmeniu turi būti pasiektas dar šiemet. Ir antra, manau, jog būtina pasiekti, kad artimiausiu laikotarpiu valstybės narės susitartų dėl konkretaus veiksmų plano, siekdamos įgyvendinti bendrą tikslą – investicijoms į mokslinius tyrimus skirti ne mažiau kaip 3 proc. BVP.

3-055-000

**Andrew Henry William Brons (NI).** - Mr President, so Mali is going to be on the agenda. All actions have consequences, some of them unintended as well as those that are planned.

Those who are disposed to learn from past mistakes will recall that Britain's war against the appalling regime in Afghanistan, and our ill-founded war against Iraq, resulted in the London bombings by third-generation Islamists from a large fifth column in Britain.

The political leaders of France, Britain and the rest will not be thanked by the families of service personnel killed in this conflict or by the families of victims of retaliatory atrocities in Europe, which will be the direct result of this perceived incursion into Muslim territory.

Of course the atrocities in Europe are facilitated by a large Muslim and significant Islamist population in the cities of Western Europe. Even those like the opportunists from whom we heard yesterday, who find it expedient to oppose this latest adventure, refuse to see the presence of fifth columns in Europe as the threat they undoubtedly are.

3-056-000

**Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE).** - Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Minister! Panie Komisarzu! Debatę o zaczynających się jutro negocjacjach, kolejnej odsłonie negocjacji na temat wieloletniego budżetu unijnego zaczęliśmy *de facto* wczoraj, wraz z wystąpieniem prezydenta Republiki Francuskiej. I muszę się Państwu przyznać, że szczególnie jeden wątek z wczorajszej dyskusji bardzo mnie zaniepokoił. Taki swoisty ping-pong pojawił się i wczoraj, i dzisiaj, z oskarżeniami, kto bardziej w Radzie, które rządy – prawicowe, lewicowe czy liberalne – forsują dalsze cięcia unijnego budżetu. Otóż niepokoi mnie – na jeden dzień przed rozpoczęciem kolejnej rundy negocjacji – właśnie to, że w takich sporach ambicjonalnych, sporach o wizerunek – kto wyszedł zwycięsko, a kto pokonany z tych negocjacji – albo co gorsza w sporach, w kłótniach o drobne szczegóły zagubi się szerszy obraz i prawdziwa stawka, o którą gramy w tych negocjacjach. Bo to, co liczy się najbardziej w idei wspólnej Europy dla wielu zwykłych Europejczyków, to świadomość solidarności między narodami i ich przywódcami i wola niwelowania wciąż ogromnych różnic w poziomie życia między biednymi i bogatymi regionami Unii Europejskiej. A jej gwarancją jest szczodry budżet, zwłaszcza na politykę spójności.

Te środki to także gwarancja inwestycji, których tak bardzo w czasach kryzysu potrzebujemy. W wielu państwach członkowskich udział środków unijnych w inwestycjach publicznych przekracza 50%, a często sięga blisko 70%. Wieloletnie planowanie jest podstawą tych inwestycji, które ratują te regiony przed jeszcze większym kryzysem. Dlatego apeluję do przywódców unijnych o rozwagę, odpowiedzialność i mądre decyzje, które będą akceptowalne również dla tej izby, a nie przez nią odrzucane.

*(Mówca zgodził się odpowiedzieć na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki (art. 149 ust. 8 Regulaminu).)*

3-057-000

**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD),** *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki* . – Panie Przewodniczący! Pan, panie pośle, mówił o zasadzie solidarności, która powinna kierować państwami Unii Europejskiej i całą Unią w podejmowaniu decyzji związanych z finansowaniem i wszystkimi ważnymi politykami, w tym, jak rozumiem, polityką rolną. Jak Pan w takim razie wyjaśni sytuację, w której Polska na przestrzeni lat 2014-2020 wpłaci do kasy unijnej 40 miliardów euro, a w tym czasie polscy rolnicy dopiero w 2020 r. będą uzyskiwać zaledwie 90% średniej dopłat unijnych? W sytuacji, kiedy rynek jest jeden, otwarty, polscy producenci rolni muszą konkurować z tymi, którzy mają znacznie wyższe dopłaty. Jak mają to robić, panie pośle?

3-058-000

**Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE),** *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki* . – Panie Pośle Ziobro! Jesteśmy mieszkańcami tego samego kraju i widzimy, jak wiele polskie rolnictwo i polska wieś zyskały na członkostwie w Unii Europejskiej. Otwarcie rynków, dofinansowanie w postaci dopłat bezpośrednich (przy różnych kosztach wytwarzania produktów rolnych) są już – po już ośmiu latach obecności w Unii Europejskiej – oczywistym i niepodważalnym atutem i korzyścią dla polskiej wsi i polskich rolników i proces ten będzie postępował, ponieważ poziom dopłat bezpośrednich będzie się systematycznie wyrównywał.

3-059-000

**Patrizia Toia (S&D).** - Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sulle spalle dell'Unione europea grava un compito gigantesco per il rilancio del sistema produttivo. È un compito gigantesco per il futuro dei giovani, una metà dei quali – la cosiddetta generazione Europa – viaggia, lavora, è inclusa, mentre l'altra metà rischia di essere la generazione perduta dell'Europa o almeno la generazione precaria.

Di fronte a questo noi ci presentiamo con un bilancio che è assolutamente inadeguato, che toglie ogni credibilità a tutti i nostri programmi: Europa 2020, COSME e via dicendo. Se la Commissione europea, che non è fatta di sognatori utopistici, propone 80 miliardi per Orizzonte, significa che ci vuole un'iniezione di innovazione e io mi chiedo con quale incoscienza noi spuntiamo quest'arma. Abbiamo bisogno di più, perché tagliare il bilancio significa lavorare contro la crescita e contro l'occupazione.

Lo dica, signora Ministro, ai suoi colleghi, e dica anche che la storia non finisce qui, non finisce a Bruxelles il 7 e l'8 febbraio. La storia passa poi da questo Parlamento. Lo dicono i trattati, ma lo dice la politica perché noi siamo la legittimazione democratica più alta dell'Europa e non rinunceremo a fare la nostra parte.

3-060-000

**Lívía Járóka (PPE).** - Mr President, the potential of social inclusion policies to support or even drive competitiveness and innovation and growth has largely been unfortunately neglected when tracing possible routes to economic recovery. But a monetary pillar without a social and economic pillar is doomed to fail.

Therefore this neglect is harmful, not only because it leaves people in the most fragile socio-economic situation unprotected, but also because it underestimates the crucial importance of social inclusion, and labour market integration in particular, to retaining and developing the economy. For that reason Members should reflect their respective strategies to improve the socio-economic situation of marginalised communities in their national budgetary policies and consider social inclusion as a very essential part of the strategy for smart and inclusive growth and fiscal consolidation.

We are now at a historic moment in which societies in all regions of the EU are demanding changes to certain models and structures which have failed and are clearly not working. In this sense, countries cannot afford to waste the potential of any part of their population. Investing in social inclusion is more than a matter of human rights; it stands for good economic sense and means progress for all of us and our future generations. Giving priority to social inclusion is not optional now, it is obligatory.

3-061-000

**Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D).** - Señor Presidente, suscribo lo que tantos diputados han dicho a lo largo de este debate.

Estas son las prioridades y, por tanto, las condiciones para que el Parlamento Europeo apruebe el presupuesto: un nivel más alto de los recursos de este presupuesto, unas prioridades orientadas hacia el crecimiento, el empleo y la innovación, unos recursos propios, por lo menos, como primer paso, y una mayor flexibilidad.

Pero quiero subrayar que una parte del presupuesto ha de mostrar otra cara de Europa a la Europa del futuro, que son sus jóvenes, unos jóvenes que en gran parte de la Unión no

encuentran empleo, no encuentran oportunidades, y que no quieren ver la cara de los éxitos del pasado, sino las respuestas del presente.

En ese sentido apoyo la garantía juvenil y el programa o dispositivo especial, con dos condiciones: que tengan unos recursos adicionales que no consistan solamente en una reorientación de recursos ya disponibles, y que no exijan sacrificios adicionales a los países más necesitados.

3-062-000

**Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE).** - Este evident că statele membre au dreptul de a stabili contribuția la bugetul Uniunii, dar este tot atât de evident că aceleași state membre au obligația să respecte prevederile Tratatului de la Lisabona, cât și angajamentele stabilite tot de ei privind politicile europene. Statele membre care consideră că vor câștiga prin reducerea contribuției naționale se înșală. Bugetul european este, în proporție de 95%, buget de investiții. Diminuarea lui va reduce investițiile și, implicit, locurile de muncă peste tot în Europa, iar efectele se vor vedea în toate statele membre. Consecințele negative vor fi mai mari decât cele relativ pozitive ale diminuării contribuției naționale. Un buget mai mic decât cel actual ar constitui un pas înapoi, un eșec al Uniunii. Vor fi și alte efecte decât cele directe, financiare; va fi un câștig pentru eurosceptici, pentru populiști, va constitui un semnal negativ pentru piețele financiare și va determina incertitudini în cancelariile țărilor terțe.

Parlamentul trebuie să voteze un aviz privind CFM-ul. Rezultatul acestui vot nu este cert în acest moment. Pe de altă parte, peste 60 de propuneri legislative se află în lucru, în procedură de codecizie, unde Parlamentul are puteri egale cu Consiliul. Este nevoie de un acord în aceste negocieri, altfel vom fi în situația aplicării, în 2014, a unor politici stabilite în 2006. Consiliul European trebuie să se gândească înainte de a lua decizia, deoarece un dezacord pe buget ne duce la aplicarea, în 2014 și în următorii ani, a plafonului bugetar din 2013, care este mult mai bun.

Domnule președinte, domnul Farage s-a referit la circulația forței de muncă, la români și la bulgari. Aș vrea să-l rog să înceteze cu astfel de aprecieri populiste și să se aplece mai mult asupra situației interne a Marii Britanii. Nu libera circulație a forței de muncă și apartenența la Uniune a creat situația din Marea Britanie acum.

*(Vorbitorul a acceptat să răspundă unei întrebări adresate în urma ridicării cartonașului albastru, în conformitate cu articolul 149 alineatul (8) din Regulament).*

3-063-000

**Lena Kolarska-Bobińska (PPE),** *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki . –* Chciałam zapytać o Pana zdanie w następującej sprawie. Pojawiła się tutaj myśl, która coraz częściej jest powtarzana. Wczoraj mówił o tym poseł Cohn-Bendit, dzisiaj poseł Verhofstadt i koledzy z ALDE że może wieloletnie ramy finansowe nie są tak ważne – odłożymy tę kwestię, zastanówmy się, nie musimy co do tego osiągnąć porozumienia. Natomiast kluczowe są roczne budżety. Zaczniemy pracować na tej podstawie. Kolega Verhofstadt posunął się nawet do tego, że mówił, że wieloletnie planowanie to jak wieloletnie plany w dawnym Związku Radzieckim. Chcę powiedzieć, że roczne budżety stwarzają ogromną niepewność, o jakiej Pan mówił, i nie dają tej pewności środkiem spójności, dużym projektem europejskim. Jakie jest Pana zdanie na ten temat?



3-064-000

**Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), Răspuns „cartonașului albastru”.** – Este evident că un buget multianual este mult mai bun decât un buget anual, dar depinde care este valoarea bugetului, pentru că, dacă avem un buget multianual mai mic decât actualul cadru financiar, nu cred că este în avantajul Uniunii. Regula din tratatul de bază spune că, în cazul în care nu există un acord privind bugetul, se va aplica, în 2014 și în următorii ani, plafonul bugetului din 2013, care este mai mare decât cel care în acest moment este propus de Consiliu. Deci s-ar putea să fie un avantaj pentru Uniune, dacă, în același timp, se aprobă și politicile orizontale.

3-065-000

**Jutta Haug (S&D).** - Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Unser Tagesordnungspunkt, unter dem wir seit mehr als zwei Stunden diskutieren, heißt „Vorbereitung des Europäischen Rates“. Das zeigt ja wieder einmal mehr, dass das Europäische Parlament den Europäischen Rat ernst nimmt. Zu ernst? Auch gehen wir davon aus, dass der Rat durchaus weiß, welche Dinge bei einem mehrjährigen Finanzrahmen für das Parlament wichtig sind, und das bei seinen Gesprächen und der Erarbeitung der Verhandlungsbasis auch berücksichtigt.

Wir haben unsere Position vor mehr als anderthalb Jahren erarbeitet und formuliert und in regelmäßigen Abständen wiederholt. Mittlerweile kennt die jeder. Die Höhe und die Struktur des Budgets mitsamt dem Verhältnis von Verpflichtungen und Zahlungen müssen stimmen. Die Flexibilität über die sieben Jahre und die unterschiedlichen Kategorien muss es geben. Wir wollen die Modernisierung des Haushalts und den Einstieg in die Eigenmittelreform. Da bleibt uns jetzt nur noch die Aufforderung an den Rat: Lassen Sie Ihre kleinlichen nationalen Egoismen hinter sich! Werden Sie wirklich eine europäische Institution! Lassen Sie sich von der Frage leiten: Was wollen wir mit dem europäischen Haushalt für Europa und seine Bürger erreichen?

3-066-000

**Paulo Rangel (PPE).** - Em primeiro lugar, aquilo que queria frisar é que é evidente que o Parlamento Europeu e, em particular, o grupo do PPE não estarão disponíveis para aceitar um orçamento da parte do Conselho que seja um orçamento que signifique um retrocesso da União Europeia. E isto tem de ficar muito claro, é apoiado pelos países da coesão e é apoiado pelos contribuintes líquidos no Parlamento Europeu. Todos os deputados dos vários países querem uma Europa mais forte com um orçamento maior.

Deixado este primeiro ponto, há um segundo que é fundamental para os países da coesão que é justamente a capacidade de aumentarmos os fundos estruturais para os países em necessidade e, em particular, para aqueles que estão em dolorosos processos de ajustamento. Se não houver fundos estruturais para esses países não haverá nenhum investimento porque o investimento privado está em retração e o investimento público está condicionado pela situação financeira dos países. O apoio e a solidariedade da União Europeia são decisivos para que, com o ajustamento necessário das contas públicas, se crie algum crescimento e se torne sustentável a recuperação destes países.

Finalmente, queria deixar uma palavra porque estamos também a favor de um reforço do investimento na investigação e desenvolvimento e, nomeadamente, nos programas para os jovens e que não pode o Conselho deixar cair, nestes dois dias, programas tão estruturantes para o futuro da União Europeia como é o caso do Programa Erasmus e de outros programas para a juventude.

3-067-000

**Edit Herczog (S&D).** - A KGST utolsó időszakában láttam egy karikatúrát, 17 sovány tehén fejte egymást. A mostani kormányfői tanácskozás egyre inkább arra hasonlít, hogy 27 sovány tehén feji egymást. Ez nem jó irány. Nagyon sok politikát az elmúlt időszakban európai szintre emeltünk, az innovációt vagy a kisvállalkozás-politikát. Ezért tagállami szinten jelentősen csökkentették a hozzárendelt forrásokat. El tudják Önök képzelni, hogy most európai szinten is megkurtítsuk ezeket a pénzeszközöket? Nemet mond erre az Európai Parlament.

Hölgyeim és Uraim! A legnagyobb tartalék az iskolából friss, korszerű tudással kikerült fiatalok munkába állításában és a tudományos-technológiai fejlődésen alapuló gazdaságfejlesztésen múlik. Ezt kell megtennünk. Ez az a vízió, amit kérünk Önöktől. Végül engedjék meg, hogy egy olyan ügyet is említsek, amiben Magyarországon egyetértünk, noha mi nagyon kevés ügyben értünk egyet. Abban, hogy a mali nemzetközi csapatot támogassuk, Magyarország minden pártja egyetért. Ehhez kívánunk nagyon sok sikert az elnökségben.

3-068-000

**Андрей Ковачев (PPE).** - Г-н Председател, първо, не мога да оставя без коментар изказването на г-н Farage, който каза, че при отпадането на ограниченията за българи и румънци от 1-ви януари 2014 година, както е записано в предприсъединителните договори и ратифицирано от Обединеното кралство, Лондон ще напусне Европейския съюз.

Сеенето на страх от източноевропейци може би носи политически дивиденди на г-н Farage и е добра политическа калкулация в неговата игра на „извиване на ръце“ с г-н Камерън, но е неморално и отвратително политическо поведение. Г-н Farage и другите представители от Обединеното кралство, дали консултирахте Вашата позиция за излизане на Вашата страна от Европейския съюз с Лондонското сити и с бизнеса на Обединеното кралство?

Но сега относно многогодишната финансова рамка. За да имат европейските региони шанс за развитие, размерът на средствата за еврофондовете трябва да бъде запазен поне на равнището от сегашния програмен период, както настоява Парламентът. За последните няколко години България усвоява ускорено и ефективно еврофондовете и българските фирми и граждани усещат ползите от членството в Европейския съюз.

Призовавам бизнеса, финансовите институции и правителствата на всички страни членки, в сътрудничество с Европейската комисия, да разработят една проевропейска комуникационна стратегия за всяка една страна членка поотделно с акценти към различните обществени групи, за да могат всички те да припознаят своя интерес от един силен европейски бюджет.

Тогава няма да е проблем да отстояваме не само 1 % от БВП на Европейския съюз да представлява европейския бюджет, а и той да се формира до голяма степен от собствени средства на ЕС. Този бюджет е целеви инвестиционен инструмент, който увеличава потенциала и конкурентоспособността на всички европейски региони и по този начин допринася за завършването на Единния европейски пазар и за растежа.

3-069-000

**Bernd Lange (S&D).** - Herr Präsident! Frau Ratsvorsitzende, ich fand ja Ihre Einlassung im Bereich Handel sehr interessant, weil das ein Thema ist, das wir heute noch gar nicht besprochen haben. Insbesondere dass wohl klar ist, dass der Handel in der Tat deutlich

zum Bruttosozialprodukt beitragen kann und dass wir auch Leitplanken brauchen. In den Schlussfolgerungen ist ja auch vorgesehen, dass zum Beispiel Reziprozität bei der öffentlichen Beschaffung geregelt werden soll, und zwar möglichst schnell – das finde ich richtig und gut. Ich beglückwünsche den Rat, dass er diesen Weg jetzt auch gehen will und dass er auch deutlich sagt, dass die Kommission *trade defence instruments* auf den Weg bringen soll. Auch das, glaube ich, ist richtig, weil Handel nur mit vernünftigen Leitplanken funktioniert.

Allerdings, Frau Ratsvorsitzende, was mir fehlt, ist, wenn man sich die ganzen Handelsabkommen, die da genannt werden, ansieht, auch gerade mit *emerging countries*, dass nicht davon gesprochen wird, dass wir auch *sustainable chapters* haben müssen, dass wir klar sagen müssen, welche sozialen und Umweltstandards wir einfordern, damit ein fairer Handel passieren kann. Gestern Abend haben wir auch über die soziale Verantwortung von Unternehmen diskutiert. Ich glaube, auch das gehört in die Schlussfolgerungen hinein, dass sich europäische Unternehmen in anderen Ländern vernünftig verhalten.

3-070-000

**Wim van de Camp (PPE).** - Na alles wat gezegd is heb ik nog vier punten. Het eerste punt is de verantwoording van de financiële middelen. Zoals Collega Mulder al zei is het onacceptabel, ook voor de burgers in Europa, dat wij niet in staat zijn om de uitgaven van de Europese Unie te verantwoorden via de nationale beheersverklaringen.

Het tweede punt is de innovatie. Wij vinden dat innovatie ook binnen de klassieke begrotingen van landbouw en regionale uitgaven een veel grotere positie moet innemen. Minder overdrachtsuitgaven, meer innovatie.

Het derde punt betreft de flexibiliteit. Wij moeten meer flexibiliteit in die meerjarige begroting krijgen opdat wij kunnen inspelen op actuele ontwikkelingen in Europa.

En het vierde punt, na afweging toch wel graag een zevenjarig meerjarig financieel kader. Er is te veel onzekerheid bij die jaarbegrotingen. Grote projecten kun je niet uitvoeren als het jaar voor jaar moet. En waarom doen wij dit allemaal? Om de jeugd in Europa hoop te bieden, om de sociale markteconomie te beschermen, om een duurzame economie te bewerkstelligen die ook de waarden van Europa de komende zeven jaar vooruithelpt.

3-071-000

**Derek Vaughan (S&D).** - Mr President, I am sure everyone wants an agreement on the budget, but it has to be a good agreement, a good agreement for citizens, for organisations, and for jobs and growth, not just for finance ministers. I say this because cuts in the overall budget will mean cuts in things like cohesion policy, rural development, research and development – and these are the programmes which we should be investing in as a European Union. These are the programmes which will help us achieve jobs and growth.

I wanted to give colleagues, the Commission and the Council, an example of what these cuts will mean. Wales, where I come from, benefits hugely from European structural funds. That is why we are perhaps the most pro-European part of the UK. The Welsh Government has recently done an analysis of what a cut of EUR 75 billion in the EU budget will mean. It means that over the next financial period Wales will get EUR 1 billion less than expected in the first place. Therefore, when David Cameron says he is defending the interests of the UK, it is not all the UK.

3-072-000

**Reimer Böge (PPE).** - Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Am Ende kann der Rat einem Vorschlag für die Finanzperspektiven erst einstimmig zustimmen, nachdem das Parlament seine Zustimmung erteilt hat. Man achte hier auch auf die Reihenfolge und nehme den Vertrag ernst.

Ich sehe die Gefahr eines zweifachen Defizits: Defizit im Haushalt und ein rasantes Defizit im Europäischen Rat im Hinblick auf europäische Gesinnung und Orientierung. Deswegen muss es auch so sein, dass die eingegangenen Verpflichtungen, die bezahlten Rechnungen von Mitgliedstaaten jetzt so ausgeglichen werden, wie die Haushaltsregeln und der Vertrag es vorsehen, damit wir nicht in ein Defizit kommen. Also lösen wir die Zahlungsrückstände der 16 Milliarden – mehr oder weniger – auf, bevor wir zum Finanzrahmen kommen, und schieben wir nicht erneut durch Haushaltstricks oder durch extrem niedrige Zahlungsermächtigungen für die nächste Laufzeit Zahlungen auf die Zeit nach 2020. Das wäre unehrlich und gegen den Vertrag, denn wir wollen auch in Zukunft keine Schulden machen.

Aus meiner Sicht wird auf der Ebene des Rates zu viel über Rabatte und Transfers zugunsten von Staaten diskutiert. Wo bleibt die Debatte um den europäischen Mehrwert? Dem Europäischen Rat muss man sagen: Schaut euch mal eure Schlussfolgerungen zu Forschung, zu Entwicklungspolitik oder zu den Verkehrsnetzen an! Das steht in einem großen Widerspruch zu dem, was dort an Zahlen diskutiert wird.

Natürlich gibt es auch hier Reformbedarf. Aber die Debatte um Reform darf nicht so geführt werden, dass die Öffentlichkeit den Eindruck bekommt, in Friedenszeiten wird der Feind durch Brüssel ersetzt. So geht das nicht! So kommen wir nicht zu einer vernünftigen europäischen Politik!

3-073-000

**Alain Lamassoure (PPE).** - Monsieur le Président, Madame la Présidente, ça ne peut pas fonctionner comme cela. Il s'agit du budget, pas pour un an mais pour sept ans. Pas pour un seul pays mais pour les vingt-huit membres de l'Union, 500 millions de citoyens.

La démocratie est née le jour où les représentants du peuple ont dit non! Quand ils ont exigé et obtenu que le financement du budget et son emploi soient décidés par eux. Depuis lors, budget signifie transparence, information, débat public, vote démocratique après des explications de vote publiques.

Or, la négociation en cours se déroule entre vingt-huit personnes, complètement à huis clos. Ce secret est mieux gardé que ceux du département d'État américain puisqu'aucun site *wikileaks* n'y a eu accès. Aucun parlement national, ni le Parlement européen n'est informé aujourd'hui du contenu des chiffres et du dossier qui sera sur la table. Aucun n'aura donc pu en débattre avant, aucun parti politique d'aucun pays n'aura pu donner son avis en connaissance de cause.

Dans ces conditions, l'accord qui sera peut-être conclu au sein du Conseil européen ne mettra pas fin au débat, au contraire. Il permettra simplement que le débat commence. Alors s'ouvrira la phase démocratique du débat budgétaire et la décision finale, la seule démocratiquement acceptable, sera celle qui sera votée par le Parlement européen.

3-074-000

**Mairead McGuinness (PPE).** - Mr President, let me pick up where my colleague, Mr Lamassoure, has just finished. I think the message to the Council – and I know Minister Creighton will convey this message – is that the European Parliament is watching very closely not just the figures, but the structure of the budget. I see that sources are saying that there would be far-reaching and serious consequences for the European Union if we do not have an agreement over the coming days. I think that is true, but remember that this is only the first step. If agreement is reached, this House has got to have its say.

I think that a few comments on agriculture were negative. Let me say something very positive about the common agricultural policy. This is a policy for jobs, for stable markets, for growth, for rural development and for increased environmental delivery, and we have been asked to do this with potentially less money and to redistribute money to those Member States – the new Member States – who rightfully are looking for more. So there are a lot of demands being made on this policy. We in the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development will certainly watch closely what the Council agrees.

3-075-000

**Presidente.** – Care colleghe e cari colleghi, io voglio essere molto chiaro. Ora inizia il "catch the eye" ma noi siamo con i tempi molto ristretti perché dovremmo finire alle 11.30 e sono già previsti gli interventi di due Commissari e della rappresentante del Consiglio. Io prenderò soltanto sei interventi, rigorosamente nell'ordine in cui le richieste sono state prese dalla presidenza. Quindi è inutile che alzate i cartelli perché io non posso fare nulla. Io seguo la lista che mi stata fatta in maniera rigorosissima.

*Procedura "catch the eye"*

3-076-000

**Jan Kozłowski (PPE).** - Panie Przewodniczący! Panie Komisarzu! Pani Minister! Najbliższy szczyt Rady Europejskiej w znacznym stopniu określi, w jakim kierunku zmierzać będzie Unia Europejska do końca roku 2020. Czy będzie to wzrost gospodarczy i tworzenie nowych miejsc pracy, czy też może stagnacja i dalszy spadek zatrudnienia? Przewodniczący Van Rompuy proponuje, aby budżet na lata 2014–2020 był budżetem umiaru. Umiar ten nie może jednak się przerodzić w zachowawczość i pozorne oszczędności, do czego wydają się dążyć niektóre z państw członkowskich. Obywatele potrzebują dziś pozytywnych sygnałów, które pozwolą odbudować zaufanie do instytucji europejskich. Bez wątpienia takim sygnałem może być przyjęcie wieloletnich ram finansowych na poziomie umożliwiającym realizację ambitnych celów strategii Europa 2020 i powrót na ścieżkę wzrostu.

3-077-000

**Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D).** - Arvoisa puhemies, komission puheenjohtaja Barroso aloitti sanomalla, että Euroopan unioni on maailman suurin kauppamahti, ja tämä on totta. Hän myös muistutti siitä, että maailmankaupassa tarvitaan uusia pelisääntöjä, että vääristävästä rakenteista päästään irti.

Yksi vääristävä tekijä tapahtui aivan hiljakkoin, jolloin eteläkorealainen yritys lypsi sekä ranskalaista että suomalaista telakkayhtiötä ja vaati mahdollisimman suuria valtion tukiaisia ja päätyi loppujen lopuksi Ranskaan. Onnittelten siitä ranskalaisia, joskin se saattaa myöhemmin koitua suureksi taakaksi ranskalaisille veronmaksajille. Nyt komissio selvittää,

onko tässä tapahtunut Euroopan unionin jäsenvaltioiden puolelta jotain EU-säännösten vastaista. Toivoisin arvoisan komission puheenjohtajan edustajan täällä kommentoivan tätä asiaa ja selventävän, miten on mahdollista, että eteläkorealaiset ikään kuin lypsävät kahta EU-maata.

3-078-000

**Graham Watson (ALDE).** - Mr President, I wish the Council well in its search for agreement on a multiannual financial framework. When tax revenues are hard to predict, spending commitments are hard to make, but I hope that all our Heads of State and Government will recognise that what is essential is to ring-fence spending for research and innovation to restore competitiveness and to commit to the trans-European networks on transport, power transmission and broadband, which will pave the way back to prosperity.

The current Presidency can doubtless make some savings as Ryanair becomes Ireland's national flag carrier, but I am not sure I would wish that on future presidencies.

3-079-000

**Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR).** - Zbliżający się szczyt Rady Europejskiej poświęcony będzie przede wszystkim budżetowi Unii na lata 2014-2020. W obliczu kryzysowej sytuacji zrozumienie budzi chęć lepszego planowania wydatków i oszczędności. Nie mogą one jednak dotyczyć strategicznych i kluczowych funduszy, jak na przykład Fundusz Spójności. Drastyczne cięcia w tym sektorze dałyby wyraźny sygnał, że starsze państwa członkowskie Unii chcą łączyć dziurę budżetową kosztem nowo przyjętych państw członkowskich. Stracą na tym nie tylko takie kraje, jak Polska czy Węgry, ale podważy to zaufanie do całej Unii Europejskiej i przyjętej wcześniej przez nią zasady solidarności. Już teraz wielu się zastanawia, czy grudniowa decyzja Komisji Europejskiej wstrzymująca fundusze na budowę dróg w Polsce nie jest pierwszym krokiem wcześniej zaplanowanej przez niektóre państwa strategii. Jeśli cięcia Funduszu Spójności dla nowych państw członkowskich, w tym Polski, miałyby oznaczać kompromis, to z pewnością w krajach tych odczytane to będzie nie jako kompromis, lecz jako kompromitacja Unii.

3-081-000

**Zofija Mazej Kukovič (PPE).** - Evropski proračun v višini enega procenta niso samo številke, čeprav so te številke tako nizke, da so v življenjskih normalnih pogojih lahko na nivoju statistične napake: en procent!

Torej gre za politično voljo. Gre za to, ali hočemo Evropo, in gre za to, ali hočemo, da bomo med sabo bolj povezljivi. Povezljivi preko digitalizacije Evrope, povezljivi preko infrastrukture. In če si želimo večjo kakovost življenja, ali bomo namenili več denarja tudi v raziskave in razvoj, ki služijo zdravju, ki služijo obvladovanju bolezni. Torej več Evrope v uravnoteženem proračunu.

3-082-000

**Ana Gomes (S&D).** - Como disse o Presidente Barroso, o quadro financeiro plurianual é para alguns Estados-Membros crucial para fazer face à crise e investir no crescimento da economia e emprego. É o caso de Portugal, hoje sob o resgate e supervisão da troica, e isso porque parte substancial da riqueza produzida pelos portugueses continua a ser apropriada por *gangsters* e desviada para o exterior a coberto da selva fiscal na União Europeia e da desregulação global. A troica fez e faz vista grossa à corrupção e às disfunções no sistema

financeiro, fiscal e judicial que garantem impunidade aos *gangsters*, agora aproveitando-se das privatizações impostas e forçadas. Como se compreende que a troica tenha endossado a amnistia fiscal de 2012 com que o Governo tratou de proteger indivíduos como o banqueiro Ricardo Salgado, que se esqueceu de declarar milhões na Suíça, e os acionistas da SLM Galileu, que não pagam os milhares de milhões que devem ao Estado à conta da fraude monstruosa no BPN? O Governo permitiu-lhes legalizar capitais no exterior sem terem de os repatriar mediante uma taxa ridícula de 7,5%, sem lhes questionar a origem e assegurando-lhes a proteção do segredo.

3-083-000

(*Fine della procedura "catch the eye"*)

3-084-000

**Janusz Lewandowski**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, colleagues, thank you for this debate, which was predominantly a true and realistic picture of the European budget. But I could also hear things that were not true, wrong and misleading. My job is to tell the difference.

Therefore, those who say that the European budget is small are right. This is 1% of the national wealth, less than 2% of public expenditure in the European Union. But those who say – and I hear it constantly – that we are cutting our national budgets at home while the European budget is growing are wrong. More than 20 national budgets are growing, and we are now expected to finance a larger Europe with the accession of Croatia – and more duties – with less money. That is true.

Those who say that the European budget is about investment are right. You cannot find investment money for growth and jobs in the national and regional budgets; these are normally the first victim of savings.

But the stability of the MFF in the European Union has nothing to do with the Soviet planning I remember. This was about planning how many shoes or toys you were to produce annually; the European MFF is about stability of investment over many years for multiannual projects, which is of great value in this time of crisis.

Those who say that one euro spent at European level could bring more added value than separate national expenditures are right. You can find the proof in international consortia in research for global competitiveness, in the trans-European networks in energy and transportation, and in humanitarian aid worldwide.

Those who say that we need to avoid an excessive gap between commitments and payments are right. Some difference is normal, but in order to avoid excessive difference we need to go into the new MFF without an excessive overhang legacy from this one.

Therefore, we need the European Parliament to find missing money for the 2013 budget. As for what I see is a real witch-hunt in respect of the less than 6% of the European budget which is set aside for administration, I will leave that story to Commissioner Šefčovič.

3-085-000

**Maroš Šefčovič**, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, allow me to have the last word before the European Council on Heading 5 of the MFF, on administration.

Despite the fact that it represents less than 6% of the budget, it is the subject of a huge discussion – I would even say a media campaign – in Europe. Therefore, I believe that it is absolutely necessary to underline the need for a top professional, independent and geographically balanced EU administration.

The EU has to deliver on more and more demanding tasks, and in all 23 languages. This alone represents 15% of administrative costs. We have to deliver on a new task given to us under the EU Semester. We will have to issue opinions on the national budgets. In the trade talks we discussed this morning we will have to face the best and finest negotiators from all over the world. This is without mentioning the European Court of Justice, where our lawyers have to face the best global law firms in the world, and in the overwhelming majority of cases – 90% – they win.

Fines imposed by the European Court of Justice have brought more than EUR 30 billion into the EU budget over the last few years. Member States, law firms and companies send their best people to Brussels, Strasbourg or Luxembourg to cover EU matters. They also need to be of high quality. If you ask them how much they are paid you will not usually get an answer. The President of the European Parliament tried to get one. He received no answer, and I do not think he will ever get one. But I can assure you that they are paid at a much different level than they are paid back home in their capitals.

But I think this is right, because they are being paid for their quality, language skills and hard work. Therefore, I would repeat here the plea I made to European ministers on Monday: let us not get carried away; let us not break the EU machine.

We have already offered to make almost EUR 10 billion in cumulative savings since 2004. Our civil servants working for the EU institutions will work longer hours and will retire later than most civil servants in the Member States, and we are already proposing to cut 2500 jobs. This is the equivalent of the entire administrative staff of the European Court of Justice, so these are very significant savings.

We know that more is expected, but I would also like to underline that if we overdo this we will create a situation where projects for regional development will be delayed or not be processed with the required quality. This would create a situation where translation will be scarce, thus leading to an even longer backlog of unsolved cases at the European Court of Justice, creating very serious legal uncertainty.

So I would just like to say that, through marginal savings, we can do structural damage where it will be the citizens who will feel it first.

3-086-000

**Lucinda Creighton**, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Members of the European Parliament for a very insightful, very fruitful and very helpful debate from my point of view. It is fair to say that we will engage in very intensive and very important negotiations at the European Council tomorrow and on Friday.

Different Member States have different perspectives. President Van Rompuy has the unenviable task of trying to bring those different perspectives together to achieve a compromise. I certainly agree with, and I think I can reflect, the desire and the determination of the European Parliament to ensure that this compromise is fair, balanced and ultimately ensures that we have a budget which is fit for purpose, so that we can continue to pursue the policies which are so essential to tackle the challenges that we face at EU level.



I would like to particularly note and thank the representatives of the Committee on Budgets, rapporteurs, members of the contact group, particularly Mr Lamassoure, Mr Böge, Mr Kalfin, Ms Jensen and Mr Dehaene for the engagement that we have seen over the last 18 months or more, from the Polish Presidency to the Danish Presidency to the Cyprus Presidency and now into the Irish Presidency. That engagement has been invaluable and has helped to inform the discussions at the General Affairs Council and at the European Council in November.

A number of points have been made, particularly by the Members of Parliament. I appreciate that there are some divergent views here in the Chamber, but there a number of common issues that are also of enormous concern to the Council.

The first of those is youth unemployment. It is clear that all Members of the European Parliament want to tackle the scourge of youth unemployment and indeed the general challenge of unemployment across the European Union. We are all agreed that the budget must be oriented towards trying to tackle that challenge.

It is important to note that as well as the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission are working in that direction. We, as the Irish Presidency, intend to secure an agreement on the Youth Guarantee at the Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council (EPSCO) at the end of February.

That is a proposal which comes from the Commission and which has been endorsed by the European Parliament. President Van Rompuy announced earlier this week his intention to ensure that several billions of euros within the Multiannual Financial Framework will be oriented towards tackling youth unemployment. So there is a coherence and a consistency in our approach, and I am confident that this will come to bear in the negotiations at the European Council tomorrow.

A number of MEPs mentioned solidarity in the debate. I note that Mr Swoboda and a number of other contributors highlighted the need for solidarity at European-Union level. I fully agree with that.

There is also a need for responsibility. That responsibility does not just lie with governments or the Council; it lies with all of the institutions and individual elected representatives at EU level. It is important that we all assume that responsibility to try to ensure that we arrive at a deal that is acceptable and, most importantly, that serves the interests of our citizens.

On the question of solidarity, certain remarks were made about immigration. I just want to say that from our experience in my country in Ireland, and indeed across the EU, immigration and free movement across EU Member States has hugely enriched the European Union. The presence of citizens from all EU Member States working, interacting and getting to know each other across borders is extremely important, and something that we should treasure and continue to embrace.

I would like to make a point on the negotiations at the European Council this week. It is important to say – and a number of Members have pointed to this, Mr Lamassoure, Mr Kalfin, Mr Daul and others – that it is not a question of a deal being agreed at European Council level on Thursday and Friday and that becoming a *fait accompli* or a ‘take it or leave it’ scenario. That is not the case.

We have had good consultation with the European Parliament to date, but we will have even better and much deeper engagement and negotiation with the European Parliament over the weeks and months ahead.

If an agreement is reached at the European Council on Thursday and Friday, the Commission will then come forward with its proposal and with its proposed interinstitutional agreement. Then we will engage in intensive negotiations with the European Parliament. So it is the beginning, rather than the end, of the process. We, as the Irish Presidency, are very much committed to that course of action.

There are a number of red-line issues and priorities which have been identified by MEPs and Parliament, and the contact group have made these very consistently and very coherently to members of the Council over recent months: flexibility, the need for a mid-term review and the question of own resources.

These priorities have been heard and are being heard, and I am confident that they will be reflected in the outcome of our negotiations over the next two days. Members of this Parliament have identified a range of priorities, from SMEs, to research and development, to the common agricultural policy, to cohesion policy, and different Members lay emphasis on different aspects of those.

All EU policies are important. It is essential that they are adequately funded, but there is no doubt that we have a challenge. We have a challenge to ensure, with reduced resources, that we have better, more effective and more efficient spending than we have ever seen before. That will be the challenge: to ensure that all of the policies are oriented towards growth and that we are investing smartly and wisely.

That does not mean that one aspect – whether it is Horizon 2020 or the common agricultural policy – should trump another. They all have their place, they are all important and we are committed as the European Union to ensuring that they can all function appropriately, adequately and for the benefit of our citizens.

To sum up I would like to say – and repeat the point – that this is the beginning of the process. I hope and believe, for the credibility of the European Union, the credibility of the Council and the credibility of the institutions, that we must arrive at a deal this week; that the EU Heads of State and Government must achieve agreement amongst themselves for a position in the Council so that we can take forward our negotiations with the European Parliament.

Over the next weeks and months we can ensure that we put in place a Multiannual Financial Framework that will benefit our citizens, that will help us in the huge challenge of tackling unemployment, particularly youth unemployment, and ensuring the growth and development of the European Union for the benefit of our citizens over the weeks and months and years ahead.

3-087-000

**ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ANNY ΠΟΔΗΜΑΤΑ**

*Αντιπρόεδρος*

3-088-000

**Πρόεδρος.** - Η συζήτηση έληξε.

## Γραπτές δηλώσεις (άρθρο 149)

3-088-500

**Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Mes premiers mots seront pour regretter que le président du Conseil européen, Herman Van Rompuy, ne soit pas venu pour écouter et entendre les positions du Parlement européen dont il faut, sans cesse, répéter qu'il est en codécision pour le cadre financier européen 2014-2020. Sur ce sujet, je me réjouis que l'idée d'une clause de révision en 2016 fasse son chemin. En effet, je crois nécessaire de laisser « souffler » les Etats membres sur le plan financier. Ils doivent faire face au rétablissement de leurs finances publiques, à la contribution au budget de l'Union et au financement du Mécanisme européen de stabilité. En 2016, nous aurons un nouveau Parlement européen, une nouvelle Commission européenne, un nouveau président du Conseil européen. En 2016, l'essentiel des Etats ayant signé le traité de stabilité, de coordination et de gouvernance économique (« règle d'or ») devraient l'avoir ratifié. En 2016, nous devrions avoir doté l'UE de ressources propres. En 2016, il est possible que le Royaume-Uni ait quitté l'Union européenne. Préalablement à 2016 et lors des élections européennes de 2014, nous pourrions mettre en débat politique tous les sujets liés au cadre financier : agriculture, fonds de cohésion, recherche scientifique etc....

3-088-750

**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Cel mai important subiect discutat la summit-ul Consiliului European din 7-8 februarie este cadrul financiar multianual 2014-2020. Mari speranțe se pun în finalizarea dezbaterilor legate de bugetul UE, iar atingerea unui consens este prioritară pentru fiecare stat membru. O altă prioritate pe care o are România în cadrul summit-ului este Republica Moldova. Țara mea va solicita ca negocierile privind acordul de asociere UE-Moldova să fie finalizate cât mai rapid, astfel încât acesta să fie semnat până în noiembrie 2013, când are loc Summit-ul Parteneriatului Estic de la Vilnius. Mai mult, în timpul vizitei sale la Chișinău anul trecut, Jose Manuel Barroso, Președintele Comisiei Europene, a subliniat că UE va continua să sprijine procesul de reforme din Republica Moldova, exprimându-și în același timp convingerea că în 2013 se va reuși semnarea Acordului de Asociere. În acest context, doresc și eu să subliniez importanța încheierii acordului, luând în considerare progresul obținut până în prezent de către Republica Moldova în alinierea legislației naționale la cea europeană. Totodată, este nevoie ca cetățenii moldoveni să poată calatori în UE fără vize cât mai rapid. De aceea rămâne prioritar obiectivul de finalizare, în acest an, a Planului de Acțiuni privind liberalizarea vizelor.

3-088-875

**John Bufton (EFD)**, *in writing*. – Last September, Mr Barroso came here and called for a 'federation of nation states. Not a superstate'. He also agreed that such a 'federation of nation states will ultimately require a new Treaty'. However he caveated it by saying, 'Discussions on treaty change must not distract or delay us from doing what can and must be done already today'. In Dublin a couple of weeks ago, when asked about the UK Government's plans for an In/Out Referendum on its membership of the European Union, he repeated those words and I quote: 'What I hope is that debate does not distract us from the very important challenges we have, namely tackling the (economic) crisis'. Prime Minister David Cameron is keen to begin those negotiations on Treaty changes so that he can get his referendum – is he as keen?

3-089-000

**George Sabin Cutaş (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Dificultatea de a ajunge la un consens cu privire la bugetul european transmite un semnal negativ nu doar piețelor internaționale, ci și cetățenilor europeni. Parlamentul European, dar și Președintele Barroso, au făcut apel în repetate rânduri la nevoia de credibilitate a instituțiilor europene în fața unor cetățeni tot mai străini de proiectul european. Reducerea fondurilor pentru educație, infrastructură și telecomunicații, dar și pentru politica de coeziune și politica agricolă comună ar amputa o parte vitală a programelor europene într-un moment de criză, în care ar trebui favorizată creșterea economică și încurajată solidaritatea socială. Faptul că se vorbește de tăierea fondurilor pentru programe precum Erasmus sau ajutorul alimentar pentru persoanele nevoiașe indică lipsa unei viziuni europene centrate asupra cetățenilor. Nu în ultimul rând, un buget european care ar reflecta doar interesele marilor contribuitori ar amplifica dezechilibrele dintre aceștia și statele membre, precum România, care au nevoie de solidaritate pentru depășirea decalajelor.

3-090-000

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – O decurso da discussão sobre o próximo Quadro Financeiro Plurianual, partindo de uma proposta já de si inaceitável da Comissão Europeia, trouxe-nos, por pressão das potências da UE, para um patamar ainda mais prejudicial aos interesses de países como Portugal. Os maiores beneficiários do mercado único e das políticas comuns querem agora esmagar o orçamento da UE, levando, pela primeira vez, a uma redução em termos reais face ao anterior Quadro Financeiro (2007-2013), ainda por cima num contexto de novo alargamento da UE. Por um lado, querem aprofundar a integração (mercado único, etc.), integração essa que, pela sua natureza capitalista, conduz a uma dinâmica de divergência. Por outro lado, o instrumento por excelência destinado a, pelo menos, minimizar este efeito de divergência ou mesmo a, desejavelmente, promover a convergência - o orçamento comunitário - é reduzido. Logo, o resultado só pode ser um: mais divergência! São cada vez mais os constrangimentos e prejuízos do processo de integração para os países com economias mais débeis, como Portugal. Os supostos benefícios, cada vez mais, uma miragem. Destaque-se ainda a inaceitável imposição de *condições a nível macroeconómico*, para utilização de verbas do orçamento comunitário (FEDER, FSE, Fundo de Coesão, Agricultura e Pescas). Mais uma forma de chantagem e de dominação de recorte neocolonial.

3-091-000

**Zita Gurmai (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The protest taking place this morning outside these walls reminds us of the harsh reality faced by many European citizens and workers. Moreover it highlights the need for Europe to come up with a concrete and ambitious common strategy for re-industrialisation. We need investment in research, innovation and transport if we want to foster the single market and Europe to compete in an increasingly globalised world. In my country Hungary, citizens from the countryside recently organised so-called 'Hunger Marches' because the crisis, the closing of local factories and the austerity measures are making it more and more difficult for them to purchase even the most basic product: food. We now have four million people living below the poverty line in Hungary and this is something I never thought I would have to witness, especially after Hungary's accession to the EU. This reminds us that we need a sustainable budget that includes provision for the most vulnerable of our Member States and citizens, Therefore I urge the

Member States to put aside their differences and short-term electoral views and remember the principles on which this Union was founded: solidarity and long-term vision.

3-091-250

**Liem Hoang Ngoc (S&D),** *par écrit*. – Le rôle du budget communautaire est crucial, notamment pour les pays de l'eurozone qui ne peuvent pas dévaluer leur monnaie. On comprend que la Grande-Bretagne, dont la monnaie s'apprécie ou se déprécie vis-à-vis de l'euro, soit sceptique à l'endroit de nos débats budgétaires. C'est d'ailleurs la raison d'être de l'eurogroupe que de traiter des problèmes spécifiques de l'eurozone. Le Parlement devrait se doter d'une structure parallèle pour lui faire contrepoids. Mais il y a d'autres responsables au blocage du débat budgétaire. Un consensus de circonstance se constitue autour du président du Conseil pour aboutir à des perspectives dont le montant serait inférieur aux perspectives 2007-2013. A l'heure où la discipline budgétaire est imposée aux Etats membres, cet accord mènerait l'Union européenne à l'impasse, en la privant complètement de politique budgétaire. Moins pour la cohésion et la PAC, trop peu pour la compétitivité ! C'est le résultat des marchandages intergouvernementaux. Il devient urgent de doter l'Union de ressources propres pérennes. Il faut pour cela envisager tous les moyens: la TTF, l'impôt européen sur les sociétés, l'emprunt. Tel doit être l'horizon de la politique budgétaire européenne en 2020. Le signal lancé au Conseil cette semaine sera décisif, ou ne sera pas.

3-091-500

**Filip Kaczmarek (PPE),** *na piśmie*. – Najbliższe posiedzenie Rady Europejskiej będzie bardzo ważne dla naszej europejskiej przyszłości. Ramy finansowe, o których toczą się tak emocjonujące spory i zabiegi, są jednocześnie małe i wielkie. Tak, to paradoks. Małe, bo od strony czysto finansowej stanowią zaledwie 1% PKB Unii Europejskiej. Wielkie, bo przy okazji tej decyzji pojawiają się koncepcje, propozycje, emocje, pułapki, które mogą mieć decydujący wpływ na to, czy projekt europejski będzie się rozwijał, a jeżeli tak – to w jakim kierunku.

Jestem optymistycznie nastawiony i wierzę, że liderzy dojdą do rozsądnego porozumienia. Niepokojące jest tylko to, że tak wielu opozycyjnych polityków życzyłoby sobie klęski szczytu. Nie potrafią spojrzeć nieco dalej, poza swój krótkoterminowy i partykularny interes polityczny. Dla nich liczą się tylko następne wybory i wszystko, czym można uderzyć w aktualny rząd. Taka postawa zniechęca, bo tak naprawdę stanowi zdradę istoty samej polityki – poszukiwania dobra wspólnego. Niszczą przy okazji wartości leżące u podstaw integracji europejskiej, na przykład solidarność. Jestem przekonany, że obywatele nie są jednak ślepi i w swej mądrości potrafią dostrzec, kto poszukuje dobra wspólnego, a kto taniego poklasku.

3-092-000

**Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE),** *în scris*. – Referitor la Consiliul European din 7-8 februarie, aş dori să fac câteva precizări legate de două dintre temele aflate pe agendă, respectiv: 1. aspectele privind relația Uniunii Europene cu principalii parteneri comerciali internaționali și 2. relațiile externe ale Uniunii Europene, cu accent pe evoluțiile din ultimii doi ani din vecinătatea sudică, respectiv situația din Siria și Mali. În ceea ce privește relațiile comerciale externe ale UE, consider că este extrem de importantă avansarea negocierilor comerciale aferente Parteneriatului estic, în special cu Republica Moldova. În perspectiva summit-ului Parteneriatului estic de la Vilnius din noiembrie 2013, cred că acest Consiliu European ar trebui să emită un semnal pozitiv în ceea ce privește Republica Moldova, având

în vedere progresele înregistrate de acest stat în finalizarea acordului de liber schimb aprofundat și cuprinzător cu UE. Referitor la Mali, trebuie continuate eforturile de combatere a terorismului și crimei organizate, cu implicarea statelor din vecinătate și din nordul Africii. Cu titlu informativ, autoritățile române analizează momentan posibilitatea unei participări românești la viitoarea misiune UE în Mali.

3-093-000

**Ivari Padar (S&D)**, *kirjalikult.* – Euroopa Liidu eelarve lõppfaas on pingeline. Nagu ikka kõikide eelarvete vastuvõtmisel – nii see just on. Kompromissi on vaja, teadmatus on hullem arengu pidurdaja. Lõppfaasi vaidlused viitavad sellele, kuidas tulevikus olla eelarveläbirääkimisteks paremini ette valmistunud. Täname arutelu näitab, et pole piisavat arusaama senise rahakasutuse otstarbekusest. Liiga palju on ikkagi õhus liikmesriigi egoismi ja vähem üldisi poliitikaid, nagu transpordiühendused, energiaprojektid, teadusprojektid. Habemega teema on kindlasti ELi institutsioonide paiknemine. Liigne hajutatatus mõjub kokkuhoiudebatis paroodiana.

3-093-500

**Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE)**, *na piśmie.* – Ze szczytem w dniach 7–8 lutego wiążemy wielkie nadzieje. Po niepowodzeniu w listopadzie ubiegłego roku teraz to już najwyższa pora, aby uzgodnić budżet UE na lata 2014–2020. Na ten budżet czekają wszyscy Europejczycy. Chcą widzieć, że UE podejmuje działania na rzecz powrotu na ścieżkę wzrostu gospodarczego. Budżet UE, który w ponad 90% ma charakter inwestycyjny, z pewnością jest narzędziem, które nas do tego zbliża. Szczególnie ważne jest, aby nie zmniejszać środków na politykę spójności i wspólną politykę rolną, które dają dużą wartość dodaną. Niedopuszczalne jest również nierówne traktowanie poszczególnych krajów w razie cięć.

Dla przykładu tzw. druga propozycja przewodniczącego Van Rompuy'a z listopada ubiegłego roku przewidywała obcięcie środków na II filar WPR (tj. politykę rozwoju obszarów wiejskich) dla Polski o blisko 3 mld euro, co stanowi prawie 25% obecnej alokacji! Niestety, z nieoficjalnych informacji wynika, że przewodniczący Van Rompuy zaproponuje jednak dalsze cięcia, rzędu nawet 15 mld euro w stosunku do swojej ostatniej propozycji, która i tak była już o 75 mld euro mniejsza w porównaniu do wyjściowego projektu Komisji Europejskiej. Nasuwa się zatem pytanie, gdzie będą ciąć szefowie państw i rządów? Przewodniczący Van Rompuy wśród swoich priorytetów wymienia badania, rozwój i edukację. Wydaje się jednak, że może być osamotniony.

3-094-000

**Γεώργιος Σταυρακάκης (S&D)**, *γραπτώς.* – Αν και κατανοούμε τις προσπάθειες εξορθολογισμού των κρατών μελών, εμείς στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο δεν θα κουραστούμε να υποστηρίζουμε ότι ο μακροπρόθεσμος προϋπολογισμός της ΕΕ αποτελεί ένα στρατηγικό εργαλείο για επενδύσεις, ένα στρατηγικό εργαλείο για την τόνωση της ανάπτυξης και της ανταγωνιστικότητας και, φυσικά, ένα στρατηγικό εργαλείο για την δημιουργία θέσεων απασχόλησης σε ολόκληρη την Ευρώπη. Σε αυτό το σημείο θα ήθελα να εκφράσω τον προβληματισμό μου για το γεγονός ότι οι διαπραγματεύσεις στο Ευρωπαϊκό Συμβούλιο θα ξεκινήσουν από το σημείο που διεκόπησαν τον Νοέμβριο, δηλ. την δεύτερη πρόταση Βαν Ρομπάι που προτείνει περικοπές 75 δις, και όχι από την πρόταση της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, όπως λογικά θα έπρεπε. Η πρόταση της Επιτροπής, μη λαμβάνοντας υπόψη την ένταξη της Κροατίας, προβλέπει 8,6 δις λιγότερα σε πραγματικούς όρους από ό, τι το πάγωμα των ανώτατων ορίων

της επομένης προγραμματικής περιόδου στο επίπεδο του προϋπολογισμού του 2013. Με απλά λόγια, η ήδη μειωμένη πρόταση που έχει υποβάλλει η Επιτροπή ψαλιδίζεται ακόμα περισσότερο από τις προτάσεις Βαν Ρομπαι, ιδιαίτερα σε μια περίοδο που αναμφισβήτητα χρειαζόμαστε περισσότερη Ευρώπη. Γι αυτό τον λόγο εμείς στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο μιλάμε για «ποιότητα στις επενδύσεις» (better investing) και διεκδικούμε την επαρκή χρηματοδότηση του κοινοτικού προϋπολογισμού. Ευελπιστούμε το Συμβούλιο να μας εισακούσει.

3-095-000

**Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D),** *írásban.* – Már a tavaly novemberben megtárgyalt költségvetési javaslatok is elfogadhatatlan csökkentést jelentettek a Bizottság eredeti javaslatához képest. Tűrhetetlen, hogy egyes tagállamok még ezt is tovább akarják csökkenteni. Hazám, Magyarország már így is kohéziós támogatásainak 30%-át, hétmilliárd eurót veszíthet el, ezzel ennek a végeláthatatlan költségvetési huzavonának igazságtalanul a legnagyobb vesztesévé válhat. Amennyiben a februári Európai Tanácson nem születik elfogadható megállapodás az Unió hétéves költségvetéséről, a Tanácsban ülő állam- és kormányfők szegénységi bizonyítványt állítanak ki magukról. Ennél azonban sokkal nagyobb gond, hogy szegénységre ítélik azokat a tagállamokat és állampolgáraikat, amelyek nehéz gazdasági helyzetük miatt uniós források hiányában nem tudnának befektetni. Magyarországon pl. az állami beruházások 97%-a társfinanszírozásból működik. Már most is késésben vagyunk: a támogatási programoknak jövő ilyenkor már működniük kellene, miközben még a főösszegekről sincsen megállapodás! Ki viseli majd a felelősséget ezért a hátrányos helyzetben lévő régiók, köztük a magyarországi régiók lakossága előtt? Ki viseli a felelősséget azért a sokkért, amelyet a támogatások hirtelen és drasztikus csökkentése jelent majd a nehéz helyzetben lévő magyar régiók, kistérségek számára? Nem lehet nacionalista gögből, önzésből követelt kiadáscsökkentések, az európai szolidaritás félreértelmezéséből fakadóan elvárt költségvetési visszatérítések miatt kockára tenni egész országok felzárkózását, sőt, az egész Európai Unió legfontosabb értékét: a szolidaritást!

3-095-250

**Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D),** *în scris.* – Consiliul European din 7-8 februarie 2013 va avea ca principale subiecte realizarea unui acord privind cadrul financiar multianual pentru perioada 2014-2020. Parlamentul încurajează realizarea unui acord, dar va susține doar un cadru financiar multianual care va întări instituțiile europene și va permite implementarea politicilor Uniunii. Cadrul financiar multianual 2014-2020 trebuie să asigure finanțarea necesară pentru politica de coeziune, pentru politica agricolă, pentru creșterea competitivității prin investiții în cercetare și inovare, precum și în rețele trans-europene de transport, energie și comunicații. Solicit Consiliului European menținerea bugetului propus de Comisie pentru programul de furnizare de alimente pentru persoanele cele mai defavorizate, pentru programul Orizont 2020 și pentru mecanismul de conectare a Europei. De asemenea, consider că viitorul cadru financiar multianual 2014-2020 și politica agricolă comună ar trebui să asigure nu doar reducerea decalajelor dintre subvențiile directe alocate agricultorilor din toate statele membre, ci chiar egalizarea acestora. În final, cadrul financiar multianual nu ar trebui să permită un deficit bugetar pentru perioada 2014-2020.

3-095-500

**Rafał Trzaskowski (PPE),** *na piśmie.* – Naszym priorytetem jest ambitny budżet dla Europy, szczególnie w obecnych warunkach kryzysu, bo właśnie w takim ambitnym budżecie widzimy skuteczny instrument pobudzania wzrostu gospodarczego w UE. Musimy mieć też na uwadze, jak istotnym elementem tego budżetu jest polityka spójności,

której fundusze są w swej istocie inwestycyjne. Cięż nie powinno się dokonywać kosztem nowych państw członkowskich, bo ich rozwój przynosi korzyści całej Wspólnocie. Przede wszystkim jednak musimy zabiegać o to, by budżet na lata 2014–2020 został uchwalony. Oczywiście nie za wszelką cenę i z uwzględnieniem postulatów Parlamentu. Brak porozumienia byłby negatywną wiadomością dla pogrążonej w kryzysie Europy.

3-096-000

**Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D),** *schriftelijk.* – Als de voorstellen voor de volgende meerjarenbegroting te ver beneden het voorstel van de Commissie zakken, moet het Europees Parlement zijn verantwoordelijkheid nemen en deze voorstellen verwerpen. We hebben die macht en onze fractie zal al het mogelijke doen om zich te verzetten tegen irrationele bezuinigingen. Ik ben blij te zien dat ook in de andere fracties de geesten ondertussen gerijpt zijn. Door nog drastischer te snijden in de Europese begroting zal de EU niet meer in staat zijn om haar taken effectief te vervullen. Bezuinigingen op de Europese begroting gaan ten koste van maatregelen die moeten worden genomen om uit de crisis te geraken. We moeten immers investeren in duurzame en groeigerichte investeringen en in mensen (bijvoorbeeld het Erasmusprogramma of de jeugdgarantieregeling).

Wij hebben de indruk dat enkel nationale belangen het Europese debat in de Raad domineren, terwijl we een gemeenschappelijk belang hebben in de strijd tegen de crisis. Door te investeren in onderzoek en ontwikkeling, infrastructuur, opleidingsprogramma's en andere cruciale domeinen zoals de strijd tegen de jeugdwerkloosheid, kan Europa de lidstaten net helpen in de strijd tegen de crisis. De Unie is geen speelgoed voor nationale belangen, het is een werktuig voor gemeenschappelijke Europese belangen.

3-097-000

**Iuliu Winkler (PPE),** *în scris.* – După puseul de optimism din 2010, când analiști economici și lideri europeni previzionau sfârșitul rapid al crizei, azi avem o certitudine: criza, cu toate aspectele ei – economică, a locurilor de muncă, criza competitivității europene – va mai dura. Trebuie găsită soluția la criză și la multiplele sale provocări, dar ne aflăm pe o cale greșită! Modul ocult, netransparent, în care Consiliul European încearcă să construiască un compromis între egoismele naționale, între duplicitatea liderilor europeni care își declară sprijinul pentru Uniune, apelând apoi acasă la protecționism și la discursul antieuropean, nu va aduce adevărata soluție. Avem răspunsul la așteptările cetățenilor noștri: strategia UE 2020 și îndeosebi CFM 2014-2020. Noul CFM trebuie să asigure suportul financiar solid politicilor comune, investițiilor, creării de noi locuri de muncă, iar pentru noi, cetățenii noilor state membre, șanse egale cu vechii membri în privința politicii de coeziune și dezvoltare regională și a politicii agricole comune. Noul CFM trebuie adoptat într-un adevărat spirit comunitar, nu doar respectând formal metoda comunitară. Consiliul European din această săptămână trebuie să țină cont de opinia formulată de PE înainte de a ceda ispitei, încheind compromisuri oculte împotriva interesului fiecăruia dintre cetățenii UE.

3-097-500

**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD),** *na piśmie.* – Kryzys finansowy lat 2008–2009 rozpoczął się i zakończył na krótko po rozpoczęciu wykonywania budżetu UE na lata 2007–2013. Niestety mało kto sądził wówczas, że kryzys rozleje się na kolejne kraje, a w Unii Europejskiej zagości na dobre. Tym samym niewielu ekspertów i polityków zaprzętało sobie głowę nadchodzącymi problemami z porozumieniem w sprawie kolejnej perspektywy



finansowej. Alternatywa „oszczędzać czy wydawać środki publiczne?” jest teraz czymś bardzo aktualnym, kwestia ta jest szczególnie oczywista przed spotkaniem Rady.

Na wstępie warto zaznaczyć, że z punktu widzenia wszystkich 27 gospodarek łącznie kwota budżetu unijnego nie jest imponująca. To nieco ponad 1% dochodu narodowego brutto całej Wspólnoty. Dla porównania poziom fiskalizacji (relacja wydatków sektora publicznego do PKB) w UE był w 2011 roku bliski przekroczenia 50%. W Polsce wskaźnik ten wyniósł 43,6%. Jak się jednak okazuje, nawet o tak „niewielką” kwotę walka trwać może miesiącami, szczególnie w dobie kryzysu i ogólnoeuropejskiej mody na oszczędzanie.

Obok wysokości przyznanych środków ważne będzie także ich przeznaczenie. Eksperti coraz częściej mówią o konieczności ograniczania dotacji i dopłat na rzecz zwrotnych instrumentów finansowych, np. kredytów czy poręczeń. Niewiadomą pozostaje także kwestia rozliczania podatku VAT w projektach finansowanych ze środków unijnych, co w polskich realiach stanowi istotną część kosztów.

## 5. Ώρα των ψηφοφοριών

3-099-000

**Πρόεδρος.** - Το επόμενο σημείο είναι η ώρα των ψηφοφοριών.

*(Για τα αποτελέσματα και άλλες ψηφοφορίες σχετικά με τις ψηφοφορίες: Βλέπε Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά)*

Επειδή έχουμε στη διάθεσή μας 30 μόλις λεπτά πριν διακόψουμε για την πανηγυρική συνεδρίαση, σας προτείνω να μεταθέσουμε την ψηφοφορία επί της έκθεσης Rodust για την κοινή αλιευτική πολιτική αμέσως μετά την πανηγυρική συνεδρίαση.

*(Το Σώμα συμφωνεί με τη μετάθεση της ψηφοφορίας)*

**5.1. Συμφωνία ΕΕ-ΗΠΑ δυνάμει της Γενικής Συμφωνίας Δασμών και Εμπορίου (ΓΣΔΕ) του 1994: τροποποίηση των παραχωρήσεων που προβλέπονται στους πίνακες της Δημοκρατίας της Βουλγαρίας και της Ρουμανίας στο πλαίσιο της προσχώρησής τους στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση (A7-0430/2012 - Vital Moreira) (ψηφοφορία)**

**5.2. Κατευθυντήριες γραμμές για τις πολιτικές απασχόλησης των κρατών μελών (A7-0010/2013 - Pervenche Berès) (ψηφοφορία)**

**5.3. Διαφάνεια των μέτρων που ρυθμίζουν τις τιμές των φαρμάκων για ανθρώπινη χρήση (A7-0015/2013 - Antonia Parvanova) (ψηφοφορία)**

3-103-000

- Πριν από την ψηφοφορία επί της τροπολογίας 7

3-104-000

**Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL).** - Eu apresentei uma alteração oral para retirar as seguintes palavras: *e assegurar as vias de recurso adequadas nos termos dos procedimentos nacionais às empresas afetadas*. A justificação é que eu pedi a retirada do artigo 8.º e portanto, para coerência, esta parte do recital 9 também deveria sair do texto.

3-105-000

(Η προφορική τροπολογία δεν κρατείται)

- Μετά από την ψηφοφορία

3-106-000

**Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE).** - Madam President, I would like to thank colleagues for the positive vote and I would like to ask the Commission to give its position on the adopted amendment.

3-107-000

**Maroš Šefčovič, Vice-President of the Commission .** – Madam President, the Commission would also like to thank the rapporteur, Ms Parvanova, for her work and for the effort invested in processing these very demanding proposals. However, given the number of amendments, the Commission will submit its position on each individual amendment to Parliament’s secretariat.

3-108-000

**Hannes Swoboda (S&D).** - Madam President, I want to take the opportunity during the vote on Ms Parvanova’s report to make one thing clear, and to ask you to refer this to President Schulz. Mr Farage said today, with reference to Mr Cameron, that there should be continuing discrimination against Bulgarian and Romanian citizens in Great Britain. This is not acceptable and I think it should very clearly be the will of this House, and President Schulz, to state at the Council that we cannot accept that Bulgarian and Romanian citizens should be discriminated against after the end of the special term for Bulgarians and Romanians. We are all equal, and Bulgarian and Romanian citizens cannot be discriminated against.

(Applause)

3-109-000

(Η συνεδρίαση διακόπτεται στις 11.55 και επαναλαμβάνεται στις 12.00 το μεσημέρι).

3-110-000

## VORSITZ: MARTIN SCHULZ

*Präsident*

### 6. Rede von Moncef Marzouki, Präsident der Tunesischen Republik

3-112-000

**Der Präsident.** – Meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es ist mir eine große Ehre, den tunesischen Staatspräsidenten Moncef Marzouki im Europäischen Parlament in Straßburg begrüßen zu dürfen. Herzlich willkommen, Herr Staatspräsident!

(Beifall)

Während Sie hier zu uns gekommen sind, trauert zur gleichen Stunde Ihr Land um den Führer der Volksfront, Chokri Belaïd, der heute Morgen auf schreckliche Weise ermordet worden ist. Wir verurteilen dieses Attentat mit großem Nachdruck.

*(Beifall)*

Wir wissen, dass die tunesischen Behörden alles tun und die nötigen Maßnahmen ergreifen werden, um die Verantwortlichen vor Gericht zu bringen. Ein solches Verbrechen darf nicht ungesühnt bleiben. Ich möchte der Familie von Herrn Belaïd und dem tunesischen Volk unser Beileid aussprechen. Wir stehen in dieser schweren Stunde an Ihrer Seite, und ich appelliere an alle Bürgerinnen und Bürger Tunesiens, aufzustehen und einzustehen für die Demokratie, damit der Geist der Einheit und des Einvernehmens, der am 14. Januar 2011 zur Befreiung des Landes geführt hat, erhalten bleibt.

Herr Präsident, in Ihrer Person nehmen wir mit offenen Armen den Vertreter eines würdigen und mutigen Volkes in Empfang. Ihr Volk hat vor zwei Jahren einem der repressivsten und auch einem der korruptesten Regime der Welt auf friedlichem Wege ein Ende gesetzt.

Herr Präsident, mit Ihrer Präsenz hier in diesem Plenarsaal geben Sie uns die Gelegenheit, auch der Tunesierinnen und Tunesier zu gedenken, die für die Freiheit und die Würde mit ihrem Leben bezahlt haben, und schließlich, meine Damen und Herren, empfangen wir mit Herrn Staatspräsidenten, mit Ihnen, in dieser Stadt einen Mann, der sich als Arzt und als Exilant über 15 Jahre lang hier in Straßburg seinen Patienten gewidmet hat und unermüdlich für die Menschenrechte eingetreten ist.

Meine Damen und Herren, Herr Staatspräsident hat mir eben, während ich ihn in Empfang nehmen durfte, erzählt: „Ich habe als Bürger von Straßburg den Bau des alten Parlamentsgebäudes und den Bau des neuen Parlamentsgebäudes sehen können, als Nachbar, in einer anderen Straße hier, und es ist für mich ein Moment der Emotion“, so hat er gesagt, „dass ich als jemand, der 23 Jahre im Exil in der Nachbarschaft dieses Gebäudes gelebt hat, wo dieses Gebäude immer das Symbol für die Hoffnung war, dass es eines Tages zur Demokratie und Freiheit in meinem Land kommt, hier empfangen werde.“ Der Herr Staatspräsident hat mir gesagt, es sei für ihn persönlich ein großer emotionaler Augenblick, jetzt hier zu sein. Ich glaube, Herr Präsident, es ist auch für uns ein emotionaler Moment, Sie hier willkommen heißen zu dürfen.

*(Beifall)*

Ihr Volk hat die Fesseln der Willkür gesprengt und damit einen historischen Weg in Richtung Demokratie und Rechtsstaat eingeschlagen. Dieser Weg war weit und steinig, und er bleibt voller Herausforderungen. Er bleibt schwer und schmerzhaft. Ich bin allerdings nach wie vor davon überzeugt, dass es für Ihr Land keinen Weg zurück geben wird, sondern dass auf dem Weg zur Demokratie weiter vorangeschritten wird.

Ich war im Dezember Ihr Gast in Tunis. Ich war zum ersten Mal in Ihrem Land, und ich muss zugeben, dass ich voller Befangenheit da war, weil ich nicht wusste, wie ein Land in Transformation ist. Aber ich muss Ihnen sagen, der Mut, die Courage und der Aufbruch in Ihrem Land ist faszinierend.

Sie haben mir in freundschaftlichen und offenen Worten erklärt, dass es Ihre Rolle als Präsident sei, allen Tunesiern Zuversicht zu vermitteln. „Denjenigen, die für den Erhalt ihres Lebensstandards kämpfen, und denjenigen, die für die Verbesserung der Demokratie kämpfen, eine Hoffnung zu geben“, haben Sie mir gesagt, „ist die Aufgabe eines

Staatspräsidenten.“ Dazu braucht ein Staatspräsident Unterstützung, und diese Unterstützung werden Sie hier in diesem Parlament ganz sicher finden.

Herzlich willkommen, Herr Staatspräsident!

(Beifall)

3-113-000

**Moncef Marzouki**, *Président de la République tunisienne* . – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, chers amis, de 1996 à 2001, la dictature m'avait interdit de quitter la Tunisie. Le Parlement européen y a répondu par ce document, "Le passeport de la liberté", remis à ma fille cadette en ce lieu en 2000.

Ce passeport symbolique a été parrainé par Hélène Flautre, Jean-Pierre Thierry, Michel Rocard, Astrid Thors, Gianfranco Dell'Alba, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, Daniel Ducarme, José María Mendiluce, Alain Lipietz, Fodé Sylla, Alima Thierry-Boumediene, Cecilia Malmström, Marie-Arlette Carlotti, Françoise Grossetête et François Zimeray.

Qu'il me soit permis de leur exprimer ma profonde gratitude et, par-delà mon cas et leurs personnes, la gratitude de tous les démocrates tunisiens et arabes qui ont toujours trouvé dans cette institution représentant les peuples de l'Europe un soutien sans équivoque.

(Applaudissements)

Mesdames et Messieurs, à la fin des années 90, j'avais écrit que, si le XVIIIe siècle a été le siècle des révolutions française et américaine, le XXe celui des révolutions russe et chinoise, le XXIe siècle sera le siècle de la révolution arabe. Ce n'était pas à force de lire dans le marc de café, mais dans le livre de l'Histoire. Les grandes nations ne se suicident pas, ne se laissent pas mourir. Au plus profond d'elles-mêmes, elles finissent, quand tout semble perdu, par retrouver l'énergie de rebondir. Plus long est le calvaire, plus profonde est la chute, plus forte est l'énergie qui va les propulser hors du trou où elles sont tombées.

Les révolutions arabes, inscrites dans une sorte de fatalité de l'Histoire, ont donc fini par arriver. La question fondamentale et légitime qui se pose à vous comme à tous les Européens est simple: ces révolutions sont-elles pour nous un bien ou un mal, une chance ou un danger? Pour comprendre les événements, les peuples, les êtres humains, voire les animaux ou même les choses, il faut une dose minimale d'empathie. Sans elle, ce que nous voyons se ferme au regard et se dérobe à l'entendement. Je ne demande pas simplement votre attention mais aussi votre empathie, Mesdames et Messieurs, sans laquelle il n'y a aucune chance que nous puissions communiquer et nous rencontrer.

Oui, les révolutions arabes peuvent poser à l'Europe de sérieux problèmes. On voit déjà se profiler les principaux. Il y a le risque de les voir dégénérer en désordres, en guerres civiles voire en guerres régionales, comme c'est déjà le cas en Syrie, avec tout l'impact que cela peut avoir sur la sécurité de l'Europe.

Le deuxième risque, nous l'avons vécu au lendemain de la chute de la dictature en Tunisie. Nos jeunes, profitant de l'effondrement de l'appareil sécuritaire et connaissant mal les difficultés économiques de l'Europe, se sont précipités sur les bateaux pour prendre d'assaut vos côtes dans l'espoir d'une vie immédiatement meilleure.

Il y a enfin la troisième menace: l'extrémisme islamiste armé, que nous appelons le salafisme djihadiste, qui pourrait retrouver une nouvelle vigueur à l'occasion de la poussée de fièvre

que connaît cette région du monde. Menace mondiale dans le cas d'Al Qaïda, menace régionale comme dans le nord du Mali, à l'origine de la nécessaire intervention française, il est surtout une menace nationale dans chaque pays du printemps arabe, car c'est lui, et non les suppôts de l'ancien régime, qui constitue la partie la plus dangereuse de la contre-révolution. Et pour cause, la révolution démocratique lui a coupé l'herbe sous le pied et l'a frustré de ce qu'il croyait être sa chance historique d'hériter des dictatures déchues.

*(Applaudissements)*

Mesdames et Messieurs, le verre est aussi à moitié plein. Non, il n'y a rien à craindre des révolutions arabes, car ce ne sont pas des révolutions nationalistes ou xénophobes. Lors de leurs déclenchements, on n'a pas entendu les habituels slogans antioccidentaux ou anti-israéliens. Et pour cause, la liberté n'est plus arrachée à l'occupant étranger, mais à une dictature corrompue et brutale qui a fini par se constituer en véritable occupation interne. Les dernières manifestations violentes de salafistes djihadistes contre les ambassades occidentales, lors de cette lamentable histoire de la vidéo islamophobe, n'ont réuni que quelques centaines d'individus, sous le regard inquiet et désapprobateur de l'écrasante majorité.

Non, il n'y a vraiment rien à craindre des révolutions arabes, car ces révolutions sont d'abord et avant tout des révolutions sociales, se battant pour les mêmes droits sociaux et économiques qui ont été à l'origine de vos propres évolutions ou révolutions. Non, il n'y a rien à craindre des révolutions arabes, car ce sont des révolutions démocratiques.

Certes, les partis islamistes ont remporté des victoires électorales indéniables en Tunisie, en Libye, en Égypte. Mais n'est-ce pas la démocratie qui a amené une fraction importante de l'islamisme dans son camp? N'est-ce pas elle qui leur a imposé ses règles, son éthique et, en arrière-plan, sa vision du monde?

Non, ce n'est pas l'islamisme qui a triomphé dans le sillage du printemps arabe, qu'il pervertirait ou récupérerait, comme le craignent certains, ce ne sont pas les démocrates qui se sont "convertis" à cette idéologie politique appelée l'islamisme, mais ce sont bel et bien les tenants de cette doctrine – du moins la fraction modérée largement majoritaire dans le spectre islamiste tunisien – qui se sont convertis à la démocratie.

Sont-ils sincères ou manœuvrent-ils? Qui le dira mieux que le temps? Ils devront apprendre le jeu et le jouer selon les règles de la démocratie, sinon ils auront à réinstaller une dictature religieuse, que les Arabes liquideront comme ils ont liquidé celles à visage dit nationaliste ou dit socialiste.

*(Applaudissements)*

Quant à ceux qui parlent déjà de l'hiver islamiste succédant au printemps arabe, ils ne semblent pas connaître le nombre d'années, voire de décennies, qu'il a fallu à d'autres peuples pour retrouver un équilibre après une révolution.

Mesdames et Messieurs, pour ce qui est du devenir de ces révolutions, tout est en jeu, rien n'est encore joué. En Tunisie, mon pays, celui que je connais le mieux, nous sommes fiers d'avoir fait une révolution au plus faible coût humain possible. Je pense ici avec une grande émotion au calvaire du peuple syrien qui, lui, paie sa liberté au plus fort prix et qui a besoin plus que jamais du soutien humanitaire et politique de tous les peuples libres et surtout de l'Europe.

*(Applaudissements)*

Nous avons mis en place un gouvernement de coalition entre laïcs modérés et islamistes modérés, pour que les deux composantes, moderniste et traditionaliste, de notre peuple se retrouvent dans ceux qui conduisent leurs affaires.

Ce gouvernement fonctionne. Il a restauré un État qui avait cessé d'exister en 2011. Il a remis en marche la machine économique qui fait que la Tunisie est passée d'un taux de croissance de -1,8 % en 2011 à + 3,5 % en 2012. Certes, le gouvernement dysfonctionne du fait de tous les conflits personnels et politiques propres à toutes les coalitions, mais nous n'avons pas cependant de meilleur choix et il faudra bien s'en accommoder jusqu'aux prochaines élections, que nous voulons aussi proches que possible.

Nous rédigeons depuis des mois la constitution d'un État démocratique et civil, d'une société plurielle, avec les difficultés que vous imaginez, mais, là aussi, l'esprit du consensus l'emporte, et nous espérons nous mettre d'accord sur le texte dans les deux ou trois mois.

Nous sommes absolument déterminés à promouvoir et à défendre toutes les libertés, à protéger les acquis de la femme, mais on ne change pas les attitudes et les comportements de plus de cinquante ans en deux années.

Nous sommes déterminés à protéger le mode de vie des Tunisiens, de la Tunisie moderniste et à élever le niveau de vie de la Tunisie pauvre et oubliée, mais les défis socio-économiques sont colossaux, tant l'héritage de la dictature, soigneusement camouflé pendant plus de vingt ans, se révèle lourd.

Nous sommes absolument déterminés à continuer notre stratégie d'absorption de la fraction moderniste, modérée de l'islamisme – car elle existe, n'en déplaise aux idéologues qui ne voient ni la complexité, ni la dynamique de la chose politique – et tout aussi déterminés à faire face à sa fraction insoluble dans la démocratie, et ce par les moyens sécuritaires dans le cadre de la loi et du respect des droits de l'homme, mais surtout par le développement social, économique et culturel. Nous n'accepterons jamais que ce courant, l'équivalent de votre extrême droite, mette en danger notre modèle de société profondément arrimé à son héritage arabo-musulman mais résolument tourné vers la modernité. Nous ne le laisserons pas mettre en danger les acquis de la femme, les droits de l'homme ou la relation à l'Occident, que nous voulons pacifiée, amicale et basée sur le respect mutuel, et le partenariat profitable à nos deux communautés.

*(Applaudissements)*

Ce chemin, Mesdames et Messieurs, est semé d'embûches, de beaucoup d'embûches, car cette révolution pacifique compte de nombreux ennemis, qui sont décidés à la faire échouer. Une violence verbale orchestrée, des marabouts brûlés, pour dresser les musulmans contre les musulmans, et aujourd'hui, cet odieux assassinat d'un leader politique que je connais bien, qui a été pour moi un ami de longue date, Chokri Belaïd. Cet assassinat politique aujourd'hui même, alors que j'allais m'adresser à vous, c'est une menace, c'est une lettre envoyée, mais qui ne sera pas reçue. Nous refusons cette lettre, nous refusons ce message et nous continuerons, d'abord à démasquer les ennemis de la révolution...

*(Applaudissements)*

... et aussi à mener notre politique.

Tout ce processus de démocratisation de l'État et de la société, de mise en place d'un développement durable se révèle être donc plus difficile, plus complexe et surtout plus long que prévu, mais il avance.

Beaucoup de facteurs vont décider du sort de notre révolution et des révolutions arabes: la détermination des peuples ou leur découragement, la sagesse des hommes ou leur folie, cet effet papillon si difficile à identifier et à contrôler et qu'on désigne, à défaut d'autre vocable, sous les termes de chance ou de providence. Mais vous pouvez parier sur la Tunisie, qui est aujourd'hui le véritable laboratoire d'une grande transition ayant vocation de réussir.

Mesdames et Messieurs, nous avons beaucoup souffert en Tunisie de l'absence de l'état de droit national mais aussi de son absence sur le plan international. Face aux élections présidentielles organisées par le dictateur et gagnées sur l'éternel score de 99 %, nous, démocrates et militants des droits de l'homme, n'avions aucun recours pour demander l'invalidation de ces élections truquées. Pas de cour constitutionnelle nationale, pas de cour constitutionnelle internationale. D'où l'idée de cette dernière: une instance supranationale chargée de statuer à partir de la Déclaration universelle des droits de l'Homme, des pactes et traités internationaux, sur la validité d'une élection et sur la conformité d'une constitution nationale avec les standards internationaux.

Cet organisme dont j'ai rêvé en intellectuel persécuté est aujourd'hui un projet ficelé qui a eu l'aval du sommet de l'Union africaine à Addis-Abeba la semaine dernière. Il a recueilli l'appui de plusieurs États sud-américains et je suis là pour vous demander, au nom de la Tunisie, de l'appuyer afin que l'état de droit sur le plan mondial continue d'avancer et la démocratie de se renforcer.

Mesdames et Messieurs, nous devons certes compter sur nous-mêmes, mais nous voulons aussi pouvoir compter sur l'Europe, surtout que pour la première fois dans notre histoire commune, nos intérêts et idéaux concordent.

Nous comprenons les difficultés de nos partenaires de la rive nord de notre mer commune mais, à moyen terme, nous sommes sûrs qu'investir et s'investir dans la consolidation de notre économie, c'est aussi consolider notre démocratie naissante et donc consolider la démocratie tout court.

Je voudrais ici remercier l'Allemagne pour avoir accepté de reconvertir une partie de notre dette – l'équivalent de 60 millions d'euros – en projets de développement. Nous espérons que nos autres partenaires, et notamment le premier d'entre eux, la France, fassent de même.

Mesdames et Messieurs, au-delà cet aspect strictement économique, il y a dans les relations entre nos deux mondes quelque chose de plus profond. Les astronomes identifient les galaxies et les groupements de galaxies. Nous pouvons identifier de la même façon des cultures et des groupes de cultures. Quelqu'un a dit à juste titre que l'Orient commençait quelque part à l'est de l'Iran. "Maghreb" signifie en arabe "occident", et dans un certain sens nous sommes des sud-occidentaux partageant avec les nord-occidentaux que vous êtes le même héritage grec, judéo-chrétien et musulman, une histoire douloureuse partagée, des croisades à la colonisation. Tout cela a tissé des relations complexes, mais puissantes, entre deux communautés.

On sait ce que l'Occident naissant doit à la culture arabo-musulmane. On sait aussi que la modernité de la culture arabo-musulmane est en grande partie l'appropriation de ce que l'Europe a créé de mieux dans le domaine des arts, de la culture, des sciences et de la politique. J'aimerais rappeler que les échanges humains ne sont enrichissants pour les uns et pour les autres, surtout s'ils se veulent pérennes, que dans l'égalité. Les trois cent millions d'Arabes ont promu plusieurs langues européennes qui font aujourd'hui partie intégrante de leur culture. Laissez-moi ici exprimer le vœu que l'Europe saura donner à la langue et

la culture arabes une place injustement refusée dans le cadre des relations inégales qui seront de moins en moins acceptées par nos nouvelles générations.

*(Applaudissements)*

Mesdames et Messieurs, l'influence européenne sur le monde arabe est aussi idéologique et cela ne date pas d'aujourd'hui. Durant le vingtième siècle, tour à tour, l'Égypte, l'Irak ou la Libye se sont vus dans le rôle de la Prusse, Nasser, Saddam et Kadhafi se voyant être les Bismarck arabes. Ce modèle de l'unité arabe fondé sur la force des armes et le charisme d'un chef a fait faillite, et tant mieux pour les Arabes et le monde. Aujourd'hui, ce qui nous fait rêver c'est une union maghrébine, et plus tard arabe, sur le modèle de l'Union européenne, c'est-à-dire une union d'États démocratiques et de peuples libres, travaillant ensemble pour le bien de tous.

*(Applaudissements)*

L'Union européenne nous fascine aussi par ce qu'elle a réussi de plus remarquable, pour ne pas dire de miraculeux: la réconciliation franco-allemande. L'existence d'un tel miracle montre sa possibilité et aussi la possibilité de sa reproduction, malgré la rareté des miracles.

Laissez-moi ici vous demander de préparer la venue de cette paix que nous attendons tous au Proche-Orient.

Demandez à tous vos collègues israéliens, face au blocage actuel, gros de toutes les menaces futures sur la paix dans cette région et dans le monde, de réfléchir à une paix qui ne rime ni avec reddition, ni avec une longue trêve que chaque camp utilise pour fourbir ses armes en vue d'un nouveau round dans la guerre éternelle.

Demandez-leur de libérer Marwan Barghouti, parlementaire comme vous...  
*(Applaudissements)*

... et de le laisser venir en Tunisie récupérer une santé détruite par dix années de prison en isolement total.

Mesdames et Messieurs, j'ai commencé par un souvenir personnel, permettez-moi de terminer par un autre souvenir personnel.

Strasbourg est la ville où j'ai fait mes études, appris mon métier, la ville dont les habitants m'ont profondément marqué, par leur sens du travail, de la discipline et de la modestie, la ville où sont nées mes deux filles. C'est aussi la ville où se sont décidés les choix fondamentaux qui ont dirigé le reste de ma vie.

Jeune interne, au début des années 70, je me suis présenté devant l'un de mes maîtres les plus prestigieux de la faculté de médecine de Strasbourg, pour lui demander un sujet de thèse pour mon doctorat. Il me proposa de travailler sur la question de l'expérimentation humaine en médecine. J'ai tout de suite accepté, pas parce que le sujet m'intéressait, mais parce que je voulais me dire l'élève de Marc Klein. Ce que je ne savais pas, c'est que mon vénéré maître, parce qu'il était juif, avait été envoyé dans un camp de concentration, et parce qu'il était médecin, il avait été affecté à une unité d'expérimentation médicale sur les prisonniers.

La préparation de la thèse fut un voyage dans l'horreur, l'horreur d'une science sans conscience, l'horreur d'une nature humaine capable du pire, l'horreur de régimes politiques déments, l'horreur de la banalité du mal.



C'est lors de mes recherches que j'ai lu pour la première fois la déclaration universelle des droits de l'homme, et c'est là que tout a basculé.

Je ne pense pas que Marc Klein ait réalisé un instant l'impact qu'il allait exercer sur la vie de ce jeune interne étranger venu lui demander l'honneur d'être son élève, ni l'impact que cela allait avoir, par des voies mystérieuses, sur le destin de milliers d'autres hommes. Il était à mille lieues d'imaginer ce que son influence allait me coûter en termes de combats, de prison, d'exil, d'années de persécution, mais aussi en termes de combats, d'accomplissements et de victoires.

Parce que cette victoire, qui me permet d'être aujourd'hui ici, en ce haut lieu de la démocratie, de la paix et de la fraternité entre les peuples, d'y prendre la parole en homme libre parlant au nom d'un peuple libre, est aussi la sienne, permettez-moi de la lui dédier.

*(Applaudissements)*

Permettez-moi enfin de saluer par la même occasion Strasbourg, l'Alsace, l'amitié franco-tunisienne et l'amitié euro-arabe.

Je termine par le plus beau salut échangé entre les hommes: As-salâm

aleïkoum, Que la paix soit sur vous.

*(L'Assemblée, debout, applaudit l'orateur)*

3-114-000

**Der Präsident.** – Meine Damen und Herren, ich glaube, ich brauche den Worten des Präsidenten und Ihrem Beifall nichts hinzuzufügen. Aber ich habe gerade mit dem Herrn Staatspräsidenten vereinbart – weil ich während der Rede des Präsidenten eine Reihe von Bitten bekommen habe –, dass dieses Haus auch symbolisch über den Beifall hinaus dem Opfer und den Opfern eine Ehrung zuteil werden lässt, indem es am Ende dieser Sitzung eine Schweigeminute einlegt. Ich würde Sie bitten, sich von Ihren Plätzen zu erheben.

*(Das Parlament legt eine Schweigeminute ein.)*

Ich darf mich herzlich bei Ihnen bedanken. Ich danke dem Staatspräsidenten von Tunesien. Ich glaube, das war ein bewegender Moment.

Vive la Tunisie, vive la liberté et vive la démocratie, Monsieur le Président!

*(Vifs applaudissements)*

3-116-000

## ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ANNY ΠΟΔΗΜΑΤΑ

*Αντιπρόεδρος*

### 7. Ώρα των ψηφοφοριών (συνέχεια)

3-118-000

**Πρόεδρος.** - Το επόμενο σημείο είναι η συνέχιση των ψηφοφοριών.

*(Για τα αποτελέσματα και άλλες πληροφορίες σχετικά με τις ψηφοφορίες: Βλέπε Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά)*

### 7.1. Κοινή αλιευτική πολιτική (A7-0008/2013 - Ulrike Rodust) (ψηφοφορία)

3-120-000

- Πριν από την ψηφοφορία επί της τροπολογίας 106

3-121-000

**József Szájer (PPE).** - Madam President, I apologise to the House for taking your time with our internal matters. We have a mistake in our voting list under 106. The first part we voted 'No' and the second part 'Yes'. I apologise for taking your time.

3-122-000

- Προφορική τροπολογία επί της τροπολογίας 119

3-123-000

**Ulrike Rodust, Berichterstatterin .** – Frau Präsidentin! Im Namen der S&D-Fraktion stelle ich folgenden mündlichen Antrag zu Artikel 15: Absatz 1 Buchstabe a soll wie folgt lauten: „spätestens ab 1. Januar 2014 Fischerei auf kleine pelagische Arten, d. h. Fischerei auf Makrele, Hering, Stöcker, Blauen Wittling, Sardelle, Goldlachs, Sardine, Sprotte;“. Das heißt, der Eberfisch wird aus der Liste gestrichen. Begründung: Damit ist das Rückwurfverbot auch im Mittelmeer möglich.

Ich bitte Sie, dem zuzustimmen.

3-124-000

(Η προφορική τροπολογία κρατείται)

- Πριν από την ψηφοφορία επί της τροπολογίας 298

3-125-000

**Ulrike Rodust, Berichterstatterin .** – Frau Präsidentin! Können Sie bitte noch einmal die Abstimmung davor wiederholen? Bei der Übersetzung sind falsche Zahlen angekommen. Wir haben eine falsche Nummer bekommen.

### 7.2. Ηχοστάθμη των μηχανοκίνητων οχημάτων (A7-0435/2012 - Miroslav Ouzký) (ψηφοφορία)

3-127-000

- Πριν από την ψηφοφορία επί της τροπολογίας 51

3-128-000

**Miroslav Ouzký, rapporteur .** – Madam President, before this vote I just want to announce, as rapporteur, that there is no point holding a split vote here because it is just one tab. If we want to avoid messing things up further down the line, I would like to ask anyone wishing to vote against one part to vote against both.

### 7.3. Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Προσφύγων, Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Επιστροφής και Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Ένταξης Υπηκόων Τρίτων Χωρών (A7-0004/2013 - Nils Torvalds) (ψηφοφορία)

#### 7.4. Ταμείο Εξωτερικών Συνόρων (A7-0433/2012 - Nils Torvalds) (ψηφοφορία)

#### 7.5. Διατήρηση των αλιευτικών πόρων (A7-0342/2012 - Pat the Cope Gallagher) (ψηφοφορία)

3-132-000

- Πριν από την ψηφοφορία

3-133-000

**Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE).** - Madam President, from the outset I want to thank the House for their support in November and January in deferring my report on technical conservation measures. The whole purpose of deferring the vote was to focus attention on the impasse between Parliament and the Council of Ministers on the issue of long-term management plans.

No progress had been made on these important plans since the introduction of the Lisbon Treaty in 2009; and this was by successive Council presidencies. Long-term management plans will be a key cornerstone of the new and reinforced common fisheries policy – which we have just recommended – as the purpose of these plans is to protect fishery resources while ensuring the livelihood of communities depending on fisheries. Last week the issue was discussed by Ministers under the Irish Presidency. The Irish Minister confirmed to the Chair of the Committee on Fisheries, Gabriel Mato, that the Council will make every effort to find an acceptable compromise. So as a gesture of goodwill the Committee on Fisheries have decided to go ahead and vote on my report today.

However, the committee, let me say a note of warning, will closely monitor developments over the next number of weeks and if no progress is made we will review our position and we may – hopefully only may – be forced to block the adoption of further reports if necessary.

3-134-000

**Werner Langen (PPE).** - Frau Vizepräsidentin! Könnten Sie entweder sofort das Telefonieren einstellen oder Ihren Platz für einen fähigen Präsidenten räumen?

(Beifall)

3-135-000

**Πρόεδρος.** - Κυρίες και κύριοι συνάδελφοι, τα σχόλια εκφράζουν αυτούς που τα διατυπώνουν.

#### 7.6. Εξάλειψη και πρόληψη όλων των μορφών βίας κατά των γυναικών και των κοριτσιών (B7-0049/2013) (ψηφοφορία)

3-137-000

- Πριν από την ψηφοφορία

3-138-000

**Licia Ronzulli (PPE).** - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ancora oggi e purtroppo anche all'interno di quest'Assemblea sentiamo frasi che assomigliano a una giustificazione delle violenze e che addossano la responsabilità di questo proprio alle donne. Parole dal

forte significato misogino, pronunciate anche da colleghe, che non possiamo né tollerare né accettare. Tutti noi dobbiamo condannarle con forza e determinazione. Senza un cambio radicale di mentalità tutti gli sforzi che facciamo quotidianamente saranno vani.

**7.7. Ευρωπαϊκή σύμπραξη καινοτομίας με θέμα την ενεργό και υγιή γήρανση (A7-0029/2013 - Kartika Tamara Liotard) (ψηφοφορία)**

**7.8. Προπαρασκευαστικές εργασίες ενόψει της 16ης Διάσκεψης των Συμβαλλομένων Μερών στη Σύμβαση για το Διεθνές Εμπόριο των Απειλούμενων με Εξάλειψη Αγρίων Ειδών Πανίδας και Χλωρίδας (CITES) (B7-0047/2013) (ψηφοφορία)**

**7.9. Κατευθυντήριες γραμμές για τον προϋπολογισμό 2014 - άλλα τμήματα πλην της Επιτροπής (A7-0020/2013 - Monika Hohlmeier) (ψηφοφορία)**

3-142-000

- Προφορική τροπολογία επί της παραγράφου 6

3-143-000

**Monika Hohlmeier, Berichterstatterin.** – Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die mündliche Änderung geht ganz kurz. Es wird das Wort „demand driven“ gegen das Wort „end“ ausgetauscht, und der restliche Text bleibt.

3-144-000

(Η προφορική τροπολογία κρατείται)

**7.10. Εταιρική κοινωνική ευθύνη: λογοδοσία, διαφάνεια και υπευθυνότητα στην επιχειρηματική συμπεριφορά και βιώσιμη ανάπτυξη (A7-0017/2013 - Raffaele Baldassarre) (ψηφοφορία)**

3-146-000

- Μετά από την παράγραφο 47

3-147-000

**Raffaele Baldassarre, relatore.** – Signora Presidente, si tratta di un emendamento orale il quale inserisce dopo il paragrafo 47 il seguente titolo: "Questioni di conformità e relazioni con i paesi terzi".

3-148-000

(Η προφορική τροπολογία κρατείται)

**7.11. Εταιρική κοινωνική ευθύνη: προώθηση των συμφερόντων της κοινωνίας και πορεία προς μια βιώσιμη και χωρίς αποκλεισμούς ανάκαμψη (A7-0023/2013 - Richard Howitt) (ψηφοφορία)**

## 8. Αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

3-151-000

**Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE).** - Madame la Présidente, je voudrais intervenir sur la base de l'article 213 de notre règlement.

Madame la Présidente, nous avons connu une séance solennelle exceptionnelle en présence du Président de la République tunisienne, Moncef Marzouki. Je voudrais exprimer le regret qu'à cette occasion – et c'est prévu par le règlement intérieur – nous n'ayons pas fait jouer l'hymne européen, puisque l'hymne européen est normalement joué pour souhaiter la bienvenue à des chefs d'État et à l'occasion de chaque séance solennelle.

**8.1. Συμφωνία ΕΕ-ΗΠΑ δυνάμει της Γενικής Συμφωνίας Δασμών και Εμπορίου (ΓΣΔΕ) του 1994: τροποποίηση των παραχωρήσεων που προβλέπονται στους πίνακες της Δημοκρατίας της Βουλγαρίας και της Ρουμανίας στο πλαίσιο της προσχώρησής τους στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση (Α7-0430/2012 - Vital Moreira)**

3-153-000

### Γραπτές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

3-153-062

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D),** *por escrito.* – Aprovo a presente recomendação, considerando antes de mais essencial potenciar os novos Estados-Membros da União Europeia a tomarem total proveito da ajuda da União Europeia no seu processo de integração, e, ao mesmo tempo, apoiar estes países a terem as condições devidas no âmbito das trocas globais. Deste modo, aprovo esta recomendação que pretende ajustar as obrigações da União Europeia sob as regras da Organização Mundial do Comércio, após a adesão da Bulgária e da Roménia. O propósito é acordar com os membros da Organização Mundial do Comércio um ajustamento justo e mutuamente satisfatório de modo a evitar perdas para estes países recém-membros da União.

3-153-125

**Sophie Auconie (PPE),** *par écrit.* – Ce rapport vise à adapter les règles du commerce international. En effet, avec l'adhésion de la Bulgarie et de la Roumanie, l'Union européenne (UE) a élargi son union douanière. Selon les règles de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce (OMC), l'UE doit ouvrir des négociations avec les membres de l'OMC concernés pour convenir de compensations. Ce genre de texte survient lors de chaque élargissement et j'ai donc voté en faveur.

3-153-250

**Elena Băsescu (PPE),** *în scris.* – Am votat în favoarea raportului deoarece acesta vizează asumarea responsabilităților UE față de partenerii săi comerciali. Aderarea țării mele și a Bulgariei în 2007 a determinat extinderea vamală a UE. Fiind membră a OMC, UE trebuie să se supună normelor organizației. În această situație, este nevoie de o ajustare care să compenseze creșterea taxelor vamale consolidate și pierderile semnificative aferente. Ajustarea este benefică tuturor statelor membre OMC, indiferent dacă țările care au aderat recent practicau tarife vamale mai mici sau mai mari față de UE. Este dreptul SUA să își restabilească drepturile comerciale anterioare în urma extinderii uniunii vamale. De aceea,

salut acordul încheiat cu SUA, care demonstrează atașamentul UE față de regimul comercial bazat pe norme multilaterale și încercarea de a facilita comerțul între părțile contractante.

3-153-500

**Nora Berra (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Avec l'adhésion de la Bulgarie et de la Roumanie, l'Union européenne a élargi son union douanière. Elle était tenue, selon les règles de l'OMC, d'ouvrir les négociations avec les membres de l'OMC concernés pour convenir d'un ajustement compensatoire. L'approbation du Parlement étant indispensable pour la conclusion de cet accord, j'y ajoute ma voix.

3-153-750

**Adam Bielan (ECR)**, *na piśmie*. – Głosowałem za przyjęciem rezolucji. Stany Zjednoczone pozostają jednym z najważniejszych producentów na świecie i zarazem kluczowym partnerem gospodarczym Europy. Wskutek rozszerzenia unii celnej po przystąpieniu Bułgarii i Rumunii, prawa handlowe tego kraju uległy nieznacznemu nadwerżeniu. W zgodzie z międzynarodowymi zasadami funkcjonowania Światowej Organizacji Handlu, której Unia jest członkiem, zobowiązani jesteśmy niwelować niedogodności w handlu zagranicznym. Przywrócenie praw handlowych Stanów Zjednoczonych w relacjach z nowymi krajami Wspólnoty jest korzystne dla wszystkich stron.

3-154-000

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**, *per iscritto*. – Ho sostenuto col mio voto la relazione Moreira sull'accordo fra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti d'America per la modifica delle concessioni negli elenchi della Repubblica di Bulgaria e della Romania. Il presente accordo non pregiudica gli interessi dell'Unione. Si tratta di un adeguamento necessario per ripristinare i diritti della controparte americana in seguito all'ingresso di Bulgaria e Romania nell'UE. Il loro mancato rispetto avrebbe implicato una violazione delle regole dell'Organizzazione mondiale del commercio.

3-155-000

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – În 2007, Uniunea Europeană și-a extins uniunea vamală cu încă două state, Bulgaria și România. În aceste condiții, UE a fost obligată să intre în negocieri cu statele membre ale OMC, având drepturi de negociere în ceea ce privește listele de angajamente ale oricărui viitor membru în curs de aderare în scopul de a conveni asupra unei ajustări reciproc avantajoase care să compenseze creșterea taxelor vamale consolidate și pierderile semnificative aferente. Dacă adoptarea regimului tarifar extern al UE duce la o creștere a taxelor vamale peste nivelul practicat de Bulgaria și România, atunci aceste compensații sunt necesare.

3-155-500

**Cristian Silviu Bușoi (ALDE)**, *în scris*. – Idealul unei uniuni vamale sau a unei zone de comerț liber este acela de a facilita comerțul între teritoriile care o compun și nu să ridice bariere. Intrarea României și Bulgariei în Uniunea Europeană a presupus și lansarea unor negocieri a tarifelor vamale cu țările care fac parte din Organizația Mondială a Comerțului. Cei care au avut de câștigat cel mai mult au fost membrii OMC și comerțul liber deoarece, la momentul aderării, atât România, cât și Bulgaria practicau taxe vamale mai mari decât cele ale UE. În cazul opus, unde România și Bulgaria au fost nevoite să își mărească taxele și cotele vamale pentru a și le ajusta la politica de tarife externe ale UE, încalcându-și astfel

angajamentele luate în OMC, UE a fost cea care a trebuit să compenseze diferența. Acest angajament a arătat încă o dată simpatia instituțiilor europene pentru comerțul multilateral.

3-155-750

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Com a adesão da Bulgária e da Roménia, a União alargou a sua união aduaneira, e em concordância com as regras da OMC foi chamada a negociações para um acordo quanto a um ajustamento compensatório, de modo a satisfazer todas as partes, contrabalançando perdas e ganhos de todos os envolvidos. Este ajustamento deverá ser feito caso a adoção do regime pautal externo da UE resulte num aumento dos direitos que ultrapasse o nível em relação ao qual o país aderente se comprometeu no âmbito da OMC. O instrumento mais frequente usado na compensação dos direitos mais elevados é a abertura do contingente pautal atribuído por país ou o aditamento do contingente pautal pré-adesão. Em 27 de janeiro de 2007, o Conselho autorizou a Comissão a entrar em negociações com os países que têm direito a compensação, resultando as negociações com os Estados Unidos num projeto de acordo sob a forma de troca de cartas, através do qual os EUA são compensados pela sua posição comercial deteriorada. A Comissão escolheu o aumento dos contingentes pautais como instrumento de compensação para os produtos provenientes dos EUA. Voto a favor da presente Recomendação.

3-156-000

**Minodora Cliveti (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Odată cu aderarea Bulgariei și României, UE și-a extins uniunea vamală. UE a fost obligată, în conformitate cu normele OMC, să intre în negocieri cu statele membre ale OMC, cu drepturi de negociere în ceea ce privește listele de angajamente ale oricărui membru în curs de aderare în scopul de a conveni asupra unei ajustări reciproc avantajoase care să compenseze creșterea taxelor vamale consolidate și pierderile semnificative aferente.

Extinderea UE este un factor pozitiv pentru membrii OMC. Când țările care au aderat practicau taxe vamale mai mari decât cele aplicate de UE, țările membre ale OMC sunt cele care au de câștigat. În caz contrar, atunci când țările care au aderat practicau taxe vamale mai mici decât cele aplicate de UE și au fost obligate să își mărească taxele vamale, UE compensează diferența. Acordul de compensare UE-SUA vizează produse cum ar fi carnea de pasăre și de porc, precum și preparatele alimentare. Acordul privind noul contingent tarifar pentru aceste produse agricole va fi implementat prin intermediul unui regulament de aplicare ce urmează a fi adoptat de Comisie. SUA au dreptul să își restabilească drepturile comerciale anterioare în urma ușoarei erodări a acestora datorată extinderii uniunii vamale a UE odată cu aderarea României și Bulgariei.

3-156-500

**Mário David (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Votei a favor deste relatório que conclui o acordo entre a UE e os EUA, no âmbito da Organização Mundial do Comércio (OMC), relativo à alteração das concessões previstas nas listas da Bulgária e da Roménia no contexto da sua adesão à UE. Com a adesão da República da Bulgária e da Roménia, a União Europeia alargou a sua união aduaneira. Consequentemente, em conformidade com as regras da OMC, teve de iniciar negociações com os membros da OMC com poderes de negociação nas listas dos novos Estados-Membros para chegar a acordo quanto a um ajustamento compensatório que satisfaça todas as partes e contrabalance o aumento dos direitos consolidados e as consequentes perdas significativas. Assim, em 29 de janeiro de 2007, a Comissão é

autorizada pelo Conselho a iniciar negociações com os países que tinham direito a uma compensação. As negociações com os Estados Unidos resultaram num projeto de acordo sob forma de troca de cartas, que foi rubricado pela parte UE em 21 de dezembro de 2011 e pela parte EUA em 17 de fevereiro de 2012 e que se encontra agora em fase de conclusão.

3-156-750

**Edite Estrela (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente esta recomendação por introduzir as alterações necessárias no Acordo UE-EUA, nos termos do GATT de 1994, tendo em conta o alargamento da união aduaneira aquando da adesão da Roménia e da Bulgária à UE.

3-157-000

**Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this report. The accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the EU's customs union resulted in an increase in some tariffs beyond the level to which they had bound themselves at the WTO. Both countries therefore have the right to compensation. It is important that we respect the position of new EU members, particularly as we wish to see Wales as a Member State in its own right in the future.

3-157-250

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O acordo com os Estados Unidos é, por mim, bem recebido, uma vez que julgo que os EUA têm direito a que sejam restabelecidos os seus direitos comerciais, que tinham sofrido uma ligeira degradação devido ao alargamento da união aduaneira aquando da adesão da Roménia e da Bulgária à UE. Este acordo de compensação é um exemplo de que a UE tenciona respeitar as regras do regime de comércio multilateral no seio da OMC. A UE e os Estados Unidos notificaram-se mutuamente da conclusão dos respetivos procedimentos internos necessários para a entrada em vigor do Acordo.

3-157-375

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O colega Vital Moreira apresenta-nos uma recomendação sobre o projeto de decisão do Conselho que conclui um Acordo sob a forma de troca de cartas entre a União Europeia (UE) e os Estados Unidos da América (EUA), nos termos do artigo XXIV, n.º 6, e do artigo XXVIII do Acordo Geral sobre Pautas Aduaneiras e Comércio (GATT) de 1994, no que respeita à alteração de concessões previstas nas listas da República da Bulgária e da Roménia no contexto da adesão destes países à UE. Este acordo surge na sequência das negociações entre a UE e os membros da Organização Mundial do Comércio (OMC), com poderes delegados para tal, a fim de proceder a um ajustamento compensatório entre as partes. O projeto de acordo foi assinado pela UE em 21 de dezembro de 2011 e pelos EUA a 17 de fevereiro de 2012 e contempla, essencialmente, a carne de aves de capoeira e de porco. Considerando que o alargamento da UE a estes dois estados foi vantajoso para os membros da OMC e tendo em conta o parecer do relator, saúdo a conclusão deste acordo com os EUA e voto favoravelmente o mesmo.

3-157-500

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Como consequência da adesão da República da Bulgária e da Roménia à União Europeia, esta última teve que alargar a sua união aduaneira.



As regras da OMC impõem que seja estabelecido entre as partes aderentes um acordo que tenha como objetivo um ajustamento compensatório que contrabalance o aumento dos direitos consolidados e as consequentes perdas significativas. Assim, após a conclusão de vários acordos semelhantes de compensação, o Parlamento aprova o acordo entre a UE e os EUA, que cria novos contingentes pautais para a carne de aves de capoeira e de porco, bem como outras preparações alimentícias. É bem conhecida a nossa opinião relativamente às regras da OMC. A própria UE reconheceu que, em consequência do acordo estabelecido em 2007, relativo às aves de capoeira nos termos do artigo XXVIII do GATT de 1994, se assistiu a um forte aumento das importações de carnes de aves de capoeira que afetou negativamente o sector aviário europeu. Um exemplo entre muitos outros possíveis. É necessária uma profunda alteração das políticas comerciais vigentes, que ponha travão à desregulação e liberalização do comércio, que tantas dificuldades têm trazido ao tecido empresarial das economias mais débeis, como Portugal. Não podemos deixar de o assinalar em mais esta ocasião.

3-158-000

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D),** *písomne* . – Pristúpením Bulharska a Rumunška Európska Únia rozšírila svoju colnú úniu. V dôsledku toho bola EÚ v zmysle pravidiel WTO (článok XXIV ods. 6 dohody GATT z roku 1994) povinná začať rokovania s členmi WTO, ktorí majú právo rokovať v rámci zoznamov záväzkov pristupujúcich členov, s cieľom dohodnúť sa na vzájomne vyhovujúcom kompenzačnom vyrovnaní, aby sa vyvážilo zvýšenie cla a z neho vyplývajúce značné straty. Rada dňa 29. januára 2007 poverila Komisiu, aby začala rokovania s krajinami, ktoré majú nárok na kompenzáciu. Výsledkom rokovaní so Spojenými štátmi americkými je návrh dohody vo forme výmeny listov, ktorá bola parafovaná Európskou úniou 21. decembra 2011 a Spojenými štátmi americkými 17. februára 2012. V kompenzačnej dohode medzi EÚ a Spojenými štátmi je predmetom dohody samotnej predovšetkým hydínové a bravčové mäso, ako aj potravinové prípravky. Dohoda o nových colných kvótach pre poľnohospodárske výrobky bude vykonaná prostredníctvom vykonávajúceho nariadenia prijatého Komisiou. Európska únia dosiaľ uzavrela podobné kompenzačné dohody s Kubou, Brazíliou a (so súhlasom Parlamentu) aj s Austráliou, Novým Zélandom a Argentínou. Ďalší návrh dohody s Čínou bol parafovaný 31. mája.

3-158-500

**Jim Higgins (PPE),** *in writing* . – I welcome and support the agreement with the United States. With the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the EU, the trading rights of the US were impacted and it is right that they are now properly restored. I also agree with the decision of the Commission to use the increase in tariff rate quotas as the method by which to compensate the United States. My wish is that, following on from this, we will be able to work further on developing our trade links with the US.

3-158-625

**Juozas Imbrasas (EFD),** *raštu* . – Balsavau už šį dokumentą. Į Europos Sąjungą įstojus Bulgarijai ir Rumunijai, išsiplėtė jos muitų sąjunga. Todėl Europos Sąjunga pagal Pasaulio prekybos organizacijos (PPO) taisyklės buvo įpareigota pradėti derybas su PPO narėmis, turinčiomis derybų teisę dėl bet kurios stojančiosios šalies išipareigojimų sąrašo, kad būtų susitarta dėl abipusiškai priimtino kompensacinio sureguliojimo siekiant išvengti privalomų muitų didėjimo ir su tuo susijusių didelių nuostolių. Toks sureguliojimas privalomas, jei patvirtintus ES išorės muitų tarifų režimą muitų tarifai padidėja, palyginti su muitais, dėl

kurių stojančioji šalis įsipareigojo PPO, „atsižvelgdama į muitų sumažinimus tai pačiai prekių grupei, kuriuos, kuriant muitų sąjungą, atliko kitos šios sąjungos šalys“. Siekiant įgyvendinti PPO reikalavimus šiuose susitarimuose sprendžiami du klausimai. Pirma, didesnių muitų tarifų kompensavimas, kuris dažniausiai vykdomas nustatant šaliai skirtą tarifinę kvotą arba padidinant esamą (-as) kvotą (-as). Antra, pasirengimo narystei *erga omnes* tarifinė kvota Bulgarijai ir Rumunijai (ne skirta tam tikrai šaliai, bet taikoma visame pasaulyje) taip pat turi būti pridedama prie galiojančių ES *erga omnes* tarifinių kvotų.

3-158-750

**Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)**, *schriftlich*. – Die Zollunion der Europäischen Union wurde durch den Beitritt Bulgariens und Rumäniens ausgeweitet. Nach WTO-Recht besteht daher die Pflicht, mit WTO-Mitgliedstaaten Verhandlungen über einen Ausgleich für die Erhöhung der gebundenen Zollsätze und die resultierenden Verluste aufzunehmen. Als Ausgleich für eine sich verschlechternde Handelsposition werden im Wesentlichen die zollfreien Warenkontingente für bestimmte Erzeugnisse aus den USA angehoben. Ich stimme daher für dieses Ausgleichsabkommen, weil es zeigt, dass die EU sich dem Handelssystem auf der Grundlage multilateraler Regeln verpflichtet fühlt.

3-159-000

**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this report. The Parliament should give its consent to the signing of this Agreement. The compensatory adjustment for the US is a natural consequence of Romania and Bulgaria's accession to the UE. The Agreement adjusts our trade relations to this post-accession reality and follows the procedural rules of the WTO.

3-160-000

**David Martin (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I supported this proposal. With the accession of Bulgaria and Romania, the European Union enlarged its customs union. Consequently, the EU was obliged under WTO rules to enter into negotiations with WTO members having negotiating rights in the schedules of any of the acceding members for the purpose of agreeing on a mutually satisfactory compensatory adjustment to offset the increase in bound duties and the resulting meaningful losses. Such adjustment is due if the adoption of the EU's external tariff regime results in an increase in tariff beyond the level for which the acceding country has bound itself at the WTO, whilst taking 'due account of reductions of duties on the same tariff line made by other constituents of the customs union upon its formation', as required by paragraph 6 of Article XXIV. In order to meet the WTO requirements, two issues are addressed in the agreements. Firstly, the compensation of higher tariffs, for which the instrument most often used is the opening of a country-allocated tariff rate quota or the increasing of existing ones. Secondly, the pre-accession *erga omnes* tariff rate quota of Bulgaria and Romania also needs to be added to the existing *erga omnes* tariff rate quota of the EU.

3-161-000

**Clemente Mastella (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Con l'adesione della Bulgaria e della Romania, l'Unione europea ha allargato la propria unione doganale. Di conseguenza, le norme dell'OMC hanno imposto di avviare dei negoziati con i paesi membri dell'OMC detentori di diritti di negoziato, negli elenchi di uno dei paesi aderenti, allo scopo di concordare un

adeguamento reciprocamente soddisfacente per compensare l'aumento dei dazi consolidati e le ingenti perdite che ne derivano.

Accogliamo, dunque, con favore l'accordo con gli Stati Uniti e riteniamo fondamentale che il Parlamento europeo sia chiamato a dare la propria approvazione. L'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti dovranno reciprocamente notificare l'avvenuto espletamento delle rispettive procedure interne necessarie per l'entrata in vigore dell'accordo. Auspichiamo che gli Stati Uniti procedano in questo senso, senza alcun indugio, in modo che tutti i produttori possano beneficiare tempestivamente dell'accesso al mercato.

3-162-000

**Iosif Matula (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Susțin decizia de încheiere a Acordului de compensare UE-SUA, deoarece acesta va influența pozitiv și va impulsiona creșterea schimburilor comerciale pe termen mediu și lung. Lărgirea Uniunii Europene, prin aderarea României și Bulgariei a făcut ca Acordul GATT 1994 să necesite o revizuire, să existe o politică unitară a tuturor țărilor UE față de Statele Unite. România și Bulgaria vor avea același statut ca și celelalte țări ale UE, raportat la comerțul cu SUA. Consider că acest pas va duce la o creștere rapidă a comerțului între țările membre ale UE, în special România și Bulgaria, și Statele Unite. Practic, e vorba de o restabilizare a accesului la piață, de o reorganizare a parteneriatului comercial între SUA și UE, necesară prin extinderea uniunii vamale a comunității europene, o extindere datorată aderării României și Bulgariei. Un nou acord înseamnă o dovadă clară a atașamentului UE față de regimul comercial bazat pe norme multilaterale cu toate țările partenere, OMC fiind în centrul acestuia.

3-162-250

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A adesão da República da Bulgária e da Roménia levou a que a União Europeia tivesse que alargar a sua união aduaneira. Assim, e em conformidade com as regras da OMC (artigo XXVI, n.º 6 do GATT de 1994), a União Europeia teve de encetar negociações com os membros da OMC com poderes de negociação nas listas de qualquer dos membros aderentes, para chegar a acordo quanto a um ajustamento compensatório que satisfaça todas as partes e contrabalance o aumento dos direitos consolidados e as consequentes perdas significativas. Saúdo assim o acordo com os Estados Unidos, dando o meu voto favorável ao mesmo. Os EUA têm assim direito a que sejam restabelecidos os seus direitos comerciais anteriores, que sofreram uma ligeira degradação devido ao alargamento da união aduaneira aquando da adesão da Roménia e da Bulgária à UE.

3-162-500

**Louis Michel (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – En 2007, la Roumanie et la Bulgarie ont rejoint l'Union européenne. Suite à cet élargissement de l'union douanière de l'UE, les droits commerciaux de certains membres de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce ont quelque peu été amoindris, notamment ceux des États-Unis.

Selon les règles de l'OMC (datant du GATT), tout membre de cette organisation est en droit d'ouvrir des négociations en vue d'obtenir une compensation s'il le juge nécessaire. En l'occurrence, les États-Unis l'ont fait de sorte à obtenir le rétablissement de leurs droits commerciaux. Ceci est tout à fait justifié et compréhensible.

C'est pour cette raison que j'ai voté en faveur de cet accord de compensation entre l'Union européenne et les États-Unis. Il est toutefois important de rappeler que, dans l'ensemble, cet élargissement de l'Union a été favorable aux membres de l'OMC.

3-162-625

**Alexander Mirsky (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I support the report since it is a technical file to adjust the EU's obligations under WTO rules, following the accession of Bulgaria and Romania. The purpose is to agree with the WTO members on a mutually satisfactory compensatory adjustment to offset the increase in bound duties and the resulting meaningful losses. The EU has so far concluded similar compensatory agreements with Cuba, Brazil, and – with Parliament's consent – Australia, New Zealand and Argentina. I voted in favour.

3-162-750

**Katarína Neveďalová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Pristúpením Bulharska a Rumunska Európska únia rozšírila svoju colnú úniu. V dôsledku toho bola EÚ v zmysle pravidiel WTO povinná začať rokovania s členmi WTO, ktorí majú právo rokovať v rámci zoznamov záväzkov prístupujúcich členov, s cieľom dohodnúť sa na vzájomne vyhovujúcom kompenzačnom vyrovnaní, aby sa vyvážilo zvýšenie cla a z neho vyplývajúce značné straty. Na to, aby sa splnili požiadavky WTO, sa v týchto dohodách riešia dve otázky. Prvou je kompenzácia vyšších ciel, ktorá sa najčastejšie dosahuje prostredníctvom zavedenia colných kvót voči konkrétnym krajinám alebo zvýšením existujúcich kvót. Druhou je skutočnosť, že predstupovú colnú kvótu Bulharska a Rumunska uplatňovanú voči všetkým treba pridať aj k jestvujúcej colnej kvóte EÚ uplatňovanej voči všetkým. Rada 29. januára 2007 poverila Komisiu, aby začala rokovania s krajinami, ktoré majú nárok na kompenzáciu. Napríklad v kompenzačnej dohode medzi EÚ a USA sa to týka najmä hydínového a bravčového mäsa, ako aj potravinových prípravkov. Súhlasím so spravodajcom pánom Moreirom, že Komisia správne zvolila zvýšenie colných kvót ako nástroj kompenzácie v prípade amerických výrobkov, ktorých sa to týka, pretože colné kvóty sú najcielenejším spôsobom kompenzácie strát.

3-162-812

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šią rezoliuciją, kuria raginama pritarti susitarimo sudarymui. Tam, kad ES tinkamai vykdytų savo tarptautinius įsipareigojimus taip pat atsižvelgiant į paskutinę Europos Sąjungos plėtrą, būtina vykdyti ES valstybių narių ir Bulgarijos bei Rumunijos GATT įsipareigojimus. Turime dėti visas pastangas, kad būtų išlaikyti įprastiniai prekybos srantai bei neužkertamas kelias prekėms iš kitų šalių patekti į ES rinką. Atkreiptinas dėmesys į tai, kad dėl ES muitų sąjungos plėtros, pablogėjo JAV padėtis. Tam, kad JAV tinkamai įgyvendintų savo teisę susigrąžinti ankstesnes prekybos teises, turi būti taikomas abipusiškai priimtinas kompensacinis suregulavimo mechanizmas. Šis mechanizmas užkirs kelią muitų didėjimui, be to, gamintojams atkurs palankias patekimo į rinką galimybes.

3-162-843

**Alfredo Pallone (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Ho votato a favore dell'accordo fra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti relativo alla modifica di concessioni negli elenchi della Repubblica di Bulgaria e della Romania perché, a seguito dell'ingresso nell'UE dei 2 Paesi, è prassi comune rivedere e risolvere i problemi relativi a precedenti regimi doganali. Nel caso specifico, Romania e Bulgaria hanno fatto sì, con il loro ingresso nell'Unione nel 2007, che l'UE fosse obbligata

a regolamentare la loro situazione di dazi e tariffe con gli Stati Uniti attraverso un indennizzo comune.

3-162-875

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A adesão da República da Bulgária e da Roménia à União Europeia teve como efeito imediato o alargamento da sua união aduaneira. Consequentemente, em conformidade com as regras da Organização Mundial do Comércio, a União Europeia teve de encetar negociações com os membros da OMC com poderes de negociação nas listas de qualquer dos membros aderentes, para chegar a acordo quanto a um ajustamento compensatório que satisfaça todas as partes e contrabalance o aumento dos direitos consolidados e as consequentes perdas significativas. O alargamento da UE foi, em geral, positivo para os membros da OMC e os ajustes necessários foram devidamente negociados e estão apenas dependentes da notificação mútua entre as partes da conclusão dos respetivos procedimentos internos necessários para a entrada em vigor do Acordo. Nestes termos, votei favoravelmente a proposta de aprovação do acordo entre a União Europeia e os Estados Unidos da América no que respeita à alteração de concessões previstas nas listas da República da Bulgária e da Roménia, no contexto da adesão destes países à União Europeia.

3-162-937

**Paulo Rangel (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Com a adesão da República da Bulgária e da Roménia, a União alargou a sua união aduaneira e, em concordância com as regras da OMC, foi chamada a negociações para um acordo quanto a um ajustamento compensatório. Tal ajustamento é devido caso a adoção do regime pautal externo da UE resulte num aumento que ultrapasse o nível em relação ao qual o país aderente se comprometeu no âmbito da OMC. O instrumento mais frequente usado na compensação dos direitos mais elevados é a abertura do contingente pautal atribuído por país ou o aumento dos já em vigor. Em 27 de janeiro de 2007, o Conselho autorizou a Comissão a entrar em negociações com os países que têm direito a compensação, resultando as negociações com os Estados Unidos num projeto de acordo sob a forma de troca de cartas: a compensação pela posição comercial deteriorada resume-se ao aumento dos contingentes pautais para importações de certos produtos agrícolas dos EUA.

3-163-000

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – In favour. With the accession of Bulgaria and Romania, the European Union enlarged its customs union. Consequently, the EU was obliged under WTO rules (Article XXIV(6) of GATT 1994) to enter into negotiations with WTO Members having negotiating rights in the schedules of any of the acceding Members for the purpose of agreeing on a mutually satisfactory compensatory adjustment to offset the increase in bound duties and the resulting meaningful losses. Such adjustment is due if the adoption of the EU's external tariff regime results in an increase in tariffs beyond the level for which the acceding country has bound itself at the WTO, whilst taking 'due account of reductions of duties on the same tariff line made by other constituents of the customs union upon its formation', as required by paragraph 6 of Article XXIV.

3-163-500

**Catherine Stihler (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour as this Agreement will award appropriate compensation to the USA.

3-164-000

**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – Avec l'adhésion de la Bulgarie et de la Roumanie, l'Union européenne a élargi son union douanière. En conséquence, elle était tenue, selon les règles de l'Organisation mondiale du commerce (article XXIV, paragraphe 6, du GATT), d'ouvrir des négociations avec les membres de l'OMC ayant des droits de négociation dans les listes des pays adhérents afin de convenir d'une compensation mutuellement satisfaisante pour contrebalancer l'augmentation des droits consolidés et les pertes notables qui en résultent.

Il est en effet nécessaire de prévoir une telle compensation si l'adoption du régime tarifaire extérieur de l'Union entraîne une augmentation des droits au-delà du niveau auquel le pays adhérent s'est engagé dans le cadre de l'OMC, tout en tenant "dûment compte des réductions de droits de douane sur la même ligne tarifaire faites par d'autres entités constitutives de l'union douanière lors de l'établissement de cette union", conformément aux dispositions de l'article XXIV, paragraphe 6.

3-164-500

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Com a adesão da República da Bulgária e da Roménia, a União Europeia alargou a sua união aduaneira. Consequentemente, em conformidade com as regras da OMC, a União Europeia teve de encetar negociações com os membros da OMC para chegar a acordo quanto a um ajustamento compensatório que satisfaça todas as partes e contrabalance o aumento dos direitos consolidados e as consequentes perdas significativas. Para cumprir tais requisitos, foram abordadas duas questões nos acordos: a compensação dos direitos mais elevados, para a qual o instrumento utilizado com mais frequência é a abertura do contingente pautal atribuído por país ou o aumento dos já em vigor; e aditar o contingente pautal pré-adesão da Bulgária e da Roménia ao atual contingente erga omnes da União. Os produtos visados no acordo de compensação entre a UE e os EUA são, principalmente, a carne de aves de capoeira e de porco, bem como as preparações alimentícias. Pelas razões apresentadas, votei favoravelmente o Acordo.

3-165-000

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Wraz z przystąpieniem Bułgarii i Rumunii do UE niezbędne było rozszerzenie unii celnej. Zgodnie z zasadami WTO UE zobowiązała się do rozpoczęcia negocjacji z członkami WTO posiadającymi prawa negocjacyjne w zakresie list koncesyjnych któregokolwiek z przystępujących krajów. Negocjacje te podjęto celem uzgodnienia wzajemnie zadowalającego wyrównania kompensującego wzrost związanych stawek celnych i powstałych w wyniku tego znacznych strat. Takie wyrównanie jest należne, jeżeli przyjęcie systemu zewnętrznej taryfy celnej UE powoduje wzrost stawek ponad poziom, do którego dany przystępujący kraj zobowiązał się w ramach WTO.

Rada upoważniła Komisję do otwarcia negocjacji z państwami, którym przysługuje rekompensata. W wyniku negocjacji ze Stanami Zjednoczonymi powstał projekt porozumienia w formie wymiany listów, które zostało parafowane przez stronę UE w dniu 21 grudnia 2011 r. i przez stronę USA w dniu 17 lutego 2012 r. Produkty, których dotyczy porozumienie kompensacyjne między UE i USA, to głównie mięso drobiowe i wieprzowe oraz przetwory spożywcze. Projekt tej rezolucji może przyczynić się do poprawy stosunków handlowych z USA. Wedle tego postanowienia w krajach, w których obowiązuje wyższa stawka niż taryfa celna UE, zyskają członkowie WTO, natomiast jeśli kraje posiadają niższe stawki, UE rekompensuje różnicę. Uważam, że takie działania przyczynią się do

poprawy wymiany handlowej, która z może być jednym z czynników wpływających pozytywnie na wzrost gospodarczy.

3-165-500

**Iva Zanicchi (PPE)**, *per iscritto* . – Il testo del collega on. Moreira riguarda l'accordo concluso tra l'Unione europea e gli Stati Uniti per risolvere i problemi sorti tra le parti a seguito dell'adesione di Bulgaria e Romania nell'UE. Poiché i due paesi in questione hanno rivisto il loro regime di dazi e tariffe con gli Stati Uniti in seguito all'adesione, si è resa necessaria una sorta di indennizzo dell'Unione in seguito al cambio di regime e di concessioni per i prodotti di questi paesi.

## **8.2. Κατευθυντήριες γραμμές για τις πολιτικές απασχόλησης των κρατών μελών (A7-0010/2013 - Pervenche Berès)**

3-167-000

### **Γραπτές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου**

3-167-250

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Aprovo o presente relatório, considerando que as Orientações para as políticas do Emprego são de extrema importância, saliento antes de mais um ponto que é essencial a meu ver: todos os Estados-Membros devem também tomar particular atenção às suas orientações nacionais, nomeadamente em Estados onde atualmente se vive um clima de severa austeridade económica e fiscal. Pois há que considerar que a análise dos programas nacionais de reformas dos Estados-Membros, constante do relatório conjunto sobre o Emprego, mostra que os Estados-Membros deverão continuar a desenvolver todos os esforços para cumprir as seguintes prioridades: aumentar a participação na atividade económica e reduzir o desemprego estrutural, desenvolvendo para tal uma mão-de-obra especializada, dando resposta às necessidades do mercado de trabalho e promovendo a qualidade dos empregos e a aprendizagem ao longo da vida, melhorar os desempenhos dos sistemas de educação e formação a todos os níveis e aumentar a participação no ensino de terceiro ciclo, promover a inclusão social e combater a pobreza.

3-167-375

**Laima Liucija Andrikiienė (PPE)**, *in writing* . – I voted in favour of the resolution on Guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States. This resolution sends a clear signal from Parliament to the Member State governments that they have to make further commitments to ensure the implementation of the Europe 2020 Strategy, with a special focus on job creation and stimulating growth. Moreover, further support should be given to the development of SMEs, and special emphasis should be placed on education and training. Member States should continue to make every effort to address the priority areas of increasing labour market participation and reducing structural unemployment, developing a skilled workforce responding to labour market needs and promoting job quality and lifelong learning, improving the performance of education and training systems at all levels, promoting social inclusion and combating poverty. Also, due to the persistent employment and social crisis, combating youth unemployment in particular should be a top priority for all governments.

3-167-500

**Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Creșterea șomajului la nivelul statelor membre ale Uniunii Europene este cea mai gravă dintre problemele cu care ne confruntăm în prezent. Nivelul ridicat al șomajului, în special în rândul tinerilor, amenință nu numai solidaritatea ce stă la baza funcționării societăților europene, ci și viitorul Uniunii. În condițiile în care coordonarea politicilor de ocupare a forței de muncă la nivel european nu va cunoaște o intensificare, obiectivul atingerii, în perspectiva anului 2020, a unui model de dezvoltare durabil, sustenabil și incluziv devine iluzoriu. Susțin adoptarea raportului comisiei, tocmai pentru că această coordonare a politicilor economice vine în întâmpinarea prevederilor tratatelor europene, care subliniază clar că acestea, alături de cele cu privire la promovarea ocupării locurilor de muncă nu sunt probleme de interesul național, ci chestiuni care țin de esența proiectului european. Totodată, adoptarea acestui document este un pas concret în direcția atingerii obiectivelor pe termen lung ale Uniunii.

3-167-531

**Sophie Auconie (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Ce texte met l'accent sur le rôle central de l'emploi conformément à la "stratégie Europe 2020" visant à aboutir à une croissance intelligente, durable et inclusive, assortie d'un niveau élevé d'emploi, de productivité et de cohésion sociale. J'ai donc soutenu ce texte qui constitue un rappel des engagements pris en 2010, qu'il convient de remplir compte tenu de la situation actuelle.

3-167-593

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį siūlymą dėl valstybių narių užimtumo politikos gairių. Vienas iš Europos Sąjungos tikslų – plėtoti suderintą užimtumo strategiją, kuriant kvalifikuotą, profesiniu atžvilgiu pasirengusią darbo jėgą bei darbo rinkas, prisitaikančias prie ekonomikos pokyčių. Šiose gairėse valstybėms narėms pateikiami aiškūs ir tikslūs nurodymai, kaip parengti su šiuo tikslu susijusiais nacionalines reformų programas ir jas įgyvendinti laikantis Stabilumo ir augimo pakto. Šiuo siūlymu siekiama pratęsti šių gairių galiojimą iki 2014 metų, todėl jam pritariu.

3-167-562

**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Am votat în favoarea raportului deoarece consider importantă menținerea orientărilor pentru coordonarea politicilor naționale de ocupare a forței de muncă în statele membre. Cred că strategia Europa 2020 trebuie susținută în continuare. Doar astfel se pot îndeplini țintele vizate: creșterea participării pe piața muncii, îmbunătățirea sistemului educațional și combaterea excluziunii sociale. Aceste priorități trebuie să rămână valide pentru a încuraja potențialul european de creștere inteligentă și sustenabilă. Iar statele membre ar trebui să se concentreze mai mult pe implementarea orientărilor principale și atingerea obiectivelor menționate în concordanță cu recomandările Consiliului. Trebuie acordată o atenție particulară Fondului social european și eficienței lui privind proiectele care vizează persoanele cu dizabilități și șomajul în rândul tinerilor.

3-167-625

**Regina Bastos (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente este relatório para que as orientações para o emprego adotadas em 2010 sejam mantidas até 2014 e sejam tidas em conta pelos Estados-Membros nas respetivas políticas de emprego. A coordenação das políticas económicas e de emprego dos Estados-Membros faz parte da Estratégia «Europa 2020» que visa reforçar o potencial da Europa em termos de crescimento sustentável e de



competitividade. Nas próximas metas para o emprego, os Estados-Membros deverão continuar a desenvolver todos os esforços para aumentar a taxa de participação dos homens e das mulheres no mercado de trabalho e reduzir o desemprego. O desenvolvimento de uma mão-de-obra especializada é outro desafio que se impõe aos Estados-Membros para dar resposta às necessidades do mercado de trabalho. Para se atingir esse objetivo, é essencial promover a aprendizagem ao longo da vida, melhorar os desempenhos dos sistemas de educação e formação a todos os níveis e aumentar a participação no ensino de terceiro ciclo. A promoção da inclusão social e o combate à pobreza devem continuar a ter um destaque especial nas políticas da União Europeia.

3-167-687

**Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Les lignes directrices pour les politiques de l'emploi adoptées par l'Union en 2010 devraient être maintenues. Les priorités suivantes, qui vont dans le bon sens, devraient animer l'action des Etats membres jusqu'en 2014 : accroître la participation au marché de l'emploi et diminuer le chômage structurel; développer une main d'oeuvre qualifiée en mesure de répondre aux besoins du marché du travail, promouvoir des emplois de qualité et l'éducation et la formation tout au long de la vie; rendre les systèmes d'éducation et de formation plus performants à tous les niveaux et augmenter la participation à l'enseignement supérieur; promouvoir l'inclusion sociale et lutter contre la pauvreté.

3-167-750

**Nora Berra (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Conformément à la "stratégie Europe 2020" visant à aboutir à une croissance intelligente, durable et inclusive, assortie d'un niveau élevé d'emploi, de productivité et de cohésion sociale, le traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne prévoit que le Conseil adopte de grandes orientations des politiques économiques et des lignes directrices pour l'emploi. Le rapport approuve la proposition de la Commission et invite le Conseil, s'il entend s'écarter du texte approuvé par le Parlement européen en 2010 ou s'il entend modifier de manière substantielle le texte approuvé par le Parlement, à en informer celui-ci. C'est donc dans cette optique que je vote en faveur de ce rapport.

3-168-000

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**, *per iscritto*. – Non ho sostenuto la relazione Berès che analizza la proposta di decisione del Consiglio sugli orientamenti per le politiche degli Stati membri a favore dell'occupazione. Le relazione riprende in modo acritico i punti programmatici della "Strategia Europa 2020", non considerando e tantomeno analizzando le problematiche di tale strategia, la sua effettiva fattibilità nel medio e lungo termine e i rischi derivanti dal rafforzamento del "coordinamento economico degli Stati membri", basato sull'imposizione della sorveglianza di Bruxelles sui bilanci dei paesi membri.

3-169-000

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Conform Tratatului privind funcționarea UE, promovarea ocupării forței de muncă reprezintă o chestiune de interes comun pentru statele membre și trebuie să le coordoneze în cadrul Consiliului. Pentru a face față concurenței reprezentate de noile economii emergente, consider că Europa trebuie să creeze locurile de muncă de care are nevoie o societate dinamică, bazată pe cunoaștere. Pentru aceasta, este necesar să se investească în educație și știință, precum și în politicile

privind ocuparea forței de muncă, astfel încât UE se țină pasul cu schimbările și să depășească perioada de criză economică.

3-169-500

**Vito Bonsignore (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – La proposta della Commissione al Consiglio enfatizza correttamente, nell'ambito della strategia Europa 2020, gli aspetti di riforma del mercato del lavoro e di qualificazione del capitale umano. Vi è ormai consenso unanime sulla necessità di incrementare il valore aggiunto dei sistemi produttivi europei se, di fronte alla concorrenza globale, intendiamo mantenere margini di competitività sufficienti a sostenere il nostro modello sociale e di sviluppo, che si fonda sul valore della persona e sulla lotta alle disuguaglianze attraverso l'esercizio delle libertà civili e di iniziativa.

I cinque ambiti di intervento riguardano soprattutto le debolezze della nostra forza lavoro in questa prospettiva, con alcuni paesi che sono molto indietro sul versante della formazione terziaria, dell'educazione degli adulti e dell'apprendimento permanente. Si tratta anche di promuovere processi di inclusione sociale fondati sulla cultura del lavoro e sull'incremento della produttività. La decisione del Consiglio ha individuato un obiettivo strategico e concertato condivisibile, così come la correlata decisione del Consiglio. Pertanto dichiaro un voto favorevole alla relazione.

3-169-625

**Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Poparłem sprawozdanie pani poseł Pervenche Berès na temat wytycznych dotyczących polityki zatrudnienia państw członkowskich. Uważam, że tworzenie odpowiednich polityk dotyczących rynku pracy, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem walki z bezrobociem, to obecnie kluczowe wyzwanie zarówno dla Unii Europejskiej, jak i poszczególnych państw członkowskich. Kryzys finansowy, pogorszenie koniunktury gospodarczej, budzący wielki niepokój poziom bezrobocia, zagrożenie wykluczeniem społecznym i ubóstwem milionów Europejczyków to największe bolączki, z jakimi przychodzi nam się zmagać.

W związku z tym niezbędne jest tworzenie długofalowych strategii dotyczących polityki zatrudnienia, tworzenie nowych miejsc pracy, szczególnie dla osób młodych, najbardziej dotkniętych negatywnymi trendami ekonomicznymi ostatnich lat. Konieczne jest też przygotowanie odpowiednich programów dla pozostałych grup zagrożonych niekorzystnymi zjawiskami na rynku pracy tj. kobiet, osób starszych, niepełnosprawnych, mieszkańców wsi i małych miast. Wyrażam nadzieję, że wysiłki podejmowane zarówno na forum UE, jak i przez państwa członkowskie przyczynią się do ograniczenia bezrobocia, wspierania wysokiego poziomu kwalifikacji i wyszkolenia pracowników oraz zwalczania ubóstwa i wykluczenia społecznego.

3-169-687

**John Bufton (EFD)**, *in writing*. – I voted against the proposals as they demonstrate the EU dictating to Member States what economic policies they should have in place.

3-169-843

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A proposta de decisão do Conselho relativa às orientações para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros (que constam no anexo da Decisão do Conselho de 21 de outubro de 2010, conforme redigido pela Comissão Europeia no âmbito da estratégia "Europa 2020") deve ser mantida para 2013 e ser tida

em conta pelos Estados-Membros de modo a conseguir uma maior coordenação em matéria de emprego, em especial promovendo mão-de-obra qualificada, formada e suscetível de adaptação, bem como mercados de trabalho que reajam rapidamente às mudanças económicas. O Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia estabelece que as orientações em matéria de emprego devem ser coerentes com as orientações gerais para as políticas económicas. Através da coordenação destas duas políticas, será possível o desenvolvimento de uma estratégia de crescimento inteligente, sustentável e inclusivo, acompanhado de um elevado nível de emprego, produtividade e coesão social, tal como preconizado na Estratégia 2020. Concordo com o presente relatório, em relação ao qual voto a favor, e realço a sua importância e a sua ênfase numa das políticas mais relevantes e urgentes da União neste momento: a política de emprego.

3-170-000

**Minodora Cliveti (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Tratatul privind funcționarea UE prevede că statele membre și Uniunea se angajează să elaboreze o strategie coordonată de ocupare a forței de muncă și să promoveze o forță de muncă formată, calificată și adaptabilă, precum și piețe ale muncii capabile să reacționeze rapid la evoluția economiei. Orientările privind ocuparea forței de muncă ar trebui să stea la baza oricăror recomandări specifice unei țări, pe care Consiliul le poate adresa statelor membre. Ele ar trebui să constituie baza pentru redactarea raportului comun privind ocuparea forței de muncă, trimis anual de Consiliu și de Comisia Europeană Consiliului European.

Statele membre trebuie să depună toate eforturile necesare pentru a aborda următoarele domenii prioritare în cadrul programelor lor naționale de reformă: creșterea participării pe piața muncii și reducerea șomajului structural, dezvoltarea unei forțe de muncă calificate care să răspundă nevoilor pieței muncii și promovarea calității locurilor de muncă și a învățării pe tot parcursul vieții, îmbunătățirea performanței sistemelor de educație și de formare profesională la toate nivelurile și creșterea participării la învățământul terțiar, promovarea incluziunii sociale și combaterea sărăciei. Orientările privind ocuparea forței de muncă adoptate în 2010 trebuie să rămână stabile până în 2014, astfel încât eforturile să se concentreze asupra punerii lor în aplicare.

3-171-000

**Carlos Coelho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A atual crise económica e financeira representa um desafio sem precedentes em termos de aumento do desemprego e da exclusão social, sendo que a Estratégia Europeia para o Emprego e as orientações para o emprego constituem os principais instrumentos no quadro da Estratégia de Lisboa com o objetivo de ultrapassar os desafios colocados pelo mercado de trabalho. É necessária uma resposta forte e coordenada que promova o aumento do emprego, da produtividade, da competitividade e que reforce, em paralelo, a coesão social. Estas orientações constituem, assim, metas partilhadas pelos Estados-Membros e fornecem-lhes orientações precisas para a definição dos seus programas nacionais de reforma e aplicação dessas reformas, nomeadamente através da definição das prioridades nas reformas a nível macroeconómico, microeconómico e do mercado de trabalho para a União no seu conjunto. O TFUE estabelece que os Estados-Membros devem considerar as suas políticas económicas e a promoção do emprego como questões de interesse comum e coordená-las no âmbito do Conselho. Pelo que, apesar das orientações terem sido adotadas em 2010 e deverem permanecer estáveis até 2014, a presente decisão é necessária de forma a confirmar a sua validade para 2013 e

recomendar que os Estados-Membros as tenham em conta nas respetivas políticas de emprego para esse ano.

3-172-000

**Ricardo Cortés Lastra (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Mi voto es favorable al informe porque los Estados miembros necesitan ahora más que nunca unas orientaciones claras hacia las que dirigir las políticas de empleo. El paro es el principal problema de Europa, sobre todo en países como el mío, que tuvo en 2012 una tasa media de desempleo superior al 25 % y en el caso del paro juvenil este porcentaje supera el 55 %. Los socialistas españoles hemos dado un primer paso la semana pasada proponiendo a las principales fuerzas políticas y sindicatos un Pacto por el Empleo para comenzar a tomar medidas cuanto antes que pongan remedio a esta situación insostenible. Sin embargo, la UE no puede dejar a los Estados miembros actuar solos ante esta dificultad que está poniendo a miles de familias en peligro de pobreza y exclusión social. Necesitamos transmitir unas orientaciones claras a los 27 y también tiene que ser la UE quien vele por una creación de empleo cualificado y formado y una mano de obra con capacidad de respuesta ante los cambios en los mercados económico y laboral.

3-173-000

**Ioan Enciu (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Am votat în favoarea raportului Parlamentului European care aprobă Decizia Comisiei privind orientările pentru politicile de ocupare a forței de muncă ale statelor membre. Sub noile prevederi ale Tratatului privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene, statele membre au obligația de a-și coordona politicile de ocupare a forței de muncă, lucru care este necesar mai ales în contextul crizei economice și financiare și, de asemenea, ținând cont de faptul că strategia Europa 2020 stabilește ținte ambițioase în domeniul ocupării forței de muncă. Statele membre trebuie să continue să-și armonizeze politicile privind forța de muncă și să asigure faptul că libera circulație a forței de muncă în interiorul UE este garantată. De asemenea, este important ca toate statele membre să continue liberalizarea totală a pieței muncii pentru lucrătorii din România și Bulgaria care se confruntă cu restricții pe piața muncii în nouă din cele 27 de state ale Uniunii Europene.

3-173-500

**Edite Estrela (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente este relatório por defender que as orientações para o emprego adotadas em 2010, que fizeram parte das orientações integradas da estratégia "Europa 2020", deverão manter-se até 2014. Considero que as prioridades definidas em 2010 para as políticas de emprego permanecem válidas, fornecem orientações importantes aos Estados-Membros sobre a definição dos seus programas nacionais de reforma e estão também em consonância com o Pacto de Estabilidade e Crescimento.

3-174-000

**Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – This uncontroversial report confirms the existing guidelines. It includes improving the quality of education and training systems, increasing the labour market participation of women and men and reducing structural employment. These and other elements are essential if we are to build and strengthen the Welsh economy. I voted in favour of the report.

3-174-500

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O TFUE prevê que o Conselho adote orientações gerais das políticas económicas (artigo 121.º) e de emprego (artigo 148.º). Ora, as prioridades para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros foram aprovadas a 21 de outubro de 2010, as quais se devem manter estáveis até 2014, até porque os seus objetivos e prioridades continuam a ser pertinentes. Porém, de acordo com o artigo 148.º, n.º 2, do TFUE, a sua validade para 2013 tem de ser confirmada por decisão do Conselho. Nesse sentido, e pela importância que tem este Parlamento na construção democrática da União, se o Conselho entender afastar-se do texto aprovado em 2010, deve envolver e consultar o Parlamento no processo da sua modificação.

3-174-750

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A estratégia “Europa 2020”, lançada pela Comissão Europeia e aprovada pelo Conselho Europeu a 26 de março de 2010, visa “reforçar o potencial da Europa em termos de crescimento sustentável e de competitividade”. O relatório presente debruça-se sobre a proposta de decisão do Conselho no que concerne às orientações para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros (EM), de acordo com o estabelecido no Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da UE (TFUE) nos artigos 121.º e 148.º, segundo os quais compete ao Conselho coordenar as políticas económicas dos EM e definir as orientações em matéria de emprego. Embora as orientações em matéria de emprego tenham sido adotadas a 21 de outubro de 2010 e devam manter-se estáveis até 2014, o n.º 2 do artigo 148.º do TFUE refere que o Conselho deve, anualmente e após consulta ao Parlamento Europeu, ao Comité Económico e Social Europeu, ao Comité das Regiões e ao Comité do Emprego, definir “as orientações que os Estados-Membros devem ter em conta nas respetivas políticas de emprego.” Nestes termos, voto favoravelmente a proposta de decisão do Conselho de aplicar, ao ano de 2013, as orientações em matéria de emprego aprovadas pelo Conselho em 26 de março de 2010.

3-175-000

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – A Comissão do Emprego e Assuntos Sociais anualmente tece recomendações relativas às orientações para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros. Estas orientações, no essencial, não têm variado significativamente desde 2010. Em termos gerais, continua-se com o discurso que acolhe como necessárias e até desejáveis as políticas de consolidação orçamental, desde que sejam favoráveis ao crescimento - mirífica conciliação que a realidade vem demonstrando não ser afinal mais do que uma grotesca contradição. Enfim, nada de novo: as habituais manobras em que a social-democracia é pródiga e que a direita aplaude. Enquanto se insistir na aplicação de reformas laborais, do sistema de segurança social, no aumento da idade da reforma, baixar salários e retirar direitos aos trabalhadores, iremos continuar com o crescimento do desemprego, nomeadamente juvenil, da pobreza e das desigualdades sociais. Não aceitamos a continuação destas políticas e exigimos novas orientações para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros que não ataquem os direitos consagrados dos trabalhadores, o direito à contratação coletiva e aos direitos sociais adquiridos. Assim, votámos contra.

3-176-000

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – V článku 145 Zmluvy o fungovaní Európskej únie sa ustanovuje, že členské štáty a Únia pracujú na rozvoji koordinovanej stratégie zamestnanosti, a najmä na podpore kvalifikovanej, vyškolenej a pružnej pracovnej

sily a na pracovných trhoch reagujúcich na podmienky hospodárskych zmien so zreteľom na dosiahnutie cieľov vymedzených v článku 3 Zmluvy o Európskej únii. Európskou komisiou navrhnutá stratégia Európa 2020 umožní Únii nasmerovať jej hospodárstvo smerom k inteligentnému, udržateľnému a inkluzívnemu rastu, ktorý bude sprevádzať vysoká miera zamestnanosti, produktivity a sociálnej súdržnosti. Päť hlavných cieľov uvedených v rámci príslušných usmernení predstavuje spoločné ciele, ktorými sa riadia opatrenia členských štátov, berúc do úvahy ich východiskovú situáciu a vnútroštátne okolnosti, ako aj situáciu a okolnosti spoločné pre celú Úniu. Európska stratégia zamestnanosti zastáva vedúcu úlohu pri plnení cieľov novej stratégie v oblasti zamestnanosti a pracovného trhu. Považujem za dôležité a nanajvýš opodstatnené, aby usmernenia pre oblasť zamestnanosti prijaté v roku 2010 naďalej zostali nezmenené až do roku 2014, v snahe zabezpečiť ich nerušené vykonávanie.

3-176-500

**Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport de ma collègue, Pervenche Berès, approuvant la décision du Conseil de maintenir, dans les mêmes termes, les lignes directrices de l'emploi des États-membres adoptées en octobre 2010. Pour mémoire, ces lignes directrices définissent la stratégie européenne pour l'emploi en assurant notamment la promotion de l'éducation et de la formation tout au long de la vie, l'inclusion sociale et la lutte contre la pauvreté. La persistance de la crise économique et sociale nous invite à maintenir nos efforts contre le chômage et à ne pas se concentrer uniquement sur les politiques d'austérité et d'assainissement des finances publiques.

3-176-625

**Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį dokumentą. Sutartyje dėl Europos Sąjungos veikimo nurodyta, kad valstybės narės ir Sąjunga veikia siekdamos plėtoti suderintą užimtumo strategiją, ypač ugdydamos kvalifikuotą, profesiniu atžvilgiu pasirengusią ir mokančią prisitaikyti darbo jėgą bei darbo rinkas, prisitaikančias prie ekonomikos pokyčių, kad būtų pasiekti Europos Sąjungos sutartyje nustatyti tikslai. Laikydamosi Komisijos siūlomos strategijos „Europa 2020“, Sąjunga galės savo ekonomiką orientuoti į pažangų, tvarų ir integracinį augimą ir kartu užtikrinti didelį užimtumą, produktyvumą ir socialinę sanglaudą. Penki pagrindiniai atitinkamos gairės išvardyti tikslai sudaro bendrus uždavinius, kuriais grindžiama valstybių narių veikla, ir kuriuose atsižvelgta į jų skirtingas pradines pozicijas ir nacionalines aplinkybes, taip pat kaip ir į Sąjungos. Europos užimtumo strategijai tenka pagrindinis vaidmuo įgyvendinant naujos strategijos užimtumo ir darbo rinkos tikslus. Šios naujos integruotosios gairės atitinka Europos Vadovų Tarybos išvadas. Jose valstybėms narėms pateikiami tikslūs nurodymai, kaip parengti nacionalines reformų programas ir įgyvendinti reformas, atsižvelgiant į jų tarpusavio priklausomybę ir laikantis Stabilumo ir augimo pakto. Užimtumo gairės turėtų būti pagrindas konkrečioms šalims teikiant rekomendacijas.

3-176-750

**Giovanni La Via (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Il tasso di disoccupazione nell'UE ha raggiunto ormai livelli di massima allerta. Nello specifico, la disoccupazione giovanile rappresenta uno degli indicatori economici che più stanno purtroppo segnando il passo di questa crisi. Con questa risoluzione, per la quale mi sono espresso in maniera favorevole, si vuole porre un ulteriore accento sul problema e avanzare proposte per risolverlo. Occorre aumentare la partecipazione al mercato del lavoro e ridurre la disoccupazione strutturale, sviluppare

una forza lavoro competente e adeguatamente formata, migliorare i risultati dei sistemi di formazione e incrementare la partecipazione all'istruzione terziaria.

3-177-000

**Elżbieta Katarzyna Łukacijewska (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – W kwestii polityki zatrudnienia państwa członkowskie powinny skupiać wszystkie wysiłki na priorytetowych obszarach, między innymi na podnoszeniu współczynnika aktywności zawodowej i ograniczaniu bezrobocia, zwłaszcza wśród młodych. Uważam, że warto poprawiać wydajność systemów kształcenia i szkolenia we wszystkich dziedzinach oraz opracowywać krajowe programy reform i ich wdrożenia. Dlatego między innymi głosowałam za sprawozdaniem Pervenche Berès na temat wytycznych dotyczących polityki zatrudnienia państw członkowskich.

3-178-000

**David Martin (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted for this resolution on the employment policies of the Member States. It is important for the Council to notify Parliament if it intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament.

3-178-500

**Iosif Matula (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Interdependența dintre politicile economice la nivel comunitar și cele în privința forței de muncă din Tratat trebuie să se regăsească în programele naționale de reformă ale statelor membre. Astfel, până în anul 2020, putem să atingem un grad ridicat de competitivitate și productivitate la nivel mondial, cu o forță de muncă formată, calificată și adaptabilă.

Cu siguranță mai sunt multe de făcut în ce privește politicile de ocupare. Aș putea să mă refer doar la un exemplu recent, acela al Marii Britanii, unde campaniile împotriva pătrunderii angajaților români pe piața muncii au atins cote alarmante, aceasta în condițiile în care, potrivit tratatului de aderare, la finalul acestui an expiră restricțiile impuse României și Bulgariei. Dincolo de valoarea economică pe care o aduce forța de muncă, să nu uităm că vorbim de soarta unor cetățeni, cărora putem să le facilităm câștigarea independenței financiare și să reducem astfel pericolul sărăciei și al excluziunii sociale.

3-179-000

**Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)**, *par écrit*. – Pour la troisième année consécutive, Mme Berès et la majorité de cette Assemblée soutiennent les "lignes directrices pour l'emploi" établies par la Commission en 2010. Celles-ci signent la destruction du droit du travail partout en Europe. Elles font des salaires et des contrats de travail la variable d'ajustement prioritaire pour maintenir la stabilité des prix et compenser l'austérité budgétaire.

Elles prônent l'abandon des négociations collectives au nom d'une "évolution des coûts du travail" devant être "cohérente avec la stabilité des prix et l'évolution de la productivité". Elles appellent au relèvement de l'âge de la retraite et à "une réforme des dépenses publiques liées à la vieillesse" notamment en matière de retraites et de santé. Je vote contre ce rapport. Je dénonce cet aveuglement réactionnaire qui est à l'origine de la crise sociale en Europe.

3-179-500

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A estratégia «Europa 2020» permite à União orientar a sua economia para um crescimento inteligente, sustentável e inclusivo, acompanhado de um elevado nível de emprego, produtividade e coesão social. Os grandes objetivos devem

ser comuns a todos e pautar a ação dos Estados-Membros, tendo em conta as situações de partida e a conjuntura de cada um deles e da União. À Estratégia Europeia de Emprego cabe o papel fundamental de concretizar os objetivos da nova estratégia em matéria de emprego e do mercado laboral.

3-179-750

**Alexander Mirsky (S&D)**, *in writing*. – A new strategy for jobs and growth, Europe 2020, based on enhanced coordination of economic policies, which will focus on the key areas where action is needed to boost Europe's potential for sustainable growth and competitiveness. I support it.

3-180-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Auf dem Papier mag es ja schön und gut klingen, dass die EU ihre Mitgliedstaaten dazu anhält, weiterhin jede erdenkliche Anstrengung in folgenden prioritären Bereichen zu unternehmen: Erhöhung der Erwerbsbeteiligung und Verringerung der strukturellen Arbeitslosigkeit; Aufbau eines qualifizierten Arbeitskräftepotenzials sowie Förderung der Arbeitsplatzqualität und des lebenslangen Lernens; Förderung der sozialen Inklusion und Bekämpfung der Armut. In der Praxis arbeiten die Mitgliedstaaten selbst an der Verwirklichung dieser Ziele schon lange, bevor diese von der EU vorgegeben wurden. Arbeitsmarktpolitik fällt in die alleinige Kompetenz der Mitgliedstaaten, und diese sind auch viel besser als die Brüsseler Bürokratie in der Lage, auf nationale Gegebenheiten einzugehen. Aus Protest gegen dieses Brüsseler Zentralisierungs-Projekt habe ich den Bericht abgelehnt.

3-180-125

**Katarína Neveďalová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Európska stratégia zamestnanosti je najdôležitejším referenčným bodom novej stratégie v oblasti zamestnanosti a pracovného trhu. Je preto nevyhnutné, aby usmernenia pre oblasť zamestnanosti prijaté v roku 2010 naďalej zostali nezmenené až do roku 2014. Nemenej dôležité je taktiež zabezpečenie ich nerušeného vykonávania. Našou úlohou nie je len vytvoriť koordinovanú stratégiu zamestnanosti, ktorá by sa sústredila na podporu kvalifikovanej, vyškolenej a pružnej pracovnej sily a na podporu pracovných trhov reagujúcich na hospodárske zmeny. Väčšia pozornosť by sa mala venovať aj prioritným oblastiam, a to hlavne zvyšovaniu účasti na pracovnom trhu, znižovaniu nezamestnanosti, rozvíjaniu kvalifikovanej pracovnej sily v súlade s potrebami pracovného trhu a podpory kvality pracovných miest a celoživotného vzdelávania, zlepšovania výkonnosti systémov vzdelávania a odbornej prípravy na všetkých úrovniach a zvyšovania účasti v terciárnom vzdelávaní, podpory sociálnej inklúzie a boja proti chudobe. Z týchto dôvodov verím, že je nesmierne dôležité, aby EP bol informovaný v prípade, ak by mala Rada v úmysle odchyliť sa od pôvodného textu.

3-180-250

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Die sture Haltung vieler Vertreter der europäischen Organe, aus zentraler Position die Wirtschaftspolitik ganz Europas lenken zu wollen, steht nicht im Einklang mit den historischen Erfahrungen. Der Staat als Lenker einer ganzen Wirtschaft, insbesondere hier in Form der EU als Superinstanz, negiert die Notwendigkeit regional zum Teil sehr unterschiedlicher Wirtschaftspolitik. Ebenso wird dadurch die mangelnde Befähigung des Staates außer Acht gelassen. Die Aufgabe des Staates ist es, wichtige Rahmenbedingungen zu setzen und Anreize zu schaffen. Größtenteils ineffiziente



Finanzierungsprogramme mittels des Europäischen Sozialfonds führen bestenfalls zu kurzfristig effizienten Beschäftigungsprogrammen, können aber nicht die Beschäftigungseffekte einer Wirtschaft ersetzen. Außerdem will die EU hier wieder eine Zusammenführung nationaler Kompetenzen auf europäischer Ebene vorantreiben. Daher konnte der Bericht aus meiner Sicht nicht unterstützt werden.

3-180-375

**Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)**, *na piśmie*. – Cele rozwojowe Unii Europejskiej zawarte są w strategii „Europa 2020”, opierającej się na ściślejszej koordynacji polityki gospodarczej, ze szczególnym naciskiem na najważniejsze obszary wymagające działań, aby pobudzić europejski potencjał w dziedzinie trwałego wzrostu gospodarczego i konkurencyjności. Realizacji tych celów służą między innymi wytyczne w sprawie polityki zatrudnienia, mające ułatwić państwom członkowskim koordynację swoich polityk. Zintegrowanie wytycznych ma zagwarantować, że polityka prowadzona na poziomie krajowym i unijnym będzie się w pełni przyczyniać do realizacji celów strategii „Europa 2020”. Pozytywnie oceniam fakt, że liczba wytycznych jest niewielka. Zapewnia to ich spójność i przejrzystość. Wytyczne, podobnie jak całą strategię „Europa 2020”, oceniam wysoko.

Na szczególną aprobatę zasługuje umieszczenie wśród wytycznych rekomendacji dotyczących przeciwdziałania ubóstwu i wykluczeniu społecznemu, ograniczenia bezrobocia strukturalnego oraz poprawy jakości systemu edukacji. Wyrażam nadzieję, że opracowując krajowy program reform, polski rząd będzie stosował się do wyżej wymienionych wytycznych, mających – w mojej ocenie – priorytetowe znaczenie. Nie możemy tracić z oczu społecznego wymiaru walki z kryzysem. Uwzględniając powyższe uwarunkowania, zdecydowałem się poprzeć sprawozdanie w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego decyzji Rady w sprawie wytycznych dotyczących polityki zatrudnienia państw członkowskich.

3-180-437

**Siiri Oviir (ALDE)**, *kirjalikult*. – Toetasin ettepanekut kinnitada 21. oktoobril 2010. aastal vastu võetud tööhõivepoliitika suunised kuni 2014. aastani, et tagada keskendumine meetmete rakendamisele. Strateegia „Euroopa 2020” tööhõivesuunised võeti vastu juba üle kahe aasta tagasi, kuid arvestades Euroopas endiselt valitsevat suurt tööpuudust, tuleb liikmesriikidel jätkata pingutusi olukorra parandamiseks. Eriti oluline on keskenduda noorte tööpuuduse vähendamisele ja selleks haridus- ja koolitussüsteemide tööturu vajadustega vastavusele viimisele, töökohtade ja elukestva õppe kvaliteedi edendamisele ning struktuurse tööpuudusega võitlemisele. Liikmesriigid peaksid tööhõivesuuniste rakendamisel tõhusamalt kasutama Euroopa Sotsiaalfondi tuge ning olema võimelised ka ESFi vahendeid rakendama.

3-180-468

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Manau, kad valstybių narių užimtumo politikos gairėse kovai su nedarbu turi būti skirtas didžiausias prioritetas, atsižvelgiant į vis labiau didėjantį jaunimo ir ilgalaikį nedarbą. Pažymėtina, kad griežtos taupymo priemonės tik padidino skurdo pavojų bei ypač neigiamai paveikė darbo rinkas. Taupydami mes negalime ir toliau nepaisyti konkrečių žmonių lūkesčių, riboti jų galimybių dirbti ir užsidirbti. Kita vertus, taupymas neturėtų būti pamirštas, tačiau taupyti reikėtų ne socialiai pažeidžiamų visuomenės sluoksnių sąskaita. Atsižvelgiant į esamą ne tik pavienių valstybių narių, bet

ir visos ES situaciją, būtina nustatyti tokias priemones, kurios iš esmės sumažintų nedarbą ir nesimokančių žmonių skaičių. Didesnis dėmesys turi būti skiriamas ilgalaikių bedarbių aktyvumo skatinimui. Socialiai pažeidžiamiems asmenims turi būti sukurtos palankios galimybės aktyviai dalyvauti įvairiose programose, susijusiose su įsidarbinimo kompetencijos įgūdžių ugdymu. Svarbu tinkamai įgyvendinti socialinės aprėpties didinimo principus bei darbo ir aktyvumą darbo rinkoje skatinančios socialinio aprūpinimo sistemos modelius.

3-180-484

**Alfredo Pallone (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Il problema principale che ci troviamo ad affrontare a causa della crisi economica è l'incremento esponenziale dei livelli di disoccupazione, soprattutto quella giovanile. Le politiche economiche degli Stati membri devono prevedere orientamenti specifici a favore dell'occupazione. Così come previsto dalla Strategia Europa 2020 la relazione della collega Berès osserva come sia necessario promuovere il più velocemente possibile queste politiche occupazionali. Incrementare i posti di lavoro è possibile nel momento in cui l'economia inizia a crescere ma la crescita deve essere indirizzata verso quei settori in grado di generare forza lavoro e moltiplicarne la richiesta. Ogni Paese deve impegnarsi favorendo le condizioni necessarie alla crescita nel suo specifico sistema produttivo, l'Unione europea indirizzerà poi verso i programmi di riforma.

3-180-500

**Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE)**, *γραφτώως*. – Υπερψήφισα την έκθεση που εγκρίνει την πρόταση της Επιτροπής. Η ευρωπαϊκή στρατηγική για την απασχόληση παρέχει μια πιο συνεκτική και ακριβή καθοδήγηση στα κράτη μέλη για τον προσδιορισμό των εθνικών προγραμμάτων μεταρρυθμίσεων. Κύρια σημεία της αποτελούν η αύξηση της συμμετοχής στην αγορά εργασίας και η μείωση της διαρθρωτικής ανεργίας, η ανάπτυξη ειδικευμένου εργατικού δυναμικού που να ανταποκρίνεται στις ανάγκες της αγοράς εργασίας, η προώθηση της ποιότητας των θέσεων εργασίας και της διά βίου μάθησης, η βελτίωση των επιδόσεων των συστημάτων εκπαίδευσης και κατάρτισης σε όλες τις βαθμίδες και η αύξηση της συμμετοχής στην τριτοβάθμια εκπαίδευση καθώς και η προώθηση της κοινωνικής ένταξης και καταπολέμηση της φτώχειας. Ωστόσο, για να υλοποιηθούν οι παραπάνω στόχοι, τα κράτη μέλη, ιδίως αυτά που βρίσκονται σε δημοσιονομική στενότητα και δεν μπορούν να κινητοποιήσουν πόρους για την απασχόληση, όπως η Ελλάδα, θα πρέπει να εκμεταλλευθούν πλήρως τα εργαλεία και τα χρηματοδοτικά μέσα που ιδίως προσφέρονται μέσω του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινωνικού Ταμείου. Η Ελλάδα ήδη κινητοποιεί περίπου 750 εκατομμύρια ευρώ για την αντιμετώπιση της ανεργίας των νέων· ωστόσο, παραμένουν διαθέσιμοι αρκετοί ακόμα πόροι που θα πρέπει να αξιοποιηθούν πριν την ολοκλήρωση του τρέχοντος πολυετούς δημοσιονομικού πλαισίου που ολοκληρώνεται το 2013.

3-180-750

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente o presente relatório sobre as orientações para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros em que se aprova a proposta apresentada pela Comissão Europeia que reforça a necessidade de cumprimento integral da estratégia para o emprego e o crescimento, por todos conhecida como estratégia «Europa 2020». Esta estratégia baseia-se numa maior coordenação das políticas económicas e centra-se nos domínios fundamentais em que se impõem medidas para reforçar o potencial da Europa em termos de crescimento sustentável e de competitividade, dos quais destaco a ciência e a inovação.

3-180-875

**Paulo Rangel (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A proposta de decisão do Conselho relativa às orientações para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros (que constam no anexo da Decisão do Conselho de 21 de outubro de 2010, conforme redigido pela Comissão Europeia no âmbito da estratégia "Europa 2020") deve ser mantida para 2013 e ser tida em conta pelos Estados-Membros de modo a conseguir uma maior coordenação em matéria de emprego, em especial promovendo mão-de-obra qualificada, formada e suscetível de adaptação, bem como mercados de trabalho que reajam rapidamente às mudanças económicas. O Tratado sobre o Funcionamento da União Europeia estabelece que as orientações em matéria de emprego devem ser coerentes com as orientações gerais para as políticas económicas, estando cada uma das políticas supramencionadas discriminadas em dois instrumentos jurídicos distintos, mas intrinsecamente ligados, cuja coordenação e aplicação devem conduzir a um crescimento inteligente, sustentável e inclusivo da economia, acompanhado de um elevado nível de emprego, produtividade e coesão social. É fundamental a aprovação da proposta de decisão do Conselho, uma vez que de acordo com o disposto na decisão de adoção de 2010, a ênfase da aplicação das políticas depende da sua estabilidade até 2014.

3-181-000

**Evelyn Regner (S&D)**, *schriftlich*. – Eine umfassende und aktive Arbeitsmarktpolitik ist ein wichtiger Bestandteil einer erfolgreichen Wirtschaftspolitik. Das gilt sowohl für einzelne Staaten und umso mehr für die Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union. Das Ziel von beschäftigungspolitischen Maßnahmen muss vornehmlich die Bekämpfung von Arbeitslosigkeit sein. In der derzeitigen Situation steht vor allem die Bekämpfung der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit im Vordergrund, aber auch eine größere Unterstützung für ältere ArbeitnehmerInnen. Gleichzeitig müssen auch die Qualität der Arbeit und eine angemessene Bezahlung gewahrt bleiben. Die Koordinierung der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten untereinander ist enorm wichtig. Ich habe deshalb für den Bericht gestimmt. Der Grundsatz „Gleicher Lohn für gleichwertige Arbeit am gleichen Ort“ muss stets berücksichtigt werden.

3-181-500

**Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Hemos empezado la semana conociendo una nueva cifra récord de paro en España: 4,98 millones de personas están en paro, lo que supone un aumento de 132 055 personas con respecto a diciembre de 2012. A pesar de la elevada tasa de desempleo, las políticas activas de empleo, destinadas a ayudar al trabajador desempleado a volver a encontrar un empleo adecuado a sus capacidades, son casi inexistentes. De hecho, la partida destinada a las políticas activas ha disminuido en un 21 % con respecto a la de 2011. Además de precisar una mayor dotación presupuestaria, estas políticas deben ser modernizadas inspirándose en modelos de activación de parados exitosos como los llevados a cabo en Suecia, Austria o Dinamarca. Por todo ello, acojo favorablemente la propuesta de la Comisión de que las directrices para las políticas de empleo de los Estados miembros que figuran en el anexo de la Decisión del Consejo de 21 de octubre de 2010 se mantengan durante el presente año y sean tenidas en cuenta por los Estados miembros en sus respectivas políticas de empleo. Dichas directrices son esenciales para el cumplimiento de los objetivos de la Estrategia Europa 2020.

3-181-625

**Amalia Sartori (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Il testo del trattato sul funzionamento dell'Unione europea (TFEU) prevede, all'articolo 148, che il Consiglio debba confermare per l'anno 2013 la validità delle linee guida riguardanti il tema dell'occupazione, indicate nella prima parte dello stesso articolo. Tali linee guida sono state approvate nel 2010 con un periodo di validità di quattro anni, durante il quale ci si deve focalizzare sulla loro implementazione e sul raggiungimento degli obiettivi occupazionali prefissati.

Ho appoggiato la riconferma delle linee guida sull'occupazione anche per quest'anno, di modo che si possa continuare sulla strada intrapresa tre anni fa. L'aumento dell'occupazione europea è una priorità assoluta che, insieme a un alto livello di produttività e coesione sociale, ci permetterà finalmente di raggiungere quella crescita intelligente, sostenibile e inclusiva per cui tutti noi ci stiamo impegnando e che abbiamo inserito all'interno della strategia Europa 2020.

3-181-750

**Catherine Stihler (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour as this report ensures that Parliament will be consulted in the event the Council decides to substantially amend the issued text on guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States.

3-182-000

**Charles Tannock (ECR)**, *in writing*. – Unemployment is an ill that plagues all countries of the EU – but no universal prescription can cure it. While we are all striving for recovery, each Member State must follow its own growth path to full employment. A single market does not require a single imposed employment policy. Prescriptive guidelines to Member States regarding employment and economic policies are an infringement of their independence, and an unnecessary consideration in our efforts to achieve jobs throughout Europe. Ultimately, it is the individual country which best knows how to address problems within its own labour market.

The United Kingdom is actively working to reduce unemployment by developing a skilled and relevant workforce based on the demands of its labour market. A unified EU employment policy, by contrast, disregards the need for individualised reforms on a state-by-state basis and instead offers a panacea. It is not that we do not all share the EU's concerns of reducing structural unemployment and poverty, and promoting job quality, market participation and social inclusion; it is merely that the Union's proposed one size cannot fit all.

3-183-000

**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai bien sûr voté en faveur de la recommandation de ma collègue Pervenche Berès à propos des lignes directrices pour les politiques de l'emploi des États membres. Le traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne dispose que les États membres doivent considérer leurs politiques économiques et la promotion de l'emploi comme des questions d'intérêt commun et les coordonner au sein du Conseil. Dans deux articles distincts, il prévoit que le Conseil doit adopter les grandes orientations des politiques économiques (article 121) et des lignes directrices pour l'emploi (article 148), précisant que les secondes doivent être compatibles avec les premières. Les lignes directrices pour l'emploi ont été adoptées le 21 octobre 2010 et, comme le prévoit la décision d'adoption,

elles devraient rester stables jusqu'en 2014 afin que l'accent puisse être placé sur leur application.

3-183-500

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O relator vai de encontro à proposta da Comissão em apoiar o Conselho na extensão do prazo, até 2014, das orientações para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros. Lembro que as orientações são específicas para com os Estados-Membros no que respeita à definição dos seus programas nacionais de reforma e à aplicação dessas reformas, estando as mesmas em consonância com os Pactos de Estabilidade e Crescimento. Dada a situação económica atual na UE e a presente necessidade de manter as orientações relativas às políticas de emprego, de forma a consolidar as bases de um crescimento sustentável na União, votei favoravelmente o relatório.

3-184-500

**Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL)**, *par écrit*. – Le PE acquiesce avec engouement aux propositions du Conseil sur les politiques de l'emploi des Etats membres. Les décisions du Conseil de 2010 dans le cadre du semestre européen pour l'emploi donnent pourtant déjà les piteux résultats que l'on connaît. Les 27 millions de chômeurs en Europe devraient en être la preuve. Relèvement de l'âge de départ à la retraite et flexibilisation du marché du travail n'ont de cesse d'ajouter à la précarisation des travailleurs. On ne peut donc se satisfaire d'un alinéa incitant à une "main-d'œuvre qualifiée", "l'éducation et la formation tout au long de la vie", ou "l'inclusion sociale et lutter contre la pauvreté". Politique économique et pour l'emploi sont liées dans les traités, cette dernière étant conditionnée au respect de la "règle d'or". Or, comment croire que l'on peut réduire le chômage structurel sans s'attaquer à la politique économique austéritaire actuelle ? Les 1500 salariés d'ArcelorMittal de Belgique, de France et du Luxembourg sont venus nous le rappeler jusque devant le Parlement ce mercredi où nous les avons rencontrés. Notre groupe a donc unanimement voté contre ce rapport.

3-185-000

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Nie ma wątpliwości, że Europa boryka się z kryzysem. Świadczy o tym choćby stopa bezrobocia, która jest największa od 10 lat i sięga obecnie 9,6%. Analizy, które przeprowadził Parlament Europejski, wskazują, że głównymi sektorami zatrudnienia będą usługi i transport.

Nowe strategie zakładają zwiększenie współczynnika aktywności zawodowej i ograniczenie bezrobocia, rozwijanie zasobów wykwalifikowanej siły roboczej odpowiadającej potrzebom rynku pracy, promowanie jakości zatrudnienia i uczenia się przez całe życie, poprawę wydajności systemów kształcenia i szkolenia na wszystkich poziomach oraz zwiększenie liczby osób podejmujących studia wyższe, a także walkę z ubóstwem oraz wykluczeniem społecznym.

Niestety wspólne wytyczne nie pomogą lepiej zrozumieć problemu bezrobocia i znaleźć jego skutecznego rozwiązania. Uważam, że nie ma złotego środka dla całej europejskiej gospodarki, ponieważ każdy kraj różni się od pozostałych. To, że wytyczne proponowane przez Brukselę mogą sprawdzić się np. w Hiszpanii, niekoniecznie oznacza, że muszą przynieść takie same skutki w Polsce czy innym państwie członkowskim. Dlatego państwa członkowskie powinny we własnym zakresie prowadzić politykę zatrudnienia i jak

najszybciej reagować na zachodzące zmiany na rynku pracy. Jestem przeciwny takim regulacjom.

3-186-000

**Iva Zanicchi (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – La disoccupazione continua a crescere nell'eurozona, colpendo circa 18 milioni di persone nei vari Stati membri. Anche la disoccupazione giovanile, fenomeno ancor più grave, ha raggiunto dati allarmanti, con percentuali che in alcuni paesi superano il 40%. In questo contesto di stagnazione economica bisogna promuovere azioni volte a far crescere i posti di lavoro nel territorio dell'Unione. Per questo ho espresso il mio voto favorevole al testo della collega Berès, consapevole che solo un rafforzamento delle politiche degli Stati membri a favore dell'occupazione potrà risollevare l'Unione e trainarla fuori dalla crisi.

3-186-250

**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Walka z bezrobociem w Europie to największa i najdłuższa walka ostatnich czasów. Uważam, że powinna ona pozostać w kwestii decyzyjnej państw członkowskich. Niemniej Unia Europejska też ma swoje znaczenie i ważne zadanie. Tym zadaniem jest przede wszystkim zmniejszenie lekkomyślnie narzucanych obciążeń administracyjnych oraz polityk klimatyczno-energetycznych prowadzących do dezindustrializacji Europy. Jak zakładają analitycy, ponad 250 tysięcy osób może stracić pracę w samej Polsce ze względu na tego rodzaju zapisy.

3-186-500

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – A Comissão do Emprego e dos Assuntos Sociais do Parlamento Europeu tece anualmente recomendações relativas às orientações para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros. No entanto, como já ocorreu em anos anteriores, a maioria política representada nesta Comissão demitiu-se de discutir novas recomendações, preferindo continuar com as orientações para a política de emprego de 2010, não propondo as mudanças necessárias em relação à política económica e social que a dramática situação social que vivemos exige. Enquanto se insistir na aplicação de reformas laborais, de forma a liquidar o sistema de segurança social, com o objetivo de introduzir a flexigurança, o aumento da idade da reforma, baixar salários e retirar direitos aos trabalhadores, iremos continuar com o crescimento do desemprego, nomeadamente juvenil, da pobreza e das desigualdades sociais. Não aceitamos a continuação destas políticas e exigimos novas orientações para as políticas de emprego dos Estados-Membros, orientações que não ataquem mas defendam os direitos consagrados dos trabalhadores, o direito à contratação coletiva e aos direitos sociais adquiridos.

### **8.3. Διαφάνεια των μέτρων που ρυθμίζουν τις τιμές των φαρμάκων για ανθρώπινη χρήση (A7-0015/2013 - Antonia Parvanova)**

3-188-000

#### **Προφορικές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου**

3-189-000

**Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR)**. - Madam President, I believe in a single market for medicinal products. In order for this market to function properly, we need a level playing field and greater transparency, and this means that pricing and reimbursement of medicines

must be based on objective and verifiable criteria. However, Member States have exclusive competence in deciding on the pricing and reimbursement of medicines. Therefore, we must ensure that the new directive does not interfere with national competences.

I voted for this report because I believe that, unlike the original Commission proposal, it offers a good deal for patients. It sets out faster and clearer procedural rules for pricing medicinal products. I hope the Commission will use the report as a basis for a new proposal that will ensure the effectiveness of the system.

3-190-000

**Iva Zanicchi (PPE).** - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, i dubbi troppo spesso legati alla fissazione del prezzo e alle modalità di rimborso dei prodotti farmaceutici hanno reso necessario aggiornare il quadro normativo in vigore nel rispetto della competenza esclusiva degli Stati membri. Nel decidere riguardo ai prezzi e al rimborso dei medicinali diviene quindi fondamentale promuovere la produzione di farmaci a costi accessibili, abolire gli ostacoli relativi al commercio dei medicinali generici e incoraggiare la ricerca e lo sviluppo per garantire cure a prezzi sostenibili per i cittadini europei.

3-191-000

**Jim Higgins (PPE).** - Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteur and the shadows for the work they have done on this important issue. It is absolutely vital that we work to create greater transparency of the measures regulating the price of the medical products. It is also very important that we do this now, as the directive in effect is completely outdated.

The conditions present in the pharmaceutical markets are vastly different to the ones which existed when the previous directives were put in place. More medical products are now available thanks to medical advances and generic medicines. They are now more readily available to the consumer and they are cheaper.

Furthermore, the directive in force, which dates from the 1980s, must be replaced. Otherwise it will be increasingly challenging for the Member States to implement it. We have adopted an excellent measure today; the time limits laid down by the previous directive are not feasible in the modern day. So it is a good day's work.

3-192-000

**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE).** - Madam President, transparency opens the way to integrity and accountability, and we need greater transparency in the decision-making process for the pricing and reimbursement of pharmaceutical products.

The pricing and reimbursement of pharmaceutical products fall within the Member States' exclusive competence. However, we need minimum procedural requirements in order to ensure the proper functioning of the single market, as well as legal certainty and transparency for national authorities.

The names and declarations of interests of the experts involved in the decision-making process should be disclosed – they should be published and made available. Moreover, the public should be aware of and have access to all the documents and information relating to a given decision. Greater transparency is the key to assessing the level of integrity and independence of decisions taken and to reinforcing citizens' trust and confidence in their national health authorities.

3-193-000

**Alfredo Antoniozzi (PPE).** - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il testo proposto dalla Commissione era frutto di un'analisi accurata delle attuali condizioni dei mercati farmaceutici, nonché dell'attuale contesto e dei vincoli finanziari cui le autorità competenti sono soggette in materia di decisione sulla fissazione del prezzo e sul rimborso dei medicinali.

Condivido in pieno l'opinione secondo cui l'obiettivo generale di tale proposta dovrebbe essere quello di aggiornare il quadro legislativo esistente in modo da chiarire gli obblighi procedurali per gli Stati membri e garantire il buon funzionamento del mercato unico e l'efficacia della legislazione in materia di mercato interno.

Vi erano grandi ritardi nelle decisioni in materia di fissazione dei prezzi e di rimborso e credo che con le soluzioni adottate riusciremo finalmente a porvi un rimedio. Devo prendere atto che la competenza esclusiva degli Stati membri in questa materia è stata rispettata. I requisiti procedurali minimi dovrebbero garantire certezze giuridiche e trasparenza per le autorità nazionali competenti. Promuovere quindi la produzione di medicinali e l'entrata sul mercato dei medicinali generici.

3-194-000

**Charles Tannock (ECR).** - Madam President, 20 years ago there were only 12 Member States and the single market was only a few months old. Despite all the fundamental changes that have occurred since then, the existing directive regulating the pricing of pharmaceutical products has not once been amended. It is therefore absolutely necessary to update this directive in the interests of patients and health insurance providers.

While the transparency directive will encourage greater efficiency, efficiency does not translate automatically into hastiness, which is why I welcome the compromises on time limits. Above all this legislation, which I voted for, could offer an exemplary reconciliation of Member State competence and Single Market harmonisation, giving patients faster and more cost-effective access to medicines while ensuring that their prices are fairly administered within the limits of national rules and regulations.

Let me also put on the record that I am proud that the European Medicines Agency is based in my London constituency – a rare example of an EU agency which provides good value for money.

3-195-000

**Diane Dodds (NI).** - Madam President, I share the committee's desire to see vital EU medicinal products reach those who need them most in the fastest possible time. As in other regions, people living in my constituency in Northern Ireland should have access to the most successful and specialised medicines available. It is therefore necessary to reduce administrative barriers to trade.

A balance must be found, however, between making the national procedures that set prices for pharmaceuticals more efficient and ensuring that products are judged solely on how effective they will be in meeting health demands. I support the plans to reduce the time limits for decisions on pricing and reimbursements for generic medicines. I also welcome provisions which would compel decision-making bodies to make public the names of their expert members, as well as the reasons for their judgments.



3-196-000

**Daniel Hannan (ECR).** - Madam President, one of the most scandalous episodes I have lived through as a Member of the European Parliament was the banning and restriction of a number of higher-dose vitamin and mineral supplements and herbal remedies by their reclassification as pharmaceutical products. The justification was the precautionary principle, which is one of those ideas that sounds plausible but turns out to be specious.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century it was widely believed that the noise of a passing train would cause miscarriages in pregnant women. Had we applied the precautionary principle we would not have laid a single inch of track, because the rail operators at that time could no more prove that they would not cause miscarriages than the herbalist can prove that her products are not deleterious to health. There is such a thing as 'benefit of the doubt'. It is not a good business model to go around poisoning your customers and opening yourself to massive liabilities.

Of course the real reason that these restrictions were brought in was because a handful of massive pharmaceutical corporations which could easily afford the compliance costs saw it as an opportunity to put their smaller competitors out of business, which is exactly what has happened. Once again, we see that consumers, taxpayers and entrepreneurs are disadvantaged in favour of the handful of corporate interests which are the real beneficiaries of this system.

3-197-000

**Hannu Takkula (ALDE).** - Arvoisa puhemies, äänestin tämän mietinnön puolesta. On erittäin tärkeää, että lääkkeet voivat olla kohtuuhintaisia Euroopan unionin kansalaisille. Tärkeää on myös muistaa se, että lääketeollisuudessa tutkimustyötä tekevien työ pitää ottaa huomioon sen sijaan että olisi hyvin lyhyet suoja-ajat ja sen jälkeen jotkut voivat kopioida lääkkeitä.

Tärkeintä on huolehtia siitä, että myös lääketieteellinen tutkimus ja lääkkeiden kehittäminen menevät eteenpäin voimakkaasti ja että niitä rahoitetaan. Monissa maissa on omat järjestelmänsä tehdä tämä erilaisten tutkimusohjelmien kautta, ja myös kalliimpia lääkkeitä sairausvakuutusjärjestelmän kautta korvataan kansalaisille. Lähtökohtaisesti on erittäin hyvä, että me saamme laadukkaita lääkkeitä edullisesti, mutta on myös tärkeää huolehtia siitä, että lääkkeitä voidaan kehittää jatkuvasti ja sitä kautta satsataan lääketeollisuuteen ja sen innovaatioihin.

3-198-000

### Γραπτές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

3-198-250

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D),** *por escrito.* – Acolho favoravelmente a proposta da Comissão e as respetivas disposições principais, no contexto das limitações atuais, nomeadamente financeiras, ao abrigo das quais as autoridades competentes têm de deliberar sobre a fixação de preços e reembolsos dos medicamentos. Considero que o objetivo geral da presente proposta deve ser a atualização do quadro legislativo existente, a fim de clarificar e de assegurar o bom funcionamento do Mercado Único e a eficácia da legislação relativa ao mercado interno, nas decisões sobre a fixação de preços e reembolsos e de obstáculos ao comércio de produtos farmacêuticos. Como prioridade, gostaria de insistir na necessidade

de reforçar as disposições relacionadas com a transparência do processo de tomada de decisões e com as decisões tomadas, que representa uma crescente exigência da sociedade. Por conseguinte, sugiro um conjunto de medidas adicionais, particularmente a obrigação das autoridades competentes de divulgar os nomes e as declarações de interesses dos peritos que sejam membros dos órgãos de decisão das autoridades competentes. Essas disposições, bem como um aumento da disponibilização ao público de documentos e informações, visam reforçar a transparência, integridade e independência das decisões tomadas e devem, em última análise, reforçar a confiança nas autoridades públicas responsáveis a nível nacional.

3-198-375

**Laima Liucija Andrikiene (PPE)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šią rezoliuciją dėl vaistų kainų skaidrumo. Europos Parlamentas pritarė Komisijos pasiūlymui atnaujinti esamą teisės aktų sistemą siekiant patikslinti valstybių narių procedūrinės prievolės ir užtikrinti vidaus rinkos teisės aktų efektyvumą tiek siekiant išvengti vilkinimo priimant sprendimus dėl kainų nustatymo ir kompensavimo, tiek šalinant prekybos farmacijos produktais kliūtis. Be abejonės, išskirtinė valstybių narių kompetencija priimant sprendimus dėl vaistų kainų ir jų kompensavimo turi būti gerbiama, tačiau taip pat turėtų būti minimaliais procedūriniais reikalavimais užtikrinamas teisinis tikrumas ir skaidrumas nacionalinėms kompetentingoms institucijoms, skatinama vaistų gamyba ir generinių vaistų patekimas į rinką ir skatinami moksliniai tyrimai ir naujų vaistų kūrimas. Tai sudarytų sąlygas visiems Europos pacientams gauti prieinamą gydymą ir geresnius bei pigesnius vaistus.

3-198-500

**Sophie Auconie (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Le Parlement européen a voté en faveur de la révision de la directive de 1989 sur la transparence des procédures de fixation du prix des médicaments. Ce texte introduit de nouveaux éléments pour faciliter une mise en œuvre effective et pratique des délais. L'objectif est qu'un cadre commun réaliste puisse être respecté au sein de l'Union quant aux délais de fixation pour le prix et le remboursement des médicaments tout en renforçant la transparence. J'ai donc également voté en faveur de ce rapport.

3-199-000

**Liam Aylward (ALDE)**, *i scríbhinn*. – Is cinnte gur chóir inniúlacht na mBallstát maidir le praghsáil agus aisíocaíochtaí táirgí íocshláinte a chosaint ach ní foláir freisin go ndéanfaimis iarracht cóir leighis ar phraghas réasúnta a chur ar fáil do gach uile dhuine san AE. Fearaim fáilte roimh an moladh i dtaca le tréimhsí feithimh níos gaire a chur i bhfeidhm do dhrugaí cineálacha, a bheadh chun leasa tomhaltóirí agus córais sláinte phoiblí, agus tacaím go hiomlán le hiarratas an Rapóirtéara maidir le trédhearcacht na gcóras praghsála agus aisíocaíochta do tháirgí cógaisíochta a fheabhsú. Cé go bhfuil laghdú tagtha ara bhfuil á íoc in Éirinn ar dhrugaí ar oideas, tá an chosúlacht ar an scéal go bhfuil tomhaltóirí agus cáiníocóirí Éireannacha ag íoc dhá oiread agus atá á íoc sa Fhrainc, sa Spáinn agus sa Bhreatain. Aontaím gur chóir go mbeadh solúbthacht ann do na Ballstáit an Treoir seo a chur i bhfeidhm de réir a rialacháin féin ach ní foláir go mbeadh na húdaráis náisiúnta ag tabhairt aghaidhe ar dhifríochtaí i bpraghas ó thír go tír agus ag cinntiú go bhfuil teacht ag daoine ar chóir leighis ar phraghas réasúnta agus nach bhfuil sailleadh á déanamh ar na Ballstáit agus táirgí íocshláinte á gceannach.

3-199-062

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį siūlymą dėl priemonių, reglamentuojančių žmonėms skirtų vaistų kainas, skaidrumo. Šio siūlymo tikslas – paspartinti generinių vaistų išleidimą į rinką supaprastinant nacionalinių sprendimų dėl vaistų kainos tvarką ir sutrumpinant šių sprendimų priėmimo laiką. Generiniai vaistai – tai pigesni esamų vaistų analogai, parduvinėjami pasibaigus patento galiojimui. Komisijos duomenimis tokie vaistai, net 40 % pigesni negu originalūs, todėl patentą turinčios įmonės siekia kuo ilgiau pratęsti savo išskirtinę teisę pardavinėti originalus, neįleidamos į rinką jų analogų. Labai svarbu tai pakeisti ir sudaryti sąlygas ES piliečiams įsigyti pigesnių vaistų. Numatoma nustatyti 60 dienų laikotarpį sprendimui dėl generinių vaistų kainos ir kompensavimo tvarkos priėmimo (šiandien toks sprendimas gali trukti net iki 700 dienų). Pritariu šiam siūlymui bei siūlymui nustatyti prievolę vaistų kontrolės tarnyboms atskleisti savo ekspertų, priimančių sprendimus dėl vaistų kainų ir kompensavimo, pavardes ir interesų deklaracijas bei siūlymui kartą per metus viešai skelbti kompensuojamų vaistų ir jų kainų sąrašus.

3-199-125

**Regina Bastos (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O presente relatório prevê uma atualização abrangente da Diretiva 89/105/CEE, com o objetivo de garantir a transparência das medidas nacionais que regulamentam a formação dos preços dos medicamentos para uso humano e a sua inclusão nos sistemas nacionais de seguro de saúde. As disposições da Diretiva em questão refletem as condições que vigoravam no mercado farmacêutico há mais de vinte anos e que sofreram, desde então, profundas alterações. Exemplo disso, é o aparecimento de medicamentos genéricos que oferecem alternativas mais baratas aos medicamentos de marca ou do desenvolvimento de medicamentos baseados na investigação cada vez mais inovadores. Neste sentido, torna-se necessário reforçar as disposições relacionadas com a transparência do processo de tomada de decisões e com as decisões tomadas e obrigar as autoridades competentes a divulgar os nomes e declarações de interesses dos peritos que sejam membros dos órgãos de decisão. Os procedimentos de recurso em caso de incumprimento dos prazos relativos à inclusão dos medicamentos nos sistemas nacionais de seguros de saúde deve permanecer administrativo e, em caso de atrasos injustificados, ser reencaminhado para a instância administrativa ou jurídica relevante de acordo com a legislação nacional. Pelo exposto, apoiei o presente relatório.

3-199-250

**Nora Berra (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'accorde ma voix en faveur du rapport d'Antonyia Parvanova qui partage l'avis selon lequel l'objectif global de la proposition est de mettre à jour le cadre législatif en vigueur afin de clarifier les obligations procédurales qui incombent aux États membres et de garantir le bon fonctionnement du marché unique.

3-199-375

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**, *per iscritto*. – Ho sostenuto col mio voto la relazione Paranova, sulla proposta della Commissione che intende sostituire la direttiva 89/105/CEE riguardante la trasparenza delle misure che disciplinano la fissazione dei prezzi dei medicinali per uso umano e la loro inclusione nei regimi nazionali di assicurazione malattia. Le modifiche saranno apportate al fine di adeguare i contenuti attuali secondo requisiti di maggiore trasparenza da applicarsi a tutte le misure di fissazione dei prezzi e di rimborso. Le nuove

disposizioni terranno conto della giurisprudenza della Corte di Giustizia e saranno affiancate da nuovi strumenti atti a facilitare il dialogo con gli Stati membri.

3-199-500

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį pranešimą, kadangi yra svarbu užtikrinti vaistų gamybą ir generinių vaistų patekimą į rinką. Be to, reikėtų skatinti mokslinius tyrimus ir naujų vaistų kūrimą, siekiant pagerinti visų Europos pacientų galimybes gauti prieinamą gydymą. Svarbu pažymėti, jog, nors ir valstybės narės yra atsakingos už savo sveikatos priežiūros sistemų, sveikatos paslaugų ir sveikatos priežiūros organizavimą, kiekviena valstybė narė gali imtis priemonių vaistų vartojimui valdyti, kainoms reguliuoti arba viešojo finansavimo sąlygoms nustatyti. Todėl šiuo Komisijos pasiūlymu yra siekiama susisteminti minimalius reikalavimus, siekiant užtikrinti, kad nacionalinės priemonės, visų pirma tos, pagal kurias reglamentuojamas žmonėms skirtų vaistų kainų nustatymas ir kompensavimas, neprieštarautų laisvo prekių judėjimo principui. Šiuo tikslu nagrinėjamoje direktyvoje nustatyta keletas procedūrinių reikalavimų, skirtų valstybių narių priimtų kainų nustatymo ir kompensavimo priemonių skaidrumui užtikrinti, įskaitant atitinkamų sprendimų priėmimo terminus ar prievolę. Trumpiau tariant, tuo tikslu, kad kompetentingos nacionalinės institucijos nurodytų kiekvieno savo sprendimo motyvus ir užtikrintų paraiškas pateikusioms bendrovėms atitinkamas teisių gynimo priemones. Šie pasiūlymai turėtų prisidėti prie veiksmingos ir saugios sveikatos srities politikos, kuri būtų orientuota į pacientus ir kuria būtų siekiama užtikrinti geriausią kainos ir kokybės santykį.

3-200-000

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Tratatul privind funcționarea Uniunii Europene prevede că statelor membre le revine sarcina să își organizeze sistemele proprii de sănătate și să presteze servicii de sănătate și de îngrijire medicală. În acest cadru, fiecare stat membru poate să adopte măsuri de gestionare a consumului de medicamente, să reglementeze prețurile acestora sau să stabilească condițiile de finanțare publică a acestora. Astfel, un medicament autorizat în conformitate cu legislația UE pe baza profilului calității, siguranței și eficacității sale poate face obiectul unor cerințe de reglementare suplimentare la nivel de stat membru, înainte de a fi introdus pe piață sau eliberat pacienților în cadrul sistemului public de asigurări de sănătate. Față de cele mai sus menționate, consider că existența unor cerințe minime procedurale ar trebui să garanteze siguranță juridică și transparență pentru autoritățile naționale competente și să promoveze producerea de medicamente și intrarea pe piață a medicamentelor generice. Este necesar să se încurajeze cercetarea și dezvoltarea unor medicamente noi pentru a facilita accesul tuturor pacienților din Europa la tratamente abordabile.

3-200-500

**John Bufton (EFD)**, *in writing*. – I voted against this report as I am wholly opposed to the EU regulating our medicine, and in particular the pricing of our medicine, in the UK.

3-200-625

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Concordo de formal geral com o presente relatório que apoia a proposta da Comissão Europeia face à atualização do quadro legislativo existente em matéria de fixação do preço e transparência dos medicamentos para uso humano, de forma a garantir o bom funcionamento do Mercado Único e a eficácia da

legislação em vigor. Será importante garantir que a lei abre espaço para que seja promovida a introdução no mercado de medicamentos genéricos, incentivar a investigação e o desenvolvimento de novos medicamentos, facilitando o acesso a tratamentos financeiramente acessíveis a todos os doentes da Europa. A garantia de transparência do processo de tomada de decisões é fundamental, de forma muito vincada no que toca à fixação de preços, pois reforça a confiança nas entidades responsáveis. O presente relatório propõe ainda que a proposta da Comissão seja alterada, a fim de garantir uma execução prática e eficaz das disposições previstas e conferir às autoridades nacionais competentes o nível necessário de flexibilidade e autonomia para cumprir os requisitos da presente diretiva. O princípio da proporcionalidade deve também ser garantido. Esta proposta é positiva sendo mais uma alavanca na garantia de políticas de saúde seguras e eficazes, centradas no doente e na geração de valor.

3-200-750

**Françoise Castex (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – Le Parlement européen s'est exprimé aujourd'hui sur la révision de la directive de 1989 sur la fixation du prix des médicaments. Ce texte prévoit les procédures à respecter pour définir le prix de vente et les conditions de remboursement des médicaments. Le point le plus contesté était l'introduction de nouveaux délais de traitement des demandes considérablement raccourcis, irréalistes, et assortis d'une clause d'acceptation tacite du prix demandé par le laboratoire au cas de non-respect des délais. Une telle mesure n'est ni proportionnée, ni conforme au principe de subsidiarité! Nous avons pu allonger les délais, ce qui rend le texte acceptable, en revanche, la clause d'acceptation tacite n'a été supprimée que pour les demandes d'augmentation de prix, ce qui est regrettable, même si l'essentiel est que les autorités disposent du temps nécessaire.

3-201-000

**Νικόλαος Χουντής (GUE/NGL)**, *γραπτώς*. – Καταψήφισα την έκθεση Παρναβονα παρά τις βελτιώσεις που επέφερε σε ορισμένα σημεία στην απαράδεκτη πρόταση οδηγίας της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής. Θεωρώ ιδιαίτερα προβληματικά τα ακόλουθα σημεία : 1. Δυστυχώς η Ολομέλεια σήμερα απέρριψε τη διπλή νομική βάση ( άρθρα 114 και 168) κρατώντας μόνο το 114 και υπονομεύοντας με τον τρόπο αυτό την ευθύνη των κρατών μελών για τα εθνικά συστήματα ασφάλισης υγείας που σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 168 επιίπτει τις ευθύνες τους. 2. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή επιβάλλει κυρώσεις σε περίπτωση μη τήρησης των προθεσμιών για την επιστροφή δαπανών. Κάτι τέτοιο αντίκειται στην αρχή της επικουρικότητας και θέτει μεγάλο πρόβλημα στα ασφαλιστικά ταμεία. Υπονομεύει την ικανότητα των αρχών τιμολόγησης και επιστροφής δαπανών να ανταποκριθούν στην αποστολή τους για την προστασία της δημόσιας υγείας και προσθέτει περιττά διοικητικά και οικονομικά βάρη στα συστήματα δημόσιας υγείας που θα θέσουν σε κίνδυνο τη βιωσιμότητά τους και την πρόσβαση των ασθενών σε ασφαλή φάρμακα. 3. Απαγορεύεται στα κράτη μέλη, στο πλαίσιο των αποφάσεων τιμολόγησης και επιστροφής δαπανών, να επαναξιολογήσουν τα στοιχεία στα οποία βασίστηκε η άδεια κυκλοφορίας, συμπεριλαμβανομένων της αποτελεσματικότητας, της ποιότητας ή της ασφάλειας του φαρμάκου. Δυστυχώς οι τροπολογίες που κατέθεσε η ομάδα μου για να εξαλείψει αυτές τις διατάξεις απορρίφθηκαν.

3-202-000

**Minodora Cliveti (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Principalul beneficiar al sistemului medical trebuie să fie și să rămână pacientul. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să promoveze o politică transparentă, predictibilă și coerentă a sistemului sanitar care să garanteze tuturor pacienților europeni un acces în timp real, eficient și de calitate atât la medicamentele originale, cât și

la cele generice. Complexitatea și diversitatea măsurilor naționale legate de stabilirea prețurilor medicamentelor a crescut considerabil după 1989, de la adoptarea Directivei 89/105/CEE privind transparența pentru produsele farmaceutice. Comisia Europeană a propus dispoziții fundamentale de actualizare a cadrului legislativ actual pentru a clarifica obligațiile procedurale care revin statelor membre și pentru a asigura buna funcționare a pieței unice și eficiența legislației privind piața internă, atât prin evitarea întârzierilor în ceea ce privește stabilirea prețurilor și deciziile de rambursare, cât și prin înlăturarea obstacolelor din calea comerțului de produse farmaceutice. Avem nevoie de decizii mai rapide privind stabilirea prețurilor și rambursarea pentru a menține dinamismul pieței farmaceutice și pentru a oferi cetățenilor un acces mai bun la medicamente. De asemenea, facilitarea intrării mai rapide pe piață a medicamentelor generice are o deosebită importanță pentru promovarea unui sistem sanitar coerent și cu o mai mare transparență și va conduce la economii substanțiale atât pentru bugetele alocate sănătății publice, cât și pentru pacienți.

3-203-000

**Carlos Coelho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Recai sobre os Estados-Membros a responsabilidade de organizarem os respetivos sistemas de saúde, a prestação de serviços e cuidados médicos e a repartição dos recursos que lhe são afetados, mas deverão sempre fazê-lo no pleno respeito das condições mínimas estabelecidas ao nível da UE, em termos de qualidade, segurança e eficácia dos medicamentos, mas também de forma a garantir a sua compatibilidade com as regras do mercado interno e o princípio da livre circulação de mercadorias.

A Diretiva que estabelece os requisitos mínimos de forma a garantir a transparência das medidas de fixação de preços e reembolsos adotadas pelos Estados-Membros deixou de estar adequada às condições atuais dos mercados farmacêuticos. Apoio esta atualização do quadro legislativo vigente, introduzindo uma maior transparência e segurança jurídica. Estes requisitos processuais mínimos deverão contribuir para promover a produção de medicamentos, a introdução no mercado de medicamentos genéricos e incentivar a investigação e o desenvolvimento de novos medicamentos, facilitando o acesso a tratamentos financeiramente acessíveis a todos os doentes da Europa. Acredito que as exigências propostas, de forma a garantir decisões atempadas e transparentes, asseguram o equilíbrio necessário entre a obrigação de preservar as competências dos Estados-Membros no domínio da saúde pública e a necessidade de garantir a eficácia da Diretiva no âmbito do mercado interno.

3-203-250

**Corina Crețu (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Susțin această rezoluție pentru că este vital să sprijinim creșterea raportului cost-eficiență în ceea ce privește produsele farmaceutice. În vederea asigurării bunei funcționări a pieței unice, a facilitării accesului pacienților la rambursări în cadrul sistemelor publice de asigurări de sănătate și pentru a încuraja schimbul comercial al acestor produse farmaceutice, avem nevoie de un cadru juridic transparent și de un sistem transparent și armonizat de reglementare a prețurilor.

3-203-500

**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Consider că inovarea și cercetarea în domeniul sănătății aduc avantaje semnificative pentru pacienți și are consecințe pozitive asupra eficacității și durabilității sistemelor de sănătate.

3-203-625

**Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Si l'Union européenne dispose d'un marché uniformisé en matière de libre circulation des travailleurs, des biens et des capitaux, il existe toujours d'énormes différences entre États membres, s'agissant du fonctionnement des systèmes de santé et de remboursement des médicaments, politiques qui relèvent des États membres. Par exemple, des médicaments sont aujourd'hui remboursés après 700 jours dans certains États. Sans empiéter sur ces compétences exclusives des États en matière de fixation des prix et de remboursement des médicaments, il apparaît nécessaire de prévoir des règles minimales permettant d'encourager la production de médicaments, l'entrée sur le marché de médicaments génériques et d'encourager la recherche et le développement de nouveaux médicaments afin de rendre les traitements médicaux abordables pour l'ensemble des citoyens européens.

3-200-875

**Anne Delvaux (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Je me réjouis du vote de ce rapport qui devrait permettre aux patients européens d'accéder plus rapidement à des médicaments génériques. Nous proposons aussi un délai de 60 jours pour décider du prix et du remboursement des médicaments génériques, en vue d'accélérer la disponibilité de ces produits et d'économiser l'argent des patients et des systèmes de sécurité sociale. Les autorités compétentes dans les États membres seraient également tenues de publier, au minimum une fois par an, une liste des médicaments couverts par leur système public d'assurance-maladie avec leur prix, une information aux patients qui me semble indispensable.

3-203-687

**Edite Estrela (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente o relatório relativo à "transparência das medidas que regulamentam os preços dos medicamentos para uso humano", porque inclui propostas que permitirão atualizar o quadro legislativo existente, a fim de conferir maior transparência e segurança jurídica, de incentivar a investigação e o desenvolvimento de novos medicamentos, bem como de facilitar o acesso a tratamentos financeiramente acessíveis a todos os doentes da Europa.

3-203-750

**Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I abstained in the vote on this report. The current directive on the pricing of medicines reflects the market conditions of twenty years ago. However, these conditions have changed with the rise of generic medicines on the one hand and of expensive innovative medicines on the other hand. Generic products are on average 40% cheaper than the branded medicines once they have been available for two years. Although the report recognises these problems, it does not go far enough and in abstaining I wanted to flag these problems. It is important that we address the situation correctly. In Wales prescriptions are free to patients but speeding up the availability of generic medicines could save substantial sums for the NHS.

3-204-500

**Göran Färm, Anna Hedh, Olle Ludvigsson, Jens Nilsson, Marita Ulvskog och Åsa Westlund (S&D)**, *skriftlig*. – Vi svenska socialdemokrater anser att transparensdirektivet gällande prissättning och ersättning av läkemedel är ett för kraftigt ingripande i något som är och bör vara medlemsstaternas angelägenhet. Vi finner det mycket problematiskt att

den svenska modellen för beslutsprocessen gällande generiska läkemedel inte ryms inom den föreslagna tidsfristen. Därför valde vi att rösta emot förslaget i slutomröstningen.

3-204-750

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A Diretiva 89/105/CEE relativa à transparência das medidas que regulamentam a formação do preço dos medicamentos nunca foi revista, embora as condições de mercado e as políticas de saúde tenham sofrido alterações substanciais nos últimos 20 anos. Assim sendo, reconheço a pertinência desta revisão e atualização da legislação vigente, a qual mantém, e bem, o princípio da autonomia dos Estados na regulamentação da formação dos preços e condições de reembolso (comparticipação) de medicamentos. Porém, são introduzidas importantes alterações no que respeita à (i) adaptação dos prazos das decisões de fixação de preços e de reembolsos, à (ii) clarificação da relação dos procedimentos de fixação de preços e de reembolsos com os direitos de propriedade intelectual e o procedimento de autorização de introdução no mercado, e à (iii) instituição de determinados instrumentos para facilitar o diálogo e a aplicação da diretiva e para assegurar o seu cumprimento efetivo.

3-204-875

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Este relatório acolhe, de uma forma geral, a proposta da Comissão e as disposições principais, com base numa análise exata das condições atuais dos mercados farmacêuticos, bem como do contexto e das limitações atuais, nomeadamente financeiras, ao abrigo das quais as autoridades competentes têm de deliberar sobre a fixação de preços e reembolsos dos medicamentos. Assim, está previsto que as decisões nacionais sobre o preço e o reembolso dos medicamentos genéricos possam ser tomadas no prazo de 60 dias. No caso dos novos medicamentos, o prazo será de 180 dias. Os estudos realizados mostraram que estas decisões podem, atualmente, demorar até 250 dias no caso dos medicamentos genéricos e até 700 dias no caso dos medicamentos inovadores. Esta proposta deverá conduzir a poupanças significativas para os orçamentos de saúde pública e criar um quadro mais previsível para as empresas farmacêuticas e, conseqüentemente, proporcionar aos cidadãos um melhor acesso a estes produtos. Este relatório vai de encontro a uma crescente exigência da sociedade, nomeadamente quando se trata da fixação de preços e reembolsos de produtos farmacêuticos.

3-205-000

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Os Estados-Membros são responsáveis pela organização dos respetivos sistemas de saúde e pela repartição dos recursos que lhe são afetados, incluindo na área dos medicamentos. Assim é e assim deve continuar a ser. A proposta da relatora, no seguimento da proposta da Comissão Europeia, a pretexto da necessária transparência na fixação do preço dos medicamentos (que não contestamos) e dos desenvolvimentos ao nível do sector farmacêutico, com desenvolvimento de novos medicamentos, acaba por submeter os Estados-Membros e os interesses dos cidadãos aos interesses da indústria farmacêutica. Caso os prazos agora estabelecidos para os Estados-Membros decidirem sobre o preço e sobre o sistema de reembolso de cada medicamento não sejam cumpridos, a indústria farmacêutica tem, no limite, o poder de impor unilateralmente o seu preço aos Estados. A proposta implica ainda limitações, que consideramos graves, da soberania dos Estados-Membros, nos domínios da reavaliação da segurança, eficácia e qualidade dos medicamentos. O nosso grupo apresentou alterações ao relatório, visando salvaguardar as competências dos Estados-Membros e impedir as inaceitáveis penalizações que afetarão ainda mais os serviços públicos de saúde - alvo já



de um insidioso processo de desmantelamento progressivo, às mãos das troicas, ocupante e colaboracionista. Estas alterações foram rejeitadas pela maioria. Assim sendo, obviamente votámos contra.

3-205-500

**Christofer Fjellner (PPE)**, *skriftlig*. – Transparensdirektivet har ur svensk synvinkel varit kontroversiellt. Framför allt har den svenska regeringen oroat sig för att direktivet ska försvåra för den svenska generika-reformen, eftersom tidsramarna för godkännandeprocesserna för generiska läkemedel var snävare i kommissionens förslag. Parlamentet utökade tidsgränserna till 30 plus 30 dagar, och Christofer Fjellner (M) lade ett ändringsförslag som mjukar upp formuleringen och skänker ökad flexibilitet för generiska preparat. Med dessa förbättringar av kommissionens förslag kunde moderaterna rösta för det förslag som låg inför kammaren.

3-206-000

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Právne predpisy Únie poskytujú harmonizovaný rámec pre povolenie liekov na humánne použitie. V súlade so smernicou Európskeho parlamentu a Rady 2001/83/ES zo 6. novembra 2001, ktorou sa ustanovuje zákonník Spoločenstva o humánných liekoch, sa môžu lieky na trh Únie uvádzať až po získaní povolenia na uvedenie na trh vychádzajúceho z hodnotenia ich kvality, bezpečnosti a účinnosti. Členské štáty boli v ostatnom období konfrontované s neustálym rastom výdavkov na lieky, čo viedlo k zavedeniu čoraz komplexnejšej politiky riadenia spotreby liekov v rámci vnútroštátnych systémov zdravotného poistenia. Príslušné orgány členských štátov zaviedli hlavne celý rad opatrení s cieľom kontrolovať predpisovanie liekov, regulovať ich ceny a stanoviť podmienky ich verejného financovania. Tieto opatrenia sa zameriavajú najmä na podporu verejného zdravia zabezpečením primeranej dostupnosti liekov v rámci primeraných nákladov a zároveň majú zabezpečiť finančnú stabilitu systémov verejného zdravotného poistenia. Rozdiely medzi jednotlivými vnútroštátnymi opatreniami však môžu brzdiť alebo deformovať obchod s liekmi v Únii, narúšať hospodársku súťaž, a tak priamo ovplyvňovať fungovanie vnútorného trhu s liekmi. Myslím si, že je opodstatnené návrh Komisie zodpovedajúcim spôsobom zmeniť a doplniť s cieľom zaručiť praktické a účinné vykonávanie plánovaných ustanovení a poskytnúť príslušným vnútroštátnym orgánom potrebnú mieru flexibility a autonómie v záujme splnenia požiadaviek predmetnej smernice.

3-206-250

**Bruno Gollnisch (NI)**, *par écrit*. – Voilà un exemple parfait de l'Europe sociale! Alors que ce n'est absolument pas dans ses attributions, l'Union européenne va pouvoir limiter et encadrer les capacités des États à décider des prix des médicaments et de toute la politique sociale et de santé qui va avec. Avec un grand bénéficiaire: l'industrie pharmaceutique. Et de grands perdants: les patients et les systèmes de sécurité sociale!

Plusieurs États membres se sont inquiétés de cet abus de pouvoir et de la violation manifeste du principe de subsidiarité par ce texte. Il est dommage que tous les Parlements nationaux n'aient pas joué leur rôle de gardiens de ce principe. Et il est également dommage que la majorité de ce Parlement ait jugé bon de rejeter la base juridique qui reconnaît aux États la responsabilité de la gestion des services de santé et des ressources qui leur sont affectées, pour ne retenir que celle qui privilégie la libre circulation des marchandises. Tout un symbole!

3-206-312

**Jim Higgins (PPE)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this report as it will allow us to move towards ensuring that every European citizen has access to affordable medical treatment. The conditions present in the pharmaceutical market of today are vastly different to those which existed when Directive 89/105/EEC was enacted. With many medical advances having occurred and greater accessibility to generic medicines, citizens can now have much cheaper access to medical treatments. However, the time limits laid down by Directive 89/105/EEC are not working for our Member States and they are instead creating delays in the entry of new generic medicines to the market. Replacing this Directive will further facilitate the entry of such generic medicinal products to the single market and this can only benefit consumers and all European citizens by enabling them to have access to treatments which are more affordable, while also creating greater transparency in the measures regulating the prices of medicinal products.

3-206-375

**Brice Hortefeux (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'accorde un grand intérêt à la santé publique, qui est généralement une des préoccupations majeures des citoyens européens. Les scandales du Médiateur et des pilules de troisième génération, plus récemment, ont aggravé le sentiment de méfiance de la part des citoyens à l'égard des autorités gouvernementales et des agences de contrôle jugées peu efficaces en matière de prévention des risques et peu réactives lors de la prise de décision. Les Etats membres et la Commission européenne doivent redoubler de vigilance afin de garantir un haut niveau de santé publique, mais ils doivent également encourager toutes les mesures et les initiatives qui permettent à la recherche pharmaceutique de proposer des médicaments innovants. La transparence des mesures qui régissent la fixation des prix des médicaments est également une mesure nécessaire, car elle évite les pratiques déloyales et facilite un accès rapide des patients à ces médicaments innovants. Tous les efforts des États membres pour raccourcir le délai d'admission au remboursement et de fixation des prix doivent donc être encouragés.

3-206-437

**Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį pasiūlymą. Bendras šio pasiūlymo tikslas turėtų būti atnaujinti esamą teisės aktų sistemą siekiant patikslinti valstybių narių procedūrinės prievolės ir užtikrinti bendros rinkos gerą veikimą bei vidaus rinkos teisės aktų efektyvumą tiek siekiant išvengti vilkinimo priimant sprendimus dėl kainų nustatymo ir kompensavimo, tiek šalinant prekybos farmacijos produktais kliūtis. Šios naujos taisyklės turėtų paspartinti generinių vaistų išleidimą į rinką. Tai pigesni esami vaistų analogai, kuriuos galima parduoti su savo prekės ženklu pasibaigus patento galiojimui. Būtent dėl to kai kurie vaistai turėtų atpigti.

3-206-500

**Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)**, *in writing*. – Member States have exclusive competence in deciding on the pricing and reimbursement of medicinal products within their public health insurance systems. However, to ensure a proper functioning of the Single Market, pricing and reimbursement measures must be free of discrimination against imported medicinal products and based on objective and verifiable criteria which are independent from the origin of the products.

The existing Directive has never been amended since its adoption and its provisions reflect the pharmaceutical market conditions which prevailed more than twenty years ago and

which have fundamentally changed, especially with the emergence of generic medicines providing cheaper versions of existing products. In parallel, the constant rise in public expenditure on pharmaceuticals in the last decades has encouraged Member States to invent more complex and innovative pricing and reimbursement systems over time.

The proposal therefore aims at adapting the Directive to the current pharmaceutical environment while preserving its core foundations. For this reason, I voted in favour of this report.

3-206-750

**Agnès Le Brun (PPE)**, *par écrit* . – Je me suis prononcée en faveur de ce rapport, qui constituait selon moi un bon compromis entre la proposition initiale de la Commission et la compétence des États membres en matière de fixation des prix et de remboursement des médicaments. La Commission souhaitait en effet par ce texte instaurer des exigences de procédure minimales en la matière visant notamment à faciliter l'accès à des traitements abordables pour tous les patients de l'Union européenne. Pour ce faire, la Commission proposait par exemple d'instaurer des délais pour la fixation des prix et le remboursement des médicaments. Les amendements du Parlement européen ont permis de prolonger et de simplifier ces nouveaux délais, qui seront désormais de 30 jours pour les médicaments génériques et de 90 jours pour les autres.

3-207-000

**Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)**, *na piśmie* . – Leki i wszelkie inne produkty medyczne dla człowieka powinny podlegać właściwej kontroli, tak pod względem ich jakości, jak i dostępności. Dostępność traktować należy w szerokim tego słowa znaczeniu: fizycznym, czyli podaży odpowiedniej ilości w miejscach, do których można dojść lub dojechać, czy ekonomicznym. Dzisiaj zajmujemy się właśnie dostępnością ekonomiczną, czyli przejrzystością w regulowaniu zasad stanowienia cen, tak by leki i produkty medyczne były dostępne cenowo dla każdego potrzebującego człowieka.

3-208-000

**David Martin (S&D)**, *in writing* . – I welcome this report and the proposed 60-day time limit to decide on the pricing and reimbursement of generic medicines, in order to speed up their availability and save money for patients and social security systems. Decisions concerning new medicines will have to respect the current deadline of 180 days. According to the European Commission, generic products are on average 40% cheaper than the original branded medicines, once they have been available for two years. An enquiry showed that companies use various means to extend the period when they can market their medicines exclusively, without competition from generics.

3-209-000

**Clemente Mastella (PPE)**, *per iscritto* . – Accogliamo con favore la proposta della Commissione in quanto basata su un'analisi approfondita delle attuali condizioni dei mercati farmaceutici nonché dell'attuale contesto e dei vincoli, soprattutto di natura finanziaria, cui le autorità competenti sono soggette in sede di decisione sulla fissazione del prezzo e sul rimborso dei medicinali.

Riteniamo che l'obiettivo generale di tale proposta dovrebbe essere quello di aggiornare il quadro legislativo esistente, al fine di chiarire gli obblighi procedurali che incombono agli

Stati membri, garantire il buon funzionamento del mercato unico e l'efficacia della legislazione in materia di mercato interno, allo scopo di evitare ingiustificabili ritardi nelle decisioni in materia di fissazione dei prezzi e di rimborso e prevenendo la comparsa di ostacoli agli scambi di medicinali.

Pur rispettando la competenza esclusiva degli Stati membri nel decidere sulla fissazione del prezzo e sul rimborso dei medicinali, i requisiti procedurali minimi dovrebbero altresì garantire certezza giuridica e trasparenza per le autorità nazionali competenti, promuovere la produzione di medicinali e l'entrata sul mercato di medicinali generici e incoraggiare la ricerca e lo sviluppo di nuovi medicinali, con il fine ultimo di facilitare l'accesso a cure a prezzi sostenibili per tutti i pazienti in Europa.

3-209-500

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du projet de directive afin d'accroître la transparence des mesures régissant la fixation des prix des médicaments à usage humain. Le délai pour qu'un Etat membre décide du prix et du remboursement des médicaments génériques a été diminué à 60 jours en vue d'améliorer la disponibilité de ces produits. La proposition de texte devrait garantir des conditions de transparence minimales dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne.

3-209-625

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Julgo que o objetivo principal da presente proposta deverá ser a atualização e melhoria do quadro legislativo existente para se clarificarem as obrigações processuais que incumbem aos Estados-Membros, assegurando o bom funcionamento do Mercado Único, bem como a eficácia da legislação relativa ao mercado interno, no que diz respeito à prevenção de atrasos nas decisões sobre a fixação de preços e reembolsos e de obstáculos ao comércio de produtos farmacêuticos. É de insistir na necessidade de reforçar as disposições relacionadas com a transparência do processo de tomada de decisões e com as decisões tomadas, que representa uma crescente exigência da sociedade, nomeadamente quando se trata da fixação de preços e reembolsos de produtos farmacêuticos. Daí o meu voto favorável.

3-209-750

**Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Esta directiva pretende imponer a los Estados miembros plazos para decidir los precios y los reembolsos de los medicamentos, con el objetivo de eliminar las barreras de acceso al mercado farmacéutico. Ahora bien, el objetivo de la propuesta legislativa de la Comisión no es garantizar que los residentes en la Unión Europea tengan acceso a una sanidad universal y a los medicamentos de forma gratuita, sino más bien imponer una serie de requisitos a los Estados miembros en materia de precios y reembolsos que, con el loable pretexto de garantizar la transparencia, en la práctica supondrán un sometimiento a los intereses de la industria farmacéutica y la posibilidad de que ésta pueda imponer unilateralmente sus precios a los Estados. Por ello, he votado en contra de este informe, con la voluntad de oponerme al avance del desmantelamiento, encarecimiento y precarización de los servicios públicos sanitarios en la Unión Europea.

3-209-875

**Alexander Mirsky (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The Commission proposal is based on an accurate analysis of current conditions on the pharmaceutical markets as well as of the current context and constraints, notably financial, under which competent authorities have to

decide on the pricing and reimbursement of medicinal products. Not rare case when pharmaceutical companies cheat customers through commercials. The control over production and sale of medicines should be increased to the maximum extent possible. I voted in favour.

3-210-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Mit der Richtlinie zur Preisfestsetzung bei Humanarzneimitteln sollten veraltete Transparenzaufgaben für alle Maßnahmen der Preisfestsetzung und Kostenerstattung von Arzneimitteln in den Mitgliedsstaaten an die heutige Zeit angepasst werden, ohne die Verantwortung dieser für das öffentliche Gesundheitswesen und die Finanzierung zu beeinträchtigen. Zudem wurde festgelegt, dass die Preise für Arzneimittel EU-weit gleich sein sollen, und auch die Zulassungsverfahren sollten vereinheitlicht werden. Die Idee dahinter ist, dass der Binnenmarkt für Arzneimittel lückenlos erschlossen werden kann und eine Chancengleichheit auf dem Markt besteht. Der Bericht hat meine Stimme nicht erhalten, da ich der Ansicht bin, dass jeder Mitgliedstaat nach wie vor ein Recht darauf haben sollte, vor allem was die Zulassung von Medikamenten betrifft, selbst entscheiden zu können, nach welchen Kriterien eine Arznei zugelassen wird. Da die Vorschriften in den Ländern divergieren, sollten sie auch selbstständig über den Zulassungszeitpunkt entscheiden können.

3-210-250

**Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį dokumentą, nes manau, jog būtina užtikrinti, kad sprendimai, kuriais nustatomos vaistų kainos ir kompensavimo dydžiai, būtų priimami laiku ir skaidriai, kruopščiai kuriama pusiausvyra tarp prievolės išsaugoti valstybių narių kompetenciją visuomenės sveikatos apsaugos srityje ir būtinybės užtikrinti direktyvos veiksmingumą siekiant vidaus rinkos tikslų. Pritariu pranešėjos siūlymams, kad reikia sutvirtinti nuostatas, susijusias su sprendimų priėmimo proceso ir priimamų sprendimų skaidrumu, kurio poreikis visuomenėje auga, ypač vaistų kainų ir kompensavimo atveju. Todėl, manau, ypač teisingas siūlymas nustatyti prievolę kompetentingoms institucijoms atskleisti ekspertų, kurie yra jų sprendimus priimančių institucijų nariai, pavardes ir interesų deklaracijas. Tikiu, kad tokiomis nuostatomis ir padidintu dokumentų ir informacijos viešinimu bus pagerintas priimtų sprendimų skaidrumas, principingumas ir nepriklausomumas.

3-210-500

**Siiri Oviir (ALDE)**, *kirjalikult*. – Toetasin oma fraktsioonikaaslase hästi koostatud raportit, pidades oluliseks patsientide kiiremat ligipääsu odavamatele geneerilistele ravimitele. Praegune olukord, kus ravimite hinna kujundamine ja maksumuse hüvitamise otsuste tegemine võib viibida mõnikord mitu aastat, ei ole kindlasti vastuvõetav ning geneeriliste ravimite hinnakujunduse ja hüvitamisprotsessi lühendamise kuni 60 päevani on igati mõistlik ajaperiood. Selleks et vastav otsustamisprotsess oleks läbipaistev ja aus, on ravikomisjonide liikmete nimede ja huvide deklaratsioonide avaldamine mõödapääsmatu. Pean minimaalsete Euroopa menetlusnõuete kehtestamist vajalikuks, et tagada pädevate asutuste õiguskindlus ja ergutada uute ravimite uurimist ja väljatöötamist, hoolimata asjaolust, et antud valdkond on liikmesriikide ainupädevuses. Lõppeesmärgiks on siiski taskukohase hinnaga ravi muutmine kõigile Euroopa patsientidele hõlpsamini kättesaadavaks.

3-210-750

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD),** *raštu* . – Balsavau už šią rezoliuciją, kadangi tik bendromis pastangomis galime palengvinti vaistų vidaus rinkos veikimą. Tam, kad būtų užtikrintas laisvas vaistų judėjimas ir teisingas jų kainų nustatymas, reikia pašalinti prekybos farmacijos produktais kliūtis. Labai svarbu užtikrinti, kad vartotojai galėtų efektyviai ir operatyviai pasinaudoti teisių gynimo priemonių procedūromis. Visų pirma, reikia nustatyti veiksmingas priemones, kurios užtikrintų greitą pažeidimų sprendimą tarpininkavimo būdu. Tokiu būdu būtų užkirstas kelias sprendimų dėl kainų nustatymo ir kompensavimo vilkinimui. Antra, toks reglamentavimas padės apsaugoti pacientus ir prisidės prie sveikatos sistemų veiksmingumo ir tvarumo. Tinkamai įgyvendinus direktyvoje nustatytas priemones, turėtų būti sumažintos visų vaistų arba tam tikrų kategorijų vaistų kainos.

3-210-875

**Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D),** *raštu* . – Vaistų kainas reglamentuojantys ES teisės aktai skaičiuoja jau 25 metus. Šiuo metu finansinis valstybių narių sveikatos priežiūros sistemų tvarumas nepakelia ekonominės krizės ir biudžetų karpymo politikos naštos. Farmacijos rinka bei pacientų poreikiai per šį laikotarpį labai pasikeitė, todėl reikalingas atnaujintas pažangesnis šios srities teisinis reglamentavimas, didesnis skaidrumas. Balsavau už šį pranešimą, kadangi jis yra naudingas ne tik valstybėms narėms, bet ir pacientams, o taip pat daug darbo vietų sukuriančiai farmacijos pramonei. Pacientams svarbi skaidresnė vaistų kainų nustatymo sistema, pagal kurią jie gautų reikiamus vaistus pigiau ir greičiau. Valstybėms svarbu sutaupyti daugiau biudžeto lėšų, o tai garantuos generinių vaistų plėtra rinkoje.

3-210-937

**Alfredo Pallone (PPE),** *per iscritto* . – Ho votato positivamente la relazione che modifica la direttiva 89/105/CEE sulla trasparenza delle misure che regolano la fissazione dei prezzi delle specialità medicinali per uso umano e la loro inclusione nei regimi nazionali di assicurazione perché, osservando l'evoluzione del mercato, anche quello farmaceutico ha bisogno di controlli e regole che assicurino equità e trasparenza per tutti i cittadini a seconda delle politiche nazionali. Gli Stati membri devono applicare immediatamente la nuova direttiva che fisserà i prezzi dei medicinali in ogni Paese facilitando la scelta dei cittadini.

3-211-000

**Αντιγόνη Παπαδοπούλου (S&D),** *γραπτώς* . – Υπερψήφισα την έκθεση γιατί πιστεύω πως είναι αναγκαίος ο εκσυγχρονισμός του νομοθετικού πλαισίου που διέπει τις αγορές φαρμακευτικών προϊόντων καθώς επίσης του πλαισίου τιμολόγησης φαρμάκων. Οι ασθενείς πρέπει να έχουν ταχύτερη πρόσβαση σε φθηνότερα φάρμακα. Τα εθνικά συστήματα υγείας, η ίδια η ενιαία αγορά αλλά κυρίως οι ασθενείς, θα ωφεληθούν ιδιαίτερα, αν οι αρμόδιες αρχές στις χώρες μέλη της ΕΕ, ενισχύσουν τη διαφάνεια στη διαδικασία λήψης αποφάσεων για την τιμολόγηση των φαρμάκων καθώς επίσης την ακεραιότητα ώστε να αποκαλύπτονται τυχόν εμπλεκόμενα συμφέροντα. Οι ορθές πρακτικές πρέπει να ακολουθούνται πιστά.

3-211-375

**Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE),** *γραπτώς* . – Γενικός στόχος της παρούσας πρότασης είναι ο εκσυγχρονισμός του κείμενου νομοθετικού πλαισίου ώστε να διευκρινιστούν οι διαδικαστικές υποχρεώσεις των κρατών μελών για την αποτροπή εμποδίων στις συναλλαγές φαρμακευτικών προϊόντων. Υπενθυμίζεται ότι αποτελεί αποκλειστική αρμοδιότητα των κρατών μελών η

τιμολόγηση και επιστροφή των δαπανών των φαρμάκων· ωστόσο, επιβάλλεται η θέσπιση ελάχιστων προβλέψεων που θα διασφαλίζουν την ασφάλεια δικαίου και τη διαφάνεια για τις αρμόδιες εθνικές αρχές σχετικά με την παραγωγή φαρμάκων και τη διάθεση στην αγορά γενόσημων φαρμάκων. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, με την παρούσα έκθεση την οποία και υπερψήφισα, τάσσεται υπέρ της προσέγγισης που προτείνει η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή όσον αφορά την πρόβλεψη διττών και διαφοροποιημένων προθεσμιών για την τιμολόγηση και την επιστροφή των δαπανών των φαρμάκων, ενώ παράλληλα παρέχεται κίνητρο για την εφαρμογή της αξιολόγησης της τεχνολογίας υγείας που θα ενισχύσει τον καθορισμό ασφαλών και αποτελεσματικών πολιτικών στον τομέα της υγείας που θέτουν στο επίκεντρό τους ασθενείς και επιδιώκουν την επίτευξη βέλτιστης τιμής.

3-211-750

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente a presente proposta de diretiva do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativa à transparência das medidas que regulamentam os preços dos medicamentos para uso humano e a sua inclusão nos sistemas nacionais de seguro de saúde por concordar com a proposta da Comissão e as suas principais disposições. Destaco das principais disposições desta proposta a análise exata das condições atuais dos mercados farmacêuticos, bem como do contexto e das limitações atuais, nomeadamente financeiras, para definir o quadro ao abrigo do qual as autoridades competentes têm de deliberar sobre a fixação de preços e reembolsos dos medicamentos. Parece-me ser uma estratégia bem pensada e adequada.

3-211-875

**Paulo Rangel (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O objetivo geral da presente proposta de diretiva é a atualização do quadro legislativo existente, adaptando-o ao atual quadro farmacêutico e mantendo os princípios fundamentais da diretiva em vigor com as seguintes adaptações: clarificação do âmbito de aplicação; maior clarificação da relação entre as decisões de fixação de preços com os direitos de propriedade intelectual e resultante procedimento de autorização de introdução no mercado; introdução de requisitos adicionais que asseguram maior transparência (v.g. a disponibilização ao público de informações e documentos); e ajustamentos e aditamentos às disposições relativas aos prazos propostas pela Comissão, a fim de garantir uma execução prática e eficaz das disposições previstas e conferir às autoridades nacionais competentes o nível necessário de flexibilidade e autonomia. O objetivo último da adoção de um quadro de requisitos processuais mínimos é facilitar o acesso a tratamentos financeiramente acessíveis a todos os doentes da Europa, reforçando a confiança nas autoridades responsáveis a nível nacional. Do conjunto de medidas adicionais sugeridas pela relatora, destaca-se a obrigação das autoridades competentes de divulgar os nomes e as declarações de interesses dos peritos que sejam membros dos órgãos de decisão afetos. Votei favoravelmente o relatório.

3-212-000

**Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Si è votata oggi in Plenaria la relazione dell'on. Parvanova volta a garantire l'accesso dei pazienti a trattamenti medici più convenienti. Il progetto introduce maggiore trasparenza e limiti precisi entro i quali i paesi dell'UE devono decidere su prezzario e rimborso delle medicine, favorendo così la commercializzazione in maniera più capillare di farmaci generici. L'intenzione non è quella di sostituire i farmaci cosiddetti di marca ma semplicemente di dare la possibilità ai consumatori di poter scegliere.

La relazione stabilisce un limite di 60 giorni per i paesi membri affinché decidano il prezzario e il rimborso delle medicine generiche, in modo da rendere disponibili più in fretta i prodotti meno cari. Le decisioni sui prezzi e sui rimborsi per le nuove medicine dovranno invece essere prese entro 180 giorni. La nuova legislazione obbliga inoltre le autorità competenti nazionali a divulgare i nomi e le dichiarazioni degli interessi finanziari dei propri membri e consulenti in modo tale che venga garantita la trasparenza e vengano evitate indebite pressioni da parte dei gruppi d'interesse più forti.

3-212-500

**Robert Rochefort (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Selon la Commission européenne, les médicaments génériques sont en moyenne 40% moins chers que les produits des marques d'origine. Or les sociétés usent de différents moyens pour allonger la période au cours de laquelle elles peuvent commercialiser leurs produits en exclusivité, sans la concurrence des génériques, ce qui se fait au détriment des patients et des systèmes nationaux de sécurité sociale. Il est nécessaire d'agir pour remédier à cette situation, et j'apporte mon soutien à cette résolution législative qui fixe un délai de 60 jours pour décider du prix et du remboursement des médicaments génériques, en vue d'accélérer la disponibilité de ces produits. En outre, les autorités compétentes dans les États membres devront rendre publics les noms et les déclarations d'intérêt de tous leurs experts et membres, en vue d'assurer la transparence et l'intégrité de leur processus décisionnel, et devront publier, au minimum une fois par an, une liste des médicaments couverts par leur système public d'assurance-maladie avec leur prix. Ces dispositions me paraissent constituer de véritables avancées, et j'espère que les négociations qui vont débiter avec le Conseil aboutiront au plus vite afin de permettre une adoption rapide du texte.

3-213-000

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *par écrit*. – Abstention. La proposition de la Commission n'était pas acceptable, car largement dominée par les intérêts des industries pharmaceutiques. Il était notamment prévu de raccourcir les délais d'instruction pour la fixation des prix des nouveaux médicaments, ce qui affaiblirait considérablement la qualité des évaluations de ces produits. La directive proposée aurait également fragilisé les missions des institutions d'évaluation de technologie de santé (HTA) et de la Haute autorité de santé qui évalue notamment le service médical rendu par les médicaments. Malgré le travail effectué par la rapporteure Antonyia Parvanova (ALDE), le texte reste flou et n'apporte aucune amélioration au droit existant. Nous avons donc préféré nous abstenir.

3-213-750

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Condivido la proposta di direttiva del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio relativa alla trasparenza delle misure che disciplinano la fissazione dei prezzi dei medicinali per uso umano e la loro inclusione nei regimi pubblici di assicurazione. Sostengo l'opinione secondo cui l'obiettivo generale di tale proposta dovrebbe essere quello di aggiornare il quadro legislativo esistente, al fine di chiarire gli obblighi procedurali che incombono agli Stati membri, garantire il buon funzionamento del mercato unico e l'efficacia della legislazione in materia di mercato interno, evitando ritardi nelle decisioni in materia di fissazione dei prezzi, di rimborso e prevenendo inoltre la comparsa di ostacoli agli scambi di medicinali. I requisiti procedurali minimi dovrebbero invece garantire certezza giuridica e trasparenza per le autorità nazionali competenti, promuovere la produzione di medicinali, l'entrata sul mercato di medicinali generici,



incoraggiare la ricerca e lo sviluppo di nuovi medicinali, con il fine ultimo di facilitare l'accesso a cure a prezzi sostenibili per tutti i pazienti in Europa.

3-213-875

**Catherine Stihler (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour as this report proposes more transparency in regulatory measures in pricing medical products used by humans.

3-214-000

**Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I supported the initiative to improve EU citizens' access to more affordable medicines. Delays in pricing and reimbursements have in some cases reached more than 700 days, which is not to the benefit of EU citizens, especially vulnerable groups coping with chronic diseases. It is essential that Member States provide for more transparency in their decisions regarding generic medicines.

3-215-000

**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – Tout en respectant la compétence exclusive des États membres en matière de fixation des prix et de remboursement des médicaments, des exigences de procédure minimales devraient également garantir la sécurité juridique et la transparence pour les autorités nationales compétentes, favoriser la production de médicaments et l'entrée sur le marché de médicaments génériques et encourager la recherche et le développement de nouveaux médicaments, le but final étant de faciliter l'accès à des traitements abordables pour tous les patients en Europe.

J'insiste en priorité sur la nécessité de renforcer les dispositions relatives à la transparence du processus décisionnel et des décisions adoptées, qui fait l'objet d'une demande croissante de la part de la société, en particulier en ce qui concerne la fixation des prix et le remboursement des produits pharmaceutiques. C'est pourquoi nous avons suggéré une série de mesures supplémentaires, notamment l'obligation pour les autorités compétentes de communiquer les noms et les déclarations d'intérêts des experts membres de leurs organes de décision. Ces dispositions, ainsi qu'une plus grande accessibilité aux documents et aux informations pour le grand public devraient viser à renforcer la transparence, l'intégrité et l'indépendance des décisions prises et devraient, à terme, consolider la confiance dans les autorités publiques compétentes au niveau national.

3-215-500

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A atualização da diretiva que regula a transparência em termos de regulamentação dos preços dos medicamentos para uso humano e a sua inclusão nos sistemas nacionais é necessária, uma vez que a atual diretiva data de 1989. Quer isto dizer que a atual legislação não leva em conta as mudanças ocorridas no setor farmacêutico no último quarto de século. Apesar de ser competência exclusiva a regulamentação de preços e os métodos de reembolso do valor dos medicamentos por parte dos Estados-Membros, entendo que uma regulamentação mínima e comum a todos os países deverá existir, de forma a garantir a certeza e transparência jurídica. Tais alterações à diretiva deverão, ainda, garantir a promoção da produção e entrada no mercado de medicamentos genéricos, bem como garantir elevados níveis de investigação e desenvolvimento por parte da indústria farmacêutica no que concerne a novos medicamentos e produtos. Face ao exposto, votei favoravelmente o relatório.

3-216-000

**Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL)**, *par écrit*. – Ce rapport traite de l'autorisation de mise sur le marché d'un médicament avant sa commercialisation. Les règles en vigueur sont destinées à veiller à ce que la qualité, la sécurité et l'efficacité des médicaments soient convenablement évaluées avant qu'ils ne soient délivrés aux patients.

L'évaluation revient principalement aux États-membres mais certaines conditions élémentaires de transparence doivent être respectées au niveau européen, en particulier les mesures concernant la fixation des prix et le remboursement des médicaments, dont le délai est ici raccourci.

Mais, sous couvert de transparence, ce rapport donne encore plus de pouvoirs aux industries pharmaceutiques, laissant ces dernières libres de mettre leurs produits sur le marché au prix qu'elles souhaitent quand les autorités ne prennent aucune décision dans les délais considérablement raccourcis.

L'objectif de mise à disposition rapide de nouveaux traitements ne peut se faire au détriment des malades ni de l'équilibre budgétaire déjà fragile des systèmes publics d'assurance-maladie. Je me suis opposée donc à ce texte comme l'ensemble des députés de mon groupe.

3-217-000

**Justina Vitkauskaitė (ALDE)**, *raštu*. – Nors turėtų būti gerbiama išskirtinė valstybių narių kompetencija priimant sprendimus dėl vaistų kainų ir jų kompensavimo, žinome, kad tų pačių vaistų kainos skirtingose valstybėse narėse gerokai skiriasi. Farmacininkai paprastai įrodo, kad vaistų kaina priklauso nuo šalies, taigi ir rinkos, dydžio, ir kuo šalis didesnė, tuo vaistai joje pigesni. Kaina taip pat skiriasi todėl, kad vienoje tie patys vaistai yra kompensuojami, o kitose – ne. Nustatant vaistų kainas valstybėse narėse stinga skaidrumo, todėl paliekama labai daug galimybių neskaidriai kainodarai ir nepagrįstam farmacijos įmonių pelno didinimui.

Pasisakau už tai, kad turi egzistuoti skaidri vaistų kainos nustatymo sistema. Pritariu 90 dienų laikotarpiui vaisto kainos ir kompensacinio mechanizmo nustatymui. Manau, ilgesniu laikotarpiu bus tinkamai pasiruošta naujo vaisto įvedimui. Manau, kad taip pat būtina sumažinti rinkos kliūtis ir suteikti pacientams galimybes naudotis naujai atrastais vaistais. Reikia užtikrinti, kad ES vaistų agentūra puikiai atliktų savo priežiūros vaidmenį. Pasisakau už didesnę vaistų kainų skaidrumą, o vaistų kainų reguliavimo tarnybos turi suteikti galimybę mums vaistus įsigyti prieinamomis kainomis.

Sveikinu pranešėją A. Parvanovą su puikiu darbu. Visuomenės sveikata yra didžiulis turtas, o ne našta. ES turi būti skatinami moksliniai tyrimai ir naujų vaistų kūrimas siekiant galutinio tikslo pagerinti visų Europos pacientų galimybes gauti prieinamą gydymą.

3-218-000

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Przepisy Unii zawierają wymóg, aby właściwe organy unijne lub krajowe wydały pozwolenie na dopuszczenie do obrotu zanim jakikolwiek produkt leczniczy będzie mógł zostać wprowadzony do handlu. Chyba nikt nie ma wątpliwości, że życie i zdrowie jest jedną z najważniejszych wartości dla każdego człowieka. Każdy produkt leczniczy dopuszczony do obrotu w UE powinien być dostępny dla pacjentów we wszystkich państwach członkowskich. Przedłużanie procedur ustalania cen i refundacji kosztów przyczynia się do opóźnień we wprowadzaniu produktów leczniczych do obrotu. Może to być szczególnie niekorzystne w przypadku innowacyjnych

środków. Konsekwencją tego może być nawet utrata życia bądź jego skrócenie. Dlatego projekt, który zawiera propozycje usunięcia przeszkód w funkcjonowaniu rynku wewnętrznego i poprawę jego działania jest jak najbardziej pożądany.

3-218-500

**Anna Záborská (PPE)**, *pisomne*. – Na Slovensku v súčasnosti prebieha verejná diskusia o registrácii potratových tabletek. Boli sme svedkami toho, ako štátne orgány najskôr neinformovali verejnosť a potom zámerne uvádzali a dodnes uvádzajú nesprávne a nepravdivé informácie. Verejnosť nie je informovaná ani o prípadnom konflikte záujmov u tých, ktorí o liekoch rozhodujú. Preto podporujem opatrenia, ktoré povedú k väčšej transparentnosti. Členské štáty majú právo aj povinnosť zabezpečiť pre svojich občanov kvalitné lieky za cenu, ktorá zohľadňuje kúpnu silu. Nová smernica vnesie viac svetla do rozhodovania regulačných orgánov, ktoré rozhodujú o uvedení liekov na trh, ich cene a miere dotácie z verejných zdrojov. To je dôležité nielen z pohľadu jednotného európskeho trhu. Je to predovšetkým v záujme občanov.

3-218-625

**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Unia Europejska nie powinna ustalać odgórníe jakichkolwiek cen produktów leczniczych. Rozumiem potrzebę wspólnego rynku, jednak ceny tak podstawowych produktów powinna regulować ręka rynku, nie unijna dyrektywa. Jednocześnie wśród zgłaszanych poprawek znalazło się wiele cennych uwag, które w swoim głosowaniu poparłem. Wspomniane minimalne wymogi proceduralne powinny również gwarantować pewność prawną i zachowywanie przez właściwe organy przejrzystości w procesie podejmowania decyzji dotyczących cen produktów leczniczych oraz ich refundacji przez systemy powszechnego ubezpieczenia zdrowotnego-to ważne zdanie wskazuje na bolączkę obecną wśród państw członkowskich a jest nią uległość wobec farmaceutycznych lobbystów. W moim kraju wielokrotnie ujawniano korupcję oraz nieścisłości przy kontraktowaniu leków ustalaniu listy leków refundowanych.

3-218-750

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Os Estados-Membros são responsáveis pela organização dos respetivos sistemas de saúde e pela repartição dos recursos que lhe são afetados, incluindo na área dos medicamentos. Assim é e assim deve continuar a ser. A proposta da relatora, no seguimento da proposta da Comissão Europeia, a pretexto da necessária transparência na fixação do preço dos medicamentos (que não contestamos) e dos desenvolvimentos ao nível do setor farmacêutico – com desenvolvimento de novos medicamentos –, acaba por submeter os Estados-Membros e os interesses dos cidadãos aos interesses da indústria farmacêutica. Caso os prazos agora estabelecidos para os Estados-Membros decidirem sobre o preço e sobre o sistema de reembolso de cada medicamento não sejam cumpridos, a indústria farmacêutica tem, no limite, o poder de impor unilateralmente o seu preço aos Estados. A proposta implica ainda limitações, que consideramos graves, da soberania dos Estados-Membros, nos domínios da reavaliação da segurança, eficácia e qualidade dos medicamentos.

#### **8.4. Κοινή αλιευτική πολιτική (A7-0008/2013 - Ulrike Rodust)**

3-220-000

**Προφορικές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου**

3-221-000

**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE).** - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, quello di oggi sulla riforma della politica comune della pesca è un voto storico. La politica fallimentare degli ultimi quarant'anni di pesca eccessiva ha minacciato la biodiversità dei nostri mari e reso i nostri pescatori disoccupati o dipendenti da sussidi e con il declino degli stock ittici ora l'Europa è costretta ad importare il 66% del pesce che consuma.

Se davvero vogliamo dare un futuro ai nostri mari, permettere agli stock di pesce di ricostituirsi e garantire un concreto futuro ai pescatori europei, dobbiamo invertire rotta. Entro il 2015 la pesca eccessiva dovrà essere convertita in una pesca ecologicamente sostenibile. I sussidi europei dovranno essere condizionati al rispetto delle nuove regole e la pesca costiera e selettiva godrà di un sostegno particolare.

Ben vengano quindi i piani di gestione pluriennali e la possibilità di istituire una rete di riserve in cui siano vietate tutte le attività di pesca per ripopolare i nostri mari. Il divieto di rigetto in mare che ogni anno in Europa comporta lo spreco di 1,7 milioni di tonnellate di pesci morti dovrà essere rafforzato attraverso l'obbligo di sbarco per tutto il pescato, senza eccezioni. L'unico futuro per la pesca europea è realizzare una pesca ecologicamente sostenibile.

3-222-000

**Vicky Ford (ECR).** - Madam President, it is rare that I feel so pleased about a vote in this Parliament, but the abhorrent system whereby perfectly edible food was thrown back into the seas because of the EU Brussels-set fishing quota has got to end, and today we have moved in the right direction.

In my region I have seen packets of cod labelled 'local' in Lowestoft which has actually been caught by vast trawlers in seas off the coast of Russia. In the meantime my local fishermen in small boats using lines, not nets, with no discards – they are sustainable fishermen – are not allowed to fish. So bringing back the decision-making to our local regional panels is absolutely key. This has started to turn the tide for the fish in our sea and for those of us who want to be able to eat our fish and chips for many more years to come.

3-223-000

**Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR).** - Madam President, the vast Billingsgate market, for example, has a turnover of GBP 200 million a year. We need to put the management back into fishing locally. A centralised system managed by Brussels has lost the confidence of the fishermen; it has also lost the confidence of consumers as they express their outrage at perfectly good fish being dumped overboard because of rigid quotas.

Conservative MEPs have led the calls for this disgraceful practice to end, and I am pleased that this report will finally put a stop to one million tonnes of healthy fish being discarded each year. We need a common fisheries policy which will allow fish stocks to grow. We need to protect our resources for the future.

3-224-000

**Nils Torvalds (ALDE).** - Fru talman! Idag har vi skrivit historia: Vi har tagit de första stegen – eller i själva verket kliven – mot en hållbar fiskeripolitik. Den politiken betyder på sikt bättre ekosystem och mer fisk i haven, större fångster och bättre ekonomi för

fiskarna. Det betyder också att fisk kommer att finnas på menyn för europeiska konsumenter även i framtiden.

Men dagens omröstning betyder inte att allt nu är klappat och klart. Nu väntar förhandlingarna med rådet och de europeiska fiskeriministrarna. Nu ligger alltså ansvaret på de nationella regeringarna för att vi i Europaparlamentet och rådet tillsammans ska nå lika långt som vi nådde i dagens omröstning.

Därför gäller det att vi, både parlamentariker och medborgare, också efter dagens omröstning fortsätter en aktiv dialog till våra regeringar och fiskeriministrar, så att vi tillsammans får reformen och fiskarna i hamn. Det är nämligen en *win win-situation* för alla. Tack.

3-225-000

**Jim Higgins (PPE).** - A Uachtaráin, vótáil mé ar son na tuarascála seo agus caithfidh mé mo chuid buíochas a chur in iúl do Bhean Uí Rodust, an dréachtóir, agus Bean Uí Fraga Estévez, an leasdréachtóir. Is iad na príomhfhadhbanna a bhaineann leis an gComhbheartas lascaigh ná nach bhfuil na cuspóirí sách dírithe ar inbhuanaitheacht chomhshaoil, eacnamaíochta agus shóisialta agus go bhfuil leibhéil arda d'ábhar muirí aischurtha nach féidir glacadh leo. Lena chois sin, tá roinnt mhaith cabhlach thíos le brabúsacht íseal agus stóinseacht eacnamaíoch íseal. Níl ceisteanna comhshaoil sách comhtháite leis an mbeartas agus bíonn easpa sonraí iontaofa ann chun measúnú a dhéanamh ar na stoic agus ar na cabhlaigh ar fad.

Caithfidh mé a rá gurb é tús maith leath na hoibre, an méid a bhfuil déanta againne inniu, agus tá tús maith déanta againne maidir le hathchóiriú a dhéanamh ar an gComhbheartas lascaigh.

3-226-000

**Norica Nicolai (ALDE).** - Am votat în favoarea acestui raport, pe care îl consider mult mai realist și mai echilibrat, un pas înainte în politicile de pescuit, dar trei lucruri m-au determinat să fac acest lucru: abordarea principiului consultării grupurilor de interes regionale, ceea ce consider că dă posibilitatea comunităților profesionale să-și spună punctul de vedere cu privire la situațiile de pescuit și să asigure un echilibru între necesitatea protejării mediului și interesele lor personale de supraviețuire; deciziile cu privire la refacerea stocurilor de pește, blocarea timp de trei ani a 10 sau 20% din apele pentru pescuit, pe care le consider o șansă pentru refacerea stocurilor și pentru economia durabilă, și nu în ultimul rând decizia de a privi nu numai la Marea Mediterană și la alte mări, ci și la Marea Neagră prin reglementarea, încercarea de a găsi soluții pentru cooperarea în spații în care pescuitul se efectuează alături de țări non-membre. Pentru că Marea Neagră constituie încă o problemă, trebuie protejată comunitatea profesională împotriva braconajului realizat de țări terțe, și posibilitatea de a avea înțelegeri regionale sau bilaterale sau multilaterale este utilă.

3-227-000

**Agnès Le Brun (PPE).** - Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, l'Union européenne nous a prouvé, une fois de plus, à travers les propositions de la Commission en matière de réforme de la politique commune de la pêche, qu'elle avait conscience de l'importance de reconstituer les stocks halieutiques dont l'avenir de nos pêcheurs dépend. Ce qui est important, c'est que cette conscience est partagée. Je crois qu'il serait absurde d'opposer ceux qui auraient été pour la reconstitution et d'autres qui auraient été contre.

Il est en effet indispensable de reconstituer les stocks halieutiques, tout le monde en convient mais, selon moi, le rapport de Mme Rodust contenait un dangereux déséquilibre entre les considérations environnementales et socio-économiques. Faut-il rappeler que dans le pilier "développement durable", il y a trois piliers? Le pilier environnemental, bien sûr, mais aussi le pilier économique et le pilier social. Ces deux derniers sont les oubliés de l'histoire.

C'est pourquoi je me suis prononcée en faveur de l'amendement 15, qui aurait permis de fixer une marge de tolérance en matière d'interdiction des rejets. L'interdiction totale des rejets est, en effet, une mesure irréaliste et surtout, me semble-t-il, inapplicable, qui démontre une méconnaissance des réalités du secteur de la pêche. Elle mettra en péril un nombre considérable d'entreprises de pêche et d'emplois au cours d'une période où le chômage, au sein de l'Union européenne, se maintient déjà à des taux historiquement élevés.

Les objectifs sont les mêmes pour tous, du législateur au pêcheur, c'est pourquoi le législateur ne peut pas proposer un avenir durable au pêcheur s'il s'oppose à son présent.

3-228-000

**Erminia Mazzoni (PPE).** - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, voglio spiegare il mio voto, quasi isolato, di contrarietà a questo provvedimento. Sono perfettamente d'accordo sull'obiettivo dichiarato di quest'iniziativa regolamentare di rivedere la politica comune della pesca e quindi sulla finalità di garantire la sostenibilità della pesca stessa, di rivedere il sistema delle quote e di ricostituire gli stock ittici.

Ritengo però che tale finalità venga contraddetta o quantomeno diminuita da un atteggiamento dell'Unione europea che si qualifica come un regolatore quasi senz'anima dei processi che pone in essere. Non può ignorare l'Unione europea le implicazioni economiche e sociali che un intervento di riforma così radicale producono. A tanto aggiungo che, tra l'altro, il legislatore europeo deve anche calare realisticamente i propri interventi nel contesto in cui si riferiscono. È impossibile pensare che le trasformazioni richieste avvengano da un giorno all'altro. Per questi motivi ho votato a favore dell'emendamento della collega Fraga e per questi motivi non ho espresso il mio favore nei confronti di questa proposta di regolamento.

3-229-000

**Peter Jahr (PPE).** - Frau Präsidentin! Auch ich habe für den Bericht gestimmt und mich besonders gefreut, dass das Europäische Parlament ein eindeutiges Bekenntnis für ein Rückwurfverbot abgegeben hat. Ich denke, es war insgesamt ein guter Tag. Das Parlament hat vor allen Dingen der Versuchung widerstanden, diesen Beschluss durch zu viele Ausnahmen wieder zu entwerten und rückgängig zu machen. Die nähere Zukunft wird zeigen, ob es insgesamt ein guter Tag nicht nur für die Fische, sondern vor allen Dingen auch für die Fischer und die Fischindustrie war.

3-230-000

**Julie Girling (ECR).** - Madam President, I would just like to say that I was delighted to vote for this report and it is, indeed, not often that one can say that. The reason I am delighted is because what it has proven above all to me – we can all talk about the fishing facts and the issues around discards, all of which I am very pleased with – but what it has proven most of all is the power of the people of Europe.

Most particularly, I would like to pay tribute to those people in the United Kingdom who have worked tirelessly to bring this whole issue up to the top of the agenda. In these days when politics is full of very difficult economic choices that we all have to make, and we have very difficult foreign affairs issues going on all around the world, it is a huge achievement to have ensured that the issue around fish and the environmental sustainability of our seas has remained at the top of the agenda. I would like to use this opportunity to congratulate all of those people.

3-231-000

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE).** - Señora Presidenta, he votado a favor de este informe porque comparto sus objetivos y creo que es un avance frente a lo que tenemos, pero espero que en las negociaciones que se abran ahora se consideren algunas mejoras que, incomprensiblemente, no se han incluido en este trámite.

Queremos un sector más sostenible, pero aún no disponemos de un mapa europeo que determine con exactitud dónde hay sobrepesca y sobrecapacidad. Esto nos ayudaría a controlar y corregir con precisión la pesca. Nos ayudaría, además, a alcanzar el rendimiento máximo sostenible en un plazo establecido que compartimos.

Hoy no hemos aprobado una definición de la pesca a pequeña escala. Las enmiendas votadas dejaban fuera a flotas y a profesionales que utilizan artes y técnicas de pesca sostenibles como la «cacea» o el «cebo vivo», que favorecen la calidad del producto fresco y transformado. Espero que, al igual que la regionalización, se permita la adaptación de las políticas a esta diversidad del sector.

Por último, quiero decir que debemos lograr un sistema de gobernanza más progresista y abierto. El sector, los profesionales, las asociaciones, los transformadores, los consumidores y las instituciones científicas deben tener un papel más activo y más transparente en la PPC, que necesita, además, planes de gestión a largo plazo basados en datos científicos. Espero que lo logremos en el futuro.

3-232-000

**Charles Tannock (ECR).** - Madam President, it scarcely needs to be pointed out that the radical change to the common fisheries policy is long overdue. For years the sight of British fishermen being compelled to throw discards back into the sea – something like one million tonnes of these dead fish yearly, and they are perfectly edible fish – demonstrated an unfeeling absurdity in EU policy and fomented deep domestic resentment in the UK about the over-extension of European Union power. At the same time, overfishing has gravely threatened the future of our fish stocks, as well as the future nutrition of my London constituents, many of whom depend on fish protein and omega 3 to keep them healthy. This applies particularly to children, who eat fish fingers as a major source of daily protein.

Therefore, with the exception of a few amendments, this report is hugely welcome to our Group. We need to create both a sustainable fishing industry and a sustainable marine ecosystem for the benefit of the environment, consumers and, not least, small-scale fishermen who have suffered great hardship under the common fisheries policy and deserve to be helped – and that is the aim of these reforms.

3-233-000

**Diane Dodds (NI).** - Madam President, I wish to acknowledge the hard work put in by Ms Rodust and many other colleagues in the Fisheries Committee in getting this report to this stage.

However, I want also to express a real desire, as this reform process now enters into a detailed negotiation phase between the EU institutions, that we will secure meaningful changes on many of the issues that have been central to the process: mainly discards and the issue of regionalisation. All of which I voted for within the amendments.

I am aware that the Council still have to settle their position on this issue, particularly the issue of discards. I wish that we could now move forward speedily into the negotiation phase during the Irish Presidency.

While I fully agree that a lot of work has been done to raise all of these issues up the political agenda, regretfully I have to inform the House that I find myself with no alternative but to abstain from the vote on the overall package.

This is the fourth CFP reform process since the United Kingdom joined the then EEC, and we still have to wait for positive change for the United Kingdom's fishermen. I hope that when I look back that there will be change, and I am waiting to see the outcome of the negotiation process.

3-234-000

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** – A Uachtaráin, cosúil le Feisire eile, bhí áthas orm tacaíocht a thabhairt do na moltaí seo agus freisin, cosúil le Feisire eile, molaim an rapóirtéir agus na Feisirí a d'oibrigh go dian dícheallach ar feadh mórán ama ag cur na moltaí go léir le chéile.

Bhí áthas orm go háirithe gur glacadh le dhá mholadh; ceann amháin a bhaineann le héisc mharbh a bheadh á chaitheamh ar ais san fharraige – níl aon tairbhe leis sin, ach tiocfaidh an moladh seo isteach de réir a chéile agus ní thiocfaidh sé isteach thar oíche, rud nach bhfuil róshásúil do na hiascairí.

Chuir an dara moladh áthas orm gur glacadh leis na 'Hague Preferences'. Vótáil mé i gcoinne an ghrúpa maidir leis an gceann seo agus tá áthas orm go raibh Feisirí timpeall orm a rinne an rud céanna. Tá sé sin an-tábhachtach d'iascairí mo thíre féin agus iascairí eile. Agus mar a dúirt an tUasal Ó hUigín – tá tús maith déanta againn anseo inniu agus tá súil agam go mbeidh níos mó iasc san fharraige amach anseo agus beidh gairm bheatha níos fearr ag iascairí dá bharr.

3-235-000

**Syed Kamall (ECR).** - Madam President, we are, of course, talking here about reform of the common fisheries policy, but many people with whom I speak think of it as a communist fisheries policy: a centrally planned regime where we decide who catches what and when they can catch it, rather than leaving it to the market.

We ought to look further afield, to places like New Zealand and Iceland, for example, where they have created property-rights-based systems with tradable rights that can be either handed down to future generations or sold to others – and that incentivises fishermen to sustain stocks. Why, indeed, would you want to deplete the stocks if you knew that you could sell on those rights or hand them down?



So we can tinker as much as we like, and I welcome much of the tinkering that we have done, especially in relation to discards, but surely we should be looking at the overall policy. It is time to abolish the common fisheries policy and to move towards a market-based solution.

3-236-000

**David Campbell Bannerman (ECR).** - Madam President, I welcome the limited reforms passed today. All credit should go to Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall for his sterling efforts on this issue, and also to the ECR group.

I fear, however, that this is still rather like spraying perfume on a long-dead fish: the bad odour lingers. The common fisheries policy (CFP) has been a disaster. Not only has it failed to secure fish stocks, but it has also failed to help the employment situation in fishing, around the UK and around Europe. The fishing community in the east of England has been devastated by the CFP. And the issue of discards in particular, the fact that good, perfectly edible fish – up to 90% of them in some areas – are dumped back in the sea, is a complete disgrace. Given that Norway and Iceland have not had a policy of discards, and call such a policy criminal, why has it taken the EU so long to follow them? Provisions such as Amendment 119, which I voted against today, seeking to allow discards, are still a disgrace. The problem continues.

3-237-000

**Elena Bănescu (PPE).** - Am votat în favoarea raportului deoarece actuala politică comună în domeniul pescuitului nu și-a atins obiectivele. Am susținut stabilirea unor ținte care să permită refacerea stocurilor peste nivelurile care pot genera producția maximă durabilă. De asemenea, am votat pentru interzicerea aruncării capturilor în mare, deoarece consider că astfel se face o mare risipă.

În Marea Neagră există o problemă specifică, întrucât doar România și Bulgaria se supun normelor Uniunii privind cotele de pescuit. De aceea, este nevoie de o mai mare descentralizare a procesului decizional și implicarea celorlalte state riverane. Pe de altă parte, m-am opus creării unui consiliu consultativ pentru piețe, care ar îngreuna procesul decizional. Totodată, am votat împotriva înființării unor structuri privind pescuitul în apele interioare, deoarece deciziile în domeniu trebuie să fie luate în continuare de către statele membre.

3-238-000

### Γραπτές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

3-238-500

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D),** *por escrito.* – A nova reforma da Política Comum das Pescas deve garantir uma gestão verdadeiramente regionalizada, que tenha em conta a diversidade das frotas, das artes de pesca e das unidades populacionais em cada país e em cada zona de pesca. Deve igualmente respeitar os direitos das regiões sobre as suas águas territoriais, as suas zonas económicas exclusivas (ZEE) e os fundos marinhos adjacentes. É igualmente fundamental proteger de forma duradoura os interesses da pesca costeira e artesanal. No que diz respeito às RUP, é incontestável que os princípios e as normas da Política Comum das Pescas não são adaptados às realidades destas regiões. A Comissão não deve esquecer que, por um lado, se trata de espaços marítimos partilhados com Estados-Membros da

União e que, por outro, para as regiões ultraperiféricas, os espaços marítimos são partilhados com Estados ACP. A reforma da Política Comum das Pescas deve velar igualmente pela manutenção essencial do regime financeiro POSEI-Pescas, bem como por uma articulação inteligente entre o FEAMP e o POSEI-Pescas.

3-238-625

**Laima Liucija Andrikiene (PPE)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šią svarbią rezoliuciją, kuri turi didelės įtakos Baltijos jūros regiono žvejams. Dėl intensyvios žvejybos žuvų ištekliai Baltijos jūroje sparčiai mažėja. Jei nepadarysime išvadų dabar ir nesiimsime priemonių, kurios įpareigotų taupiai naudoti žuvų išteklius, neįgyvendinsime žuvų išteklių atkūrimo strategijos, tai po kelerių metų atsidursime apgailėtinoje padėtyje: turėsime žvejų, bet neturėsime žuvų, žvejams nebus ką žvejoti. Balsavau už šią rezoliuciją, siekdama palaikyti Lietuvos gamtininkų poziciją, t.y. didžiausios tausios žvejybos laimikio principą, žvejybos pajėgumų apibrėžimą, draudimą išmesti atgal į jūrą netikslinį laimikį ir t. t. Tikimasi, kad bus leidžiama kasmet sužvejoti tik tiek tam tikros rūšies žuvų, kiek jų per metus atsinaujina. Tokiu būdu iki 2020 m. būtų atkurti sumažėję žuvų ištekliai. Tai leistų papildomai sugauti 15 mln. tonų žuvis ir sukurti 37 tūkst. naujų darbo vietų. ES planuoja sudaryti tikslesnius daugiamečius žuvų išteklių valdymo planus remdamasi valstybių pateiktais moksliniais duomenimis. Džiaugiuosi, kad balsuodami dėl Europos Parlamento rekomendacijų ES Tarybai dėl ES bendrosios žuvininkystės politikos pagrindinio reglamento, mes, europarlamentarai iš valstybių, esančių aplinkui Baltijos jūrą, kiek įmanoma susivienijome, peržengdami ir partinių grupių ribas. Pasirodo, kad aplinkui Baltijos jūrą ir Viduržemio jūrą gyvenančiųjų interesai ir pozicijos dėl žuvų ir žuvininkystės politikos gerokai skiriasi, kai kuriais klausimais – net radikalčiai.

3-238-750

**Roberta Angelilli (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – La riforma della pesca ha come obiettivo quello di garantire che le attività di pesca e acquacoltura creino condizioni ambientali sostenibili a lungo termine e contribuiscano alla sicurezza dell'approvvigionamento alimentare. Sebbene si tratti di un'importante riforma, quanto mai necessaria visto che l'attuale normativa risale al 2002, c'è da sottolineare che il testo votato oggi penalizza fortemente gli operatori del settore. Ho votato contro perché ho ritenuto importante prevedere un calendario e delle percentuali graduali per l'attuazione dell'obbligo di sbarco, prevedendo uno studio sull'effettiva situazione dei rigetti e sull'impatto dell'obbligo di sbarco nelle diverse attività di pesca. Il voto di oggi non contribuisce a invertire la tendenza al declino del settore, che ha provocato una riduzione della redditività del settore e delle flotte ittiche causando la perdita di migliaia di posti di lavoro.

3-239-000

**Χαράλαμπος Αγγουράκης (GUE/NGL)**, *γραπτώς*. – Το ΚΚΕ καταψήφισε την πρόταση της Επιτροπής και την έκθεση για την αναθεώρηση της Κοινής Αλιευτικής Πολιτικής (ΚΑΛΠ), γιατί στόχος της είναι η εντατικότερη αναδιάρθρωση του κλάδου της αλιείας με την παραπέρα καταστροφή των μικρών ψαράδων - που σε μεγάλο βαθμό έχει ήδη συντελεστεί με την ισχύουσα ΚΑΛΠ - και την ενίσχυση των μεγάλων αλιευτικών στόλων και των μονοπωλιακών επιχειρήσεων στις υδατοκαλλιέργειες. Η απαγόρευση των απορρίψεων ευνοεί τη μονοπωλιακή συγκέντρωση. Η υποχρέωση της εκφόρτωσης και η αύξηση της επιλεκτικότητας έχουν στόχο τη μείωση της παραδοσιακής αλιείας, για να αναπτυχθούν περισσότερο οι επιχειρήσεις ιχθυοκαλλιέργειας. Η επίκληση των διαπιστώσεων για τα επίπεδα απορρίψεων, την υπεραλίευση, την περιορισμένη συμμόρφωση, την υπερεκμετάλλευση των ιχθυοποθεμάτων, τις επιπτώσεις σε μικρές παράκτιες

κοινοτήτες κ.ά., αποτελεί το κατάλληλο πρόσχημα για να προωθηθεί με μεγαλύτερη ταχύτητα από την ΕΕ και τις κυβερνήσεις των κρατών μελών της η εξόντωση της παράκτιας και μέσης αλιείας. Η ανάπτυξη βιώσιμης αλιείας για την ικανοποίηση των λαϊκών αναγκών προϋποθέτει την κοινωνικοποίηση των μονοπωλίων. Λαϊκή Εξουσία και Οικονομία, που, με κεντρικό σχεδιασμό της αλιευτικής παραγωγής και μοχλό τον αλιευτικό παραγωγικό συνεταιρισμό, θα εξασφαλίζει τις λαϊκές διατροφικές ανάγκες σε αλιευτικά προϊόντα, σύμφωνα με τις αλιευτικές δυνατότητες που υπάρχουν, με σεβασμό στις απαιτήσεις των ιχθυοπληθυσμών, των οικοσυστημάτων και του περιβάλλοντος.

3-239-125

**Sophie Auconie (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce rapport réformant l'une des politiques majeures de l'Union européenne. Soutenu par une large majorité du Parlement, ce texte actualise le cadre européen de la pêche pour les prochaines années. Pour la première fois, les enjeux environnementaux y sont pleinement pris en compte, et je m'en réjouis. Ainsi, une attention toute particulière a été portée à la durabilité de la ressource en s'assurant que les stocks puissent se renouveler. Néanmoins, j'aurais souhaité que certaines adaptations puissent être apportées à ce rapport, afin de faciliter la mise en œuvre de ces règles.

3-239-187

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį siūlymą dėl Bendrosios žuvininkystės politikos (BŽP) reformos. Reformos tikslas – sustabdyti per daug intensyvią žvejybą, žuvų išteklių mažėjimą bei kovoti su nedarbu ES pakrančių teritorijose. Nors trūksta mokslinių duomenų, Komisijos teigimu apie 75 % ES žuvų išteklių pereikvoti, o dėl netausios žuvininkystės ES kasmet praranda apie 1,8 mlrd. EUR. Šiuo siūlymu siekiama nustatyti tvarios žvejybos kvotas, drausti žvejams išmesti atgal į jūrą nereikalingas žuvis, nuo 2015 m. nustatyti didžiausio galimo tausios žvejybos laimikio principą, pagal kurį kasmet bus leidžiama sužvejoti tiek žuvų, kad jų populiacija spėtų atsinaujinti. Bus siekiama iki 2020 m. atkurti išsekintus žuvų išteklius. Pritariu, kad viena iš problemų, kurias reikėtų spręsti – mokslinių duomenų trūkumas bei neatsižvelgimas į mokslininkų rekomendacijas. Pritariu aukščiau išdėstytiems siūlymams ir siūlymams numatyti papildomų mokslinių tyrimų programas, užtikrinti, kad visos sužvejotos žuvys būtų iškraunamos, orientuoti finansinę paramą į selektyvią žvejybą.

3-239-218

**Francesca Barracciu (S&D)**, *per iscritto*. – La politica comune della pesca in Europa ha, nel corso degli anni, fallito buona parte dei suoi obiettivi. Lo sfruttamento eccessivo delle nostre risorse ittiche, l'indebolimento ormai drammatico degli stock esistenti e l'importazione di più del 60% dei prodotti ittici consumati sui mercati europei danno il senso di una politica sbagliata. Con l'approvazione di questa relazione e con le modifiche che il Parlamento ha apportato alla proposta della Commissione Europea si stanno ponendo le basi per una inversione di tendenza. Introduzione del rendimento massimo sostenibile, recupero degli stock ittici, aree marine protette, divieto dei rigetti, regionalizzazione delle responsabilità: un percorso di pesca ed acquacoltura sostenibili a lungo termine, di tutela irrinunciabile per la grande risorsa ambientale rappresentata dai nostri mari e di garanzia per la disponibilità di cibo di buona qualità. A ciò si potranno aggiungere benefici per il reddito ed i livelli occupazionali del settore. Tutto questo conferma il ruolo fondamentale del Parlamento in quanto co-legislatore. L'auspicio è che, nel confronto delle prossime settimane con Commissione e Consiglio, questo impianto largamente positivo possa essere confermato.

3-239-250

**Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Tant pour la préservation des stocks que pour la sauvegarde des emplois à moyen et long terme, la réforme de la PCP était très attendue. La bonne philosophie qui émerge désormais de cette politique commune fait nettement apparaître une voie vers une pêche plus durable en Europe. C'est une excellente nouvelle. Par l'intermédiaire des critères de renouvellements annuels des stocks, c'est bien de la survie de la pêche qu'il est question. Les techniques traditionnelles de pêche sont reconnues et seront préservées. La préservation des ressources halieutiques et la fin des rejets - plus d'un quart des captures est gaspillé chaque année - sont des éléments déterminants pour l'avenir de la pêche à petite échelle, artisanale et côtière. Pour la France, qui est, rappelons-le, la première interface maritime d'Europe, ce sont des pas en avant considérables, qu'il convient de saluer comme tels. Au passage, notons également que les organisations caritatives seront associées à l'avenir, puisque le Parlement propose de leur distribuer les poissons jusqu'à présent jetés en pure perte pour des raisons de taille ou d'espèce.

3-239-500

**Sergio Berlato (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – L'attuale politica comune della pesca si è rivelata un fallimento. I problemi ben noti da tempo – pesca eccessiva, sovraccapacità, situazione economica precaria di molte aziende del settore, problemi sociali connessi al declino della pesca nelle regioni costiere – non sono stati finora risolti.

Il nuovo regolamento ha l'ambizioso obiettivo di invertire la tendenza negativa e assicurare una pesca sostenibile ed efficace in Europa. In particolare, in molte attività di pesca europee le sovraccapacità rappresentano un problema da risolvere con urgenza. La situazione rimane insoddisfacente anche con riferimento all'applicazione del regolamento (CE) n. 1967/2006 per la pesca a strascico sottocosta che, malgrado alcune lodevoli iniziative attuate a livello nazionale, continua a creare seri problemi agli operatori del segmento di mercato interessato.

Concordo con la relatrice nel ritenere che l'adattamento della capacità di pesca con le possibilità di pesca disponibili dovrebbe essere coordinato tra gli Stati membri e che dovrebbero essere utilizzati piani pluriennali al fine di evitare il dar luogo a un mosaico di misure nazionali diverse. Per garantire la realizzazione degli obiettivi della politica comune della pesca sottolineo, infine, la necessità di una valutazione periodica da parte della Commissione delle misure adottate in materia a livello nazionale.

3-239-750

**Nora Berra (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Le rapport d'Ulrike Rodust fixe l'interdiction totale des rejets. J'ai refusé d'accorder ma voix à ce rapport car après consultations avec le secteur de pêche, force est de constater la difficulté de mettre en place une telle règle. Il serait plus judicieux de prévoir, pour différentes espèces, un calendrier plus flexible. Même si l'interdiction totale est un but à long terme, elle est irréalisable à court terme pour les professionnels.

3-240-000

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**, *per iscritto*. – Ho sostenuto col mio voto la relazione Rodust che analizza la proposta di regolamento del Parlamento e del Consiglio sulla politica comune della pesca. Le regole e i meccanismi di funzionamento fissati per questo settore nel precedente periodo di programmazione sono obsoleti e lontani dalle esigenze del mercato

ma anche dell'ambiente. Problemi fondamentali quali l'eccessivo sfruttamento degli stock ittici, il fallimento della politica centralista europea e la situazione di crisi di moltissime aziende del settore, devono essere prioritariamente affrontati con un nuovo approccio. A questo scopo ho trovato sicuramente positivo il contenuto del regolamento proposto dalla Commissione europea che mira a "garantire che le attività di pesca e di acquacoltura creino condizioni ambientali sostenibili a lungo termine e contribuiscano alla disponibilità dell'approvvigionamento alimentare", andando ad impattare principalmente sulla massima cattura sostenibile, la modifica del funzionamento degli scarti del pescato e l'acquacoltura.

3-241-000

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Pescuitul reprezintă o proprietate naturală, regenerabilă, mobilă și comună, care face parte din patrimoniul nostru comun. Politica comună în domeniul pescuitului a fost introdusă prin Tratatul de la Roma. Inițial, această politică era strâns legată de politica agricolă, însă de-a lungul timpului a devenit din ce în ce mai independentă față de ea. De la reforma sa din 2002, politica comună în domeniul pescuitului are drept obiectiv principal să asigure exploatarea durabilă a resurselor piscicole și să garanteze venituri și locuri de muncă stabile pentru pescari. Salut propunerea Comisiei de a se garanta activitățile de pescuit și acvacultură care să ofere condiții de mediu sustenabile pe termen îndelungat și care să contribuie la disponibilitatea aprovizionării cu alimente.

3-241-500

**Philippe Boulland (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté contre le rapport sur la réforme de la PCP afin d'exprimer mon soutien aux pêcheurs français. Le PPE a souhaité participer activement à la réforme, notamment en votant en faveur de l'amendement 297, qui respecte le principe de l'obligation de débarquement en l'aménageant de manière à permettre au secteur de la pêche de s'adapter à cette mesure. Malheureusement, cet amendement n' a pas pu être adopté. La réforme de la PCP a des conséquences sociales importantes pour les pêcheurs. Elle mérite donc une attention particulière pour soutenir ce secteur déjà fortement fragilisé.

3-241-750

**Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Europejski sektor rybołówstwa produkuje co roku około 6,4 mln ton ryb. W rybołówstwie i przemyśle przetwórczym zatrudnionych jest 350 000 osób. Świadczy to o wielkim znaczeniu tego sektora oraz jego wpływie na pozostałe istotne obszary, takie jak gospodarka, zatrudnienie, ochrona środowiska.

W głosowaniu opowiedziałem się za przyjęciem sprawozdania dotyczącego wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa. Nie możemy lekceważyć istniejących w tym sektorze problemów, wierzę jednak, że podejmowane działania są właściwym krokiem w kierunku przezwyciężania istniejących trudności. Mam nadzieję, że proponowane rozwiązania przyczynią się do rozwoju tego sektora, zrównoważonej eksploatacji zasobów morskich, skutecznej ochrony środowiska morskiego, a także do zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa dostaw żywności.

3-242-000

**Zuzana Brzobohatá (S&D)**, *písemně*. – Zpráva, kterou předkládá Ulrike Rodust, navrhuje změny v rybářské politice EU a má za cíl za prvé ukončit do roku 2015 nadměrný rybolov a přinést posun směrem k udržitelné rybářské praxi, za druhé uplatnit přístup předběžné opatrnosti a řízení rybolovu založeného na ekosystémech, za třetí zvýhodnit ty, kteří loví

ryby trvale udržitelným způsobem a naposledy používat veřejné zdroje na řešení problému a ne na podporu nadměrného rybolovu. Domnívám se, že bohatství oceánů je třeba chránit pro příští generace, a proto jsem zprávu podpořila.

3-242-562

**John Bufton (EFD),** *in writing* . – I abstained from voting as without the policy amendments suggested by my party – all of which were, unfortunately, defeated – I do not believe the policy is either reliable or effective.

3-242-593

**Cristian Silviu Bușoi (ALDE),** *în scris* . – Am votat în favoarea acestui raport pentru că acesta vine cu câteva noi propuneri în ceea ce privește politicile comune în domeniul pescuitului. În primul rând, mă bucură faptul că s-a stabilit includerea grupurilor profesionale într-un dialog cu privire la situațiile de pescuit, protejarea mediului și a stocurilor de pești. În al doilea rând, interzicerea aruncării capturilor înapoi în apă e un lucru pozitiv pentru că astfel se reduce risipa de pește care, conform estimărilor Comisiei, este 23% din totalul peștelui capturat. Un alt plus al acestui raport îl reprezintă politicile care privesc refacerea stocurilor de pește și prioritizarea economiei durabile în această industrie, un exemplu bun fiind blocarea unor zone a apelor pentru pescuit pentru o perioadă de timp care să ofere durata necesară refacerii faunei piscicole a acelor ape.

3-242-625

**Alain Cadec (PPE),** *par écrit* . – J'ai voté contre le rapport Rodust sur la politique commune de la pêche. En effet, après trois ans de travail en commission parlementaire, il reste un point essentiel que je ne peux pas accepter dans cette réforme. Il s'agit de la stricte obligation de débarquement de toutes les captures avec un calendrier trop serré et inapplicable aujourd'hui. Cette mesure est en l'état dogmatique, c'est pourquoi j'avais déposé un amendement de compromis qui proposait de rendre l'obligation de débarquement plus flexible et plus réaliste. Malheureusement, il a été rejeté, ce qui a motivé mon opposition. Je me réjouis toutefois de la suppression des concessions de pêche transférables proposées par la Commission européenne. En tant qu'auteur de l'amendement de suppression de ces droits de pêche monétarisés, je me félicite que mes collègues parlementaires aient suivi ma proposition, qui était la seule raisonnable. L'abandon des concessions de pêche transférables reste une victoire significative, puisqu'il évite la disparition de notre modèle de pêche européen.

3-242-687

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE),** *por escrito* . – A Política Comum das Pescas (PCP) tem demonstrado incapacidade na sua eficácia, não permitindo resolver problemas de longa data: sobrepesca, sobrecapacidade, situação económica débil de muitas empresas do setor das pescas, problemas sociais causados pelo declínio das pescas em numerosas regiões costeiras. Assim sendo, o novo regulamento deve criar um quadro ambicioso para inverter a persistente tendência negativa e permitir a sustentabilidade e o êxito do setor das pescas na Europa. Este estrutura-se em 8 eixos: 1) Rendimento máximo sustentável ou RMS; 2) Obrigação de desembarcar todas as capturas/Proibição de devolução; 3) Um sistema transparente de concessões de pesca individuais e coletivas; 4) Redução da sobrecapacidade; 5) Regionalização/Consulta das partes interessadas; 6) Medidas adicionais de reconstituição das unidades populacionais visando obrigar os EM a encerrarem 10 a 20% das suas águas

às atividades de pesca no prazo de três anos; 7) Medidas transitórias para o Mar Mediterrâneo; e 8) Parcerias com países terceiros para efeitos de gestão comum das pescas. Votei contra o presente relatório pois evidencia ainda uma priorização da vertente ambiental, subestimando os pilares social e económico, e não concordo com as exigências impostas no âmbito do rendimento máximo sustentável/MSY e a lei de proibição das rejeições.

3-242-750

**Françoise Castex (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – Alors que 65% de la consommation européenne des produits de la mer sont importés, l'UE a la responsabilité de tout mettre en oeuvre pour empêcher la délocalisation de notre capacité de production alimentaire. Or, le débarquement obligatoire de tous les rejets risque de détruire nos entreprises de pêche et les emplois les plus fragiles, particulièrement les pêcheries multi-spécifiques. Ce texte aurait dû respecter l'équilibre entre le nécessaire renouvellement de la ressource et la pérennité des activités de pêche européenne qui participent de notre autonomie alimentaire.

3-242-781

**Birgit Collin-Langen (PPE)**, *schriftlich*. – Die derzeitige Gemeinsame Fischereipolitik folgt keinem nachhaltigen Ansatz. Die Probleme durch Überfischung und Überkapazitäten werden durch sie nicht gelöst. Weil wir unsere Umwelt schützen und gleichzeitig gute und gesunde Lebensmittel wollen, müssen wir wirklich etwas ändern und das Zurückwerfen von Fischen stoppen. Wir können das gängige Verfahren nicht rechtfertigen, das es zulässt, im Schnitt 23 % des gefangenen Fisches wieder wegzuworfen. Deshalb brauchen wir, um die Überfischung zu stoppen, diese ambitionierte und grundlegende Reform der Fischereipolitik der EU. Ich unterstütze den Vorschlag des Ausschusses für nachhaltige Fangquoten, ein Rückwurfverbot und Mehrjahrespläne (*maximum sustainable yield*, MSY), weil das der beste Weg ist für die Fischer, die Küstengebiete, den Fischbestand und unsere Bürger. Durch diese Reform wird sich der Fischbestand in den Meeren bis 2020 um 15 Mio. Tonnen erhöhen können. Gleichzeitig steigt das Einkommen der Fischer um 25 % und die Zahl der Arbeitsplätze um 38 % bis 2022.

3-242-796

**Emer Costello (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I welcome the adoption of the Rodust report on reform of the Common Fisheries Policy, and particularly the proposals on: ending the practice of discarding fish at sea (starting 2014); moving towards quotas that respect maximum sustainable yields (from 2015) and to multiannual plans and regional structures; taking full account of local communities that are especially dependent on fishing and related activities when allocating quotas. I also welcome the overwhelming rejection – by 620 votes to 36 with 4 abstentions – of amendment 214, which sought the effective abandonment and dismemberment of the CFP. Since overfishing is a Europe-wide, indeed a global problem, it is obvious we need a common European approach. But we do need a reformed CFP. One that seeks to put an end to overfishing and to allow fish stocks to recover, to secure a sustainable future for fishing communities, especially small-scale fishermen, and achieve more jobs in this sector. The very large majority in favour of this report, as well as Parliament's enhanced role in the CFP under the Lisbon Treaty, put the rapporteur in a strong position to negotiate with the Council which, under the Irish Presidency, wants to reach agreement by July.

3-242-804

**Corina Crețu (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Am votat în favoarea acestei rezoluții pentru că este necesară o politică sustenabilă pentru sectorul pescuitului. Sunt indispensabile schimbări pentru a combate pescuitul excesiv, pentru a ameliora situația precară a pescarilor și a reduce dificultățile financiare existente în prezent în sectorul pescuitului. Este esențial să avem o politică comună pe termen lung pentru a prezerva mediul maritim, atât pentru noi, cât și pentru generațiile viitoare.

3-242-812

**Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Przyjęliśmy dziś ważne sprawozdanie dotyczące przyszłości wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa. Zmiany w tym obszarze miałyby wejść w życie od początku 2014 roku. Głównym celem rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady jest stworzenie warunków dla odnowienia się zasobów ryb do 2020 roku, tak aby rybołówstwo w Europie stało się zrównoważonym sektorem. Przyjęte rozwiązania zakładają większą ochronę zasobów morskich. Odnowione zasoby ryb będą generować większy połów, więc w dalszej perspektywie oczekiwana tendencja powinna prowadzić do tworzenia nowych miejsc pracy w sektorze.

3-242-875

**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Consider că politica comună în domeniul pescuitului trebuie să contribuie la aprovizionarea pieței Uniunii cu alimente foarte nutritive, reducând dependența pieței interne în domeniul alimentar, contribuind la crearea, în mod direct sau indirect, de locuri de muncă și implicit la dezvoltarea economică în zonele de coastă.

3-242-937

**Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Aujourd'hui, les ressources halieutiques européennes, notamment dans l'Atlantique et la Méditerranée, sont menacées par la surpêche. Alors que plus de 350 000 Européens vivent de la pêche et de l'industrie de transformation, une réforme durable de la politique commune est rendue nécessaire si nous voulons préserver sur les moyen et long termes cet important secteur économique de l'Union européenne. Avec la nouvelle politique commune de la pêche, les critères de renouvellement annuels permettront de maintenir les stocks de poissons. Les techniques traditionnelles de pêche seront également reconnues et préservées. La préservation des ressources halieutiques et la fin des rejets - plus d'un quart des captures est gaspillé chaque année - sont aussi des éléments déterminants pour perpétuer la pêche à petite échelle, artisanale et côtière. Cette nouvelle politique commune de la pêche est un pas en avant considérable pour la France, qui est la première interface maritime d'Europe.

3-243-000

**Philippe de Villiers (EFD)**, *par écrit*. – Avec ce rapport sur la réforme de la politique commune de la pêche, le Parlement tente, par des amendements, de contrecarrer quelque peu une Commission de Bruxelles sourde aux revendications et qui campe sur des positions très restrictives mettant en péril l'avenir de nos pêcheurs.

Bruxelles cherche à imposer à une profession déjà affaiblie par les importations étrangères des politiques de pêche dictées par une vision idéologique et technocratique ouvrant la porte aux dumpings sociaux, environnementaux et sanitaires. Le principe du rendement



maximal durable réduira encore le nombre de pêcheurs en activité, ce qui déstabilisera encore davantage les régions côtières. L'infantilisation d'une profession noble qui participe à la sécurité alimentaire européenne en proposant des produits de qualité est outrageuse.

Si certains amendements vont dans le bon sens, nous ne pouvons mettre en péril les pêcheurs français et leur activité.

3-243-500

**Anne Delvaux (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Le Parlement européen a voté en faveur d'une réforme ambitieuse qui vise à rendre plus durable la pêche dans l'Union européenne en mettant fin aux pratiques de surpêche à l'origine du déclin des ressources halieutiques. Nous avons ainsi voté pour la reconstitution des stocks de poissons dans les eaux de l'UE, aujourd'hui surexploités, d'ici à 2015 ainsi que pour l'interdiction progressive des rejets en mer à partir de 2014 (pratique qui consiste à passer par-dessus bord les poissons non commercialisables car trop petits, abîmés ou simplement hors quotas etc., qui représente près d'un quart des captures totales de l'UE). La réforme, censée entrer en vigueur en 2014, devra encore faire l'objet de discussions entre le Parlement et le Conseil mais la Présidence irlandaise a d'ores et déjà annoncé espérer parvenir à un accord avant la fin de son mandat, en juin. Je m'en réjouis car le vote de ce rapport est une grande victoire!

3-243-750

**Edite Estrela (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente o relatório sobre a "Política comum das pescas", por incluir medidas que irão contribuir para a reposição dos estoques, ao impedir, designadamente, a sobrepesca e a devolução de capturas indesejadas, tendo em vista uma maior sustentabilidade ambiental, económica e social das atividades da pesca.

3-244-000

**Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I was pleased to vote in favour of this report which sees the culmination of years of work and lobbying and represents an important step on the road to CFP reform. This reform is vital for coastal communities in Wales as well as our fishing industry. Sustainability has always been central to the aim of developing and growing our fish and shellfish industry and in particular enabling more locally sourced produce to be used. I am pleased too that we could see an end to overfishing and the senseless practise of discards which so many constituents have contacted me about. I hope that the substantial majority in Parliament for this vote will enable an agreement to be reached in the Council in the very near future so that the reforms can be put in place.

3-244-500

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – As pescas são elemento essencial para a vida de muitas populações e o consumo de pescado é cada vez mais necessário para uma dieta sã por parte dos consumidores. Já por diversas vezes a Comissão Europeia tem defendido que a Política Comum das Pescas tem por objetivos a proteção das unidades populacionais contra a pesca excessiva, a garantia de um rendimento para os pescadores, o abastecimento regular dos consumidores e da indústria transformadora a preços razoáveis, bem como a exploração sustentável dos recursos vivos marinhos de um ponto de vista biológico, ambiental e económico. A mera enunciação dos objetivos torna patente a dificuldade de defender todos de forma equilibrada. A União Europeia tem-se dividido, grosso modo, em "amigos dos pescadores" e "amigos do pescado", dicotomia que urge ultrapassar. Estou em crer que qualquer política comum das pescas pouco flexível e que ignore os seus principais e mais

diretos destinatários estará condenada ao insucesso. A falta de flexibilidade, plasmada nas regras demasiado exigentes e onerosas para os pescadores concretos não teve essa preocupação. Esta circunstância, que muito lamento, forçou o meu voto contra.

3-244-750

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Há muito que o Parlamento Europeu (PE) vem reivindicando urgência na revisão da Política Comum das Pescas (PCP) da União Europeia (UE). A nossa preocupação com a sustentabilidade dos recursos haliêuticos, preservando a biodiversidade e garantindo condições mínimas de subsistência para as comunidades piscatórias, estava na base desse nosso pedido. Na realidade, torna-se imperioso acabar com a devolução ao mar de milhares e milhares de toneladas de pescado e de recuperar as espécies ameaçadas. Além disso, há muitas outras possibilidades de exploração de espécies marinhas, como o recurso à aquacultura, que podem garantir o fornecimento dos mercados sem pôr em causa os estoques em risco. O relatório em análise, elaborado pela colega Ulrike Rodust, incide sobre a proposta de regulamento do Parlamento Europeu (PE) e do Conselho no que respeita à PCP. Faço votos para que todo este processo seja concluído durante a presidência irlandesa e que, no horizonte do ano 2020, tenhamos mais possibilidades de pesca e mais emprego no setor.

3-245-000

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Com este relatório decide-se parte fundamental da futura Política Comum das Pescas (PCP). Este regulamento terá profundas implicações no futuro do sector, desde logo em Portugal - o país da UE com a maior ZEE. Apesar das melhorias introduzidas relativamente à proposta inicial da Comissão, como a eliminação das concessões de pesca transferíveis, o documento agora aprovado não resolve os principais problemas com que as pescas nacionais se confrontam e pode, inclusivamente, gerar novos problemas. Insiste-se numa gestão centralizada da PCP, distante da realidade complexa e diversificada que caracteriza as pescas na UE. Apesar da necessária definição de objetivos ambientais, em linha com recomendações científicas atuais, que apoiámos, a dimensão socioeconómica da política de pescas é manifestamente negligenciada, o que trará prejuízos evidentes para os segmentos da pesca de pequena escala e para os países, como Portugal, em que esta tem uma fortíssima prevalência. A pesca de pequena escala é tratada de forma muito insatisfatória neste regulamento. É significativo que tenha sido eliminada qualquer referência a este segmento da frota, contrariando as orientações constantes do Relatório Ferreira sobre a pequena pesca, recentemente aprovadas por este mesmo Parlamento. Por estas razões, e por entendermos que assim o exigia a defesa dos interesses nacionais, votámos contra.

3-247-000

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Nariadením Rady (ES) č. 2371/2002 sa zriadil systém Spoločenstva na ochranu a udržateľné využívanie zdrojov rybného hospodárstva v rámci spoločnej rybárskej politiky. Spoločnou rybárskou politikou by sa malo zaistiť, aby rybolovné a akvakultúrne činnosti prispeli k dlhodobu udržateľným environmentálnym, hospodárskymi a sociálnym podmienkam. Na Svetovom summite o trvalo udržateľnom rozvoji, ktorý sa konal v roku 2002 v Johannesburgu, sa Únia a jej členské štáty zaviazali, že budú konať tak, aby zabránili neustálemu úpadku mnohých zásob rýb. Únia by preto mala zlepšiť svoju spoločnú rybársku politiku, aby zaistila, že úrovne využívania zásob morských biologických zdrojov sa prioritne obnovia a zachovajú na úrovniach schopných priniesť maximálne udržateľné výnosy z populácií lovených

zásob, a to do roku 2015. Je dôležité, aby bolo riadenie spoločnej rybárskej politiky vedené podľa zásad dobrej správy vecí verejných. Spadá sem napríklad rozhodovanie založené na najlepších dostupných vedeckých odporúčaníach, široká účasť zainteresovaných strán a dlhodobá perspektíva. Zastávam názor, že úspešné riadenie spoločnej rybárskej politiky do veľkej miery závisí od jasného vymedzenia zodpovedností na úrovni Únie, vnútroštátnej, regionálnej a miestnej úrovni a od vzájomnej zlučiteľnosti a konzistentnosti prijatých opatrení s inými politikami Únie.

3-245-500

**Ashley Fox (ECR)**, *in writing*. – I have voted in favour of this report as I believe it will help to create a viable future for our fisheries. It contains practical provisions which set out a positive framework for further negotiations on Common Fisheries Policy. It is critical that CFP is reformed so that it ends overfishing. We need more sustainable practices so that there will be fish in the sea for years to come. I am pleased that the Fraga amendment was defeated. I look forward to the abolition of discards which have blighted Europe's fisheries for so long.

3-245-750

**Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Oggi in aula si è assistito all'adozione a larga maggioranza del regolamento di base della nuova politica comune della pesca che, se sarà ratificato dagli Stati membri, garantirà la sostenibilità del settore e metterà fine allo scarico a mare del pescato. Sono perfettamente d'accordo nel garantire la sostenibilità della pesca stessa, rivedere il sistema delle quote e ricostituire gli stock ittici. Ritengo condivisibile l'obiettivo, tuttavia credo che l'adozione di tale regolamento non tenga conto delle conseguenze in termini economici e sociali che tale riforma comporta. L'Unione europea oggi ha dimostrato un atteggiamento avulso dalla realtà in quanto è impossibile pensare che le trasformazioni richieste avvengano da un giorno all'altro. Per questi motivi ho accolto la posizione quasi isolata di contrarietà e non ho espresso il mio voto favorevole al regolamento.

3-245-875

**Catherine Grèze (Verts/ALE)**, *par écrit*. – Nous le savons, la surpêche détruit le milieu marin et menace sérieusement les populations qui dépendent de la pêche. Financement de bateaux de plus en plus performants incitant à pêcher toujours plus, intérêts à court-terme, gestion centralisée, gaspillage de près d'un quart du total des captures européennes. Après 30 ans de mise en œuvre d'une politique européenne défailante dans le domaine de la pêche, le constat est amer. Aujourd'hui, le Parlement européen a pour la première fois eu la possibilité de se prononcer et d'exercer son rôle de colégislateur dans ce domaine de la pêche. Pour éviter que nos océans soient transformés en désert d'ici 2050, un vote positif du Parlement européen était fondamental. L'objectif est d'exploiter les ressources halieutiques dans la logique du "rendement maximal durable", d'éviter les captures accidentelles, d'attribuer des aides à des pratiques durables et de rapprocher du terrain la gestion de la pêche. Aujourd'hui, notre vote permet d'aller vers une PCP vertueuse, dans ses dimensions économique, sociale et environnementale, et profitant ainsi à toutes et tous.

3-245-937

**Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce rapport car il pose les grands principes d'une nouvelle politique commune de la pêche, qui parvient à concilier

la préservation des stocks et la sauvegarde des emplois à moyen et long terme. Ce texte ouvre la voie vers une pêche plus durable en Europe axée sur les techniques traditionnelles de pêche, à petite échelle, artisanales et côtières. La préservation des ressources halieutiques et la fin des rejets -plus d'un quart des captures est gaspillé chaque année- sont des éléments clefs de ce rapport et il faut s'en féliciter.

3-246-000

**Françoise Grossetête (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté contre ce rapport car il met en danger la survie de la pêche européenne. Nous devons soutenir une pêche durable afin de préserver nos ressources halieutiques. Toutefois, la réforme de la pêche doit se faire de manière juste, sans porter préjudice aux pêcheurs qui se trouvent déjà dans une situation difficile.

L'obligation immédiate de débarquement de tous les poissons pêchés, même inaptes à la consommation humaine, est une mesure dangereuse. Un délai est nécessaire pour l'aménagement des navires ainsi que des ports: l'interdiction totale des rejets ne doit pas être immédiate. Le rejet de cet amendement, qui en respectait le principe tout en permettant aux pêcheurs de s'adapter, menace la survie de la pêche européenne. Cet amendement était pourtant un compromis réaliste qui aurait permis de mettre en œuvre cette obligation dans des délais raisonnables.

Ce règlement doit être revu afin de trouver un équilibre adéquat entre préservation des ressources halieutiques et prise en compte des pêcheurs européens et notamment de la pêche artisanale. Ces derniers ne survivraient pas à une politique irréaliste. Les actions réalisées depuis des années par la profession en faveur d'une pêche durable constituent des avancées notoires et témoignent de sa volonté d'exploiter les ressources d'une façon soutenable.

3-246-250

**Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté contre le rapport d'Ulrike Rodust sur la réforme de la politique commune de la pêche (PCP). S'il est nécessaire de réformer la PCP pour la rendre plus durable, la position finale du texte me semble problématique. En effet, j'ai considéré qu'il faut réussir à concilier la reconstitution de la ressource halieutique d'ici 2020 avec le maintien dans de bonnes conditions des activités de pêche.

La nécessité de respecter les quotas de pêche dans le cadre du rendement maximal durable (RMD) est incontestable. Pour autant, le calendrier de mise en œuvre pose problème. Par ailleurs pour ce qui concerne la pratique des rejets en mer, l'obligation de débarquement de toutes les captures ne permettra pas de lutter contre ce gaspillage.

Nous préférons d'autres solutions alternatives comme la sélectivité et les plans de gestion. Avec mes collègues socialistes français, nous espérons que la suite de la négociation permettra d'aboutir à une législation plus équilibrée.

3-246-312

**Jim Higgins (PPE)**, *in writing*. – I believe that this report greatly strengthens the common fisheries policy and this is the reason why I voted in favour of it. Sustainability is a very important issue with regard to fishing and I fully support the establishment of a legally binding obligation with regard to the maximum sustainable yield. Along with this, the discard ban would be a major step forward for the common fisheries policy, although this should be done on a gradual basis for practical reasons.

3-246-343

**Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Pritariau šiam pasiūlymui. Europos Sąjungos bendra žuvininkystės politika (BŽP) yra būtina norint užtikrinti aplinkosaugos, ekonominiu ir socialiniu aspektais tausų žuvininkystės valdymą. Bendros žuvininkystės politikos tikslų, kurių buvo tikimasi, iki šiol nepasiekta. Dabartinė BŽP iš esmės buvo nesėkminga. Paaiškėjo, jog neįmanoma išspręsti senų problemų kaip žvejybos išteklių pereinimo, perteklinių pajėgumų, prastos daugelio žvejybos sektoriaus įmonių ekonominės padėties, socialinių problemų, kurias kelia daugelyje pakrančių regionų mažėjanti žvejyba. BŽP reforma būtina, kad būtų išvengta nuolatinio didelio žuvų išteklių eikvojimo, perteklinio laivynų pajėgumo, nedidelio daugelio laivynų pelningumo ir ekonominio atsparumo. Per pastaruosius dešimtmečius Europos vandenyse labai sumažėjo žuvų ištekliai ir esama rizikos, kad kai kurie iš jų visiškai išnyks. Viena iš keturių sugautų žuvų negyva išmetama atgal į jūrą. Tai visiškas išteklių eikvojimas, o juk daugiau negu 60 proc. Europoje suvartojamos žuvies šiuo metu importuojama. Žuvininkystės sektorius beveik nepelningas ir daugeliu atvejų išgyvena tik remiamas subsidijų. Dėl didžiulių finansinių sunkumų skatinamas trumpalaikis planavimas, taip pat netausi ir netinkama veikla, dėl kurios labai nukenčia jūros aplinka. Tad būtinybė skubiai reformuoti BŽP akivaizdi kaip niekada.

3-246-375

**Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Problemy odnoszące się do wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa przez lata można było, pomimo mnogości podjętych w przeszłości kroków wiodących ku zreformowaniu sektora, zamknąć w kilku ważniejszych blokach. Liczne powikłania w głównej mierze przejawiały się w braku zrównowazenia środowiskowego, wynikającego z problemu „przełowienia”, wrażliwości flot połowowych na tzw. „wstrząsy zewnętrzne” (choćby wysokie ceny paliwa), niemożności uzyskania względnej stabilności gospodarczej, braku zrównoważonego rozwoju społecznego (sektor przestał być źródłem atrakcyjnych miejsc pracy dla potencjalnych nowych pokoleń rybaków) czy też w złożoności ram prawnych, co z kolei zamyka koło, utrudniając osiągnięcie wspomnianego powyżej zrównoważonego środowiska naturalnego.

Rozpatrując zmiany proponowane przez prezentowany projekt, ze spokojem spoglądam ku przyszłości tego sektora. Wprowadzenie precyzyjnych regulacji, poruszających każdą z wyszczególnionych kwestii, winno skutkować osiągnięciem stanu kompleksowego usystematyzowania sytuacji wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa, począwszy już od 2017 r. – data ta stanowi jasną cezurę odrodzenia nadziei dla tego niepotrafiącego wyjść z wewnętrznego impasu sektora.

3-246-500

**Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this report. This report is very important because it sets out the framework of the future CFP policy for the next 10 years, and will have a big effect on fishermen all across Europe. I believe that it is critical that we find concrete ways to stop overfishing. There are a few ways that we can help to achieve this goal. EU vessels fishing outside EU waters must meet the same requirements as boats in Europe, and fisheries agreements with third countries should only cover fish stocks with a surplus of fish. We also need to find a balanced approach with regards to the number of controls carried out in EU waters. It is absolutely crucial to sustainable fishing that the control system is reformed to take into account specific characteristics and sizes of different European fleets.

3-246-750

**Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)**, *schriftlich*. – Ziel der Gemeinsamen Fischereipolitik ist es, Fischfang und Aquakultur langfristig, nachhaltig und ökologisch zu betreiben und die Nahrungsmittelversorgung sicherzustellen. Ich setzte mich dafür ein, dass alle gefangenen Fische an Bord bleiben und schließlich angelandet werden. Es soll ein absolutes Verbot der Rückwürfe gelten, das ab 2014 schrittweise nach einem Zeitplan eingeführt werden soll, der jeweils für die einzelnen Fischarten gilt. Die Mitgliedstaaten haben dabei die Pflicht zu sorgen, dass das Rückwurfverbot auf den Fischereifahrzeugen eingehalten wird. Bis spätestens 2015 und allerspätestens ab 2020 sollen die Fischbestände wieder ein Niveau erreichen, auf dem der höchstmögliche Dauerertrag erzeugt werden kann. Um Nachhaltigkeit und Planungssicherheit sicherzustellen, sollen außerdem langfristige Pläne die Bewirtschaftung der Fischbestände regeln.

3-246-812

**Agnès Le Brun (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Il était urgent de réformer la Politique commune de la pêche et la proposition de la Commission européenne en la matière était extrêmement attendue. S'il est indispensable de lutter contre la surpêche et de reconstituer les stocks halieutiques, dont l'avenir de nos pêcheries dépend, le rapport présenté renfermait selon moi un dangereux déséquilibre entre considérations environnementales et considérations socio-économiques. L'interdiction totale des rejets est en effet une mesure irréaliste et surtout inapplicable, qui mettra en péril un nombre considérable de pêcheries et les emplois que ces dernières créent, dans une période où le chômage au sein de l'Union européenne se maintient déjà à des taux historiquement élevés. L'amendement présenté par Alain Cadec, qui aurait permis de fixer une marge de tolérance en matière d'interdiction des rejets, n'ayant pas été adopté, je me suis donc prononcée contre ce texte.

3-246-875

**Jean-Marie Le Pen (NI)**, *par écrit*. – En aggravant considérablement les contraintes environnementales sur la pêche et leur mise en œuvre dans des délais aussi serrés, le rapport Rodust propose tout simplement l'arrêt de mort de ce secteur. Sous couvert de bonnes intentions, tel le zéro rejet, et sous la pression des lobbies écologistes, le Parlement européen a cédé à la démagogie et montré sa méconnaissance totale des réalités de ce métier et des contraintes qu'il subit déjà. Les professionnels de la pêche ont présenté des solutions alternatives qui étaient respectueuses de l'environnement et assuraient l'avenir de leur secteur, ils n'ont pas été entendus. La pêche artisanale sera bien sûr la première à en faire les frais. C'est notre sécurité alimentaire qui est en jeu, le maintien de l'emploi et des économies de nos zones côtières. Ce rapport qui prétend prôner l'équilibre entre la durabilité des ressources halieutiques et la durabilité économique et sociale du secteur de la pêche est en fait une réforme radicale et idéologique. Il est une preuve, s'il en fallait encore une, que l'Europe n'aime pas les pêcheurs. J'ai voté contre le rapport de Mme Rodust.

3-248-000

**Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)**, *na piśmie*. – Wspólna polityka rybołówstwa jest ważnym i wrażliwym zagadnieniem. Ważnym z punktu widzenia bilansu żywnościowego i równowagi biologicznej w morzach i oceanach. Jest zagadnieniem wrażliwym, wręcz delikatnym – chodzi bowiem o dostęp do zasobów, ograniczenia w dostępie i gotowość do udostępniania zasobów innym.

Otrzymaliśmy setki maili z propozycjami, wnioskami i oczekiwaniami. Przyznaję, że maile pomogły nam w podejmowaniu decyzji w głosowaniu. Przyjeliśmy dobry dokument, który uwzględnia wymogi rybołówstwa zrównoważonego, uwzględnia racjonalizację, sposoby zrównoważonego łowienia, kształtowania nakładu połowowego.

Kolejne ważne obszary regulacji to badania naukowe i programy innowacyjne, uczciwa kontrola rybaków i połowów, sprawy wód terytorialnych i przybrzeżnych. Duch i litera tej polityki mogą dobrze służyć także rybołówstwu na Bałtyku i polskim rybakom.

3-248-500

**Krzysztof Lisek (PPE)**, *na piśmie* . – Głosowałem za reformą wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa UE, gdyż nie można było dalej akceptować przeławiania zasobów rybnych. Widzimy, że poprzez wzrost przełowionych zasobów rybnych w porównaniu z rokiem 2002 obecna polityka rybołówstwa poniosła porażkę. Bez zrównoważonej polityki połowów narazilibyśmy środowisko naturalne na nieodwracalne, katastroficzne w skutkach konsekwencje, populacja wielu gatunków ryb doprowadzona zostałaby do minimalnych wielkości lub całkowitego wyginięcia.

3-249-000

**David Martin (S&D)**, *in writing* . – I welcome this vote for a major reform of the EU's common fisheries policy (CFP) which aims to cut fishing to sustainable stock levels, end dumping at sea and base long-term planning on sound scientific data.

3-250-000

**Clemente Mastella (PPE)**, *per iscritto* . – Una riforma sostanziale della politica comune della pesca risulta sempre più indispensabile e urgente. I problemi da molto tempo noti (quali pesca eccessiva, sovraccapacità, situazione economica precaria di molte aziende del settore, problemi sociali connessi al declino della pesca in molte regioni costiere) non sono stati finora risolti. Il nuovo regolamento di base deve, quindi, costituire un pilastro ambizioso per invertire la tendenza negativa costante e assicurare una pesca sostenibile ed efficace in Europa.

Per aumentare ulteriormente la coerenza e garantire la realizzazione degli obiettivi previsti, riteniamo necessario che la Commissione valuti periodicamente le misure adottate a livello nazionale. Gli organi consultivi dovrebbero essere consultati anche in merito all'introduzione dell'obbligo di sbarco e, prima dell'entrata in vigore di quest'ultimo, dovrebbero presentare delle proposte per lo sviluppo di una pesca pienamente documentata. Essi dovrebbero, inoltre, formulare proposte in merito alle deroghe per i pesci che presentano un'elevata probabilità di sopravvivenza. Tali proposte devono naturalmente essere sottoposte a una successiva verifica scientifica.

3-251-000

**Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL)**, *par écrit* . – Ce rapport supprime l'obligation de privatisation des droits de pêche, le pire est évité. Il confirme la mise en œuvre du rendement maximum durable ainsi que son report à l'horizon 2020. Il établit une gestion pluriannuelle des pêches concertée entre tous les acteurs de la filière et conforme aux meilleurs avis scientifiques, disposition qui donnera de la lisibilité aux entreprises de pêche. Il tient compte de la viabilité sociale et économique des activités de pêche et acte l'introduction de l'aquaculture durable et de la conchyliculture dans la PCP.

Autant de raisons pour lesquelles je soutiens ce rapport. Je signale cependant que, si la mesure dite "zéro rejet" est destinée à accroître la sélectivité des engins de pêche, elle ne doit pas condamner la filière. Son application devra être conduite par pêcherie, au cas par cas, après études de faisabilité et d'impact socioéconomique.

Une planification de la modernisation de la flotte pour permettre une pêche sélective, durable et plus sûre pour les marins est nécessaire. Ce rapport ne prévoit rien de tel. Je vote pour les nombreuses avancées de ce texte mais je dénonce cette grave lacune.

3-251-500

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A atual Política Comum das Pescas (PCP) não foi ainda capaz de resolver alguns dos problemas que se vêm a arrastar há alguns anos como é o caso da sobrepesca, da sobrecapacidade, da situação económica débil de muitas das empresas do setor das pescas, e os problemas sociais causados pelo declínio das pescas em numerosas regiões costeiras. Este novo regulamento de base deve contribuir para criar um quadro ambicioso para inverter esta situação e permitir a sustentabilidade e o êxito do setor das pescas na Europa. Estamos perante um objetivo ambicioso que só com a ajuda de todos os interessados neste importante setor económico, conseguiremos atingir.

3-251-750

**Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – He votado a favor del Informe Rodust sobre la posición del Parlamento Europeo en materia de reforma de la Política Pesquera Común y en contra de la propuesta inicial de la Comisión. Si bien todos los sectores coinciden en reconocer los grandes fallos de la Política Pesquera Común y la necesidad de proceder a una reforma de la misma, los buenos propósitos de la Comisión no acaban con la centralización de la PPC y conllevarán una mayor liberalización de este sector. Al contrario, la PPC debería tener en cuenta la realidad compleja y diversificada de la pesca en la UE y definir, además de los objetivos medioambientales, un apoyo claro a la dimensión socioeconómica de la PPC. Ahora bien, he apoyado la posición del Parlamento Europeo puesto que mejora la de la Comisión con la voluntad de garantizar la subsistencia del medio marino mediante una pesca sostenible. Se opone a las concesiones de pesca transferibles y propone una prohibición gradual de los descartes, la promoción del respeto al rendimiento máximo sostenible y la voluntad de una planificación de largo plazo con la voluntad de recuperar las poblaciones de peces de cara al año 2020.

3-252-000

**Louis Michel (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – La politique commune de la pêche menée jusqu'à présent n'a pas donné les résultats escomptés. Toutefois, les eaux de l'Union européennes jouissent de toutes les prédispositions nécessaires pour que la pêche soit bénéfique sur les plans économique, social et environnemental. Il est donc essentiel d'apporter des modifications à cette politique en vue de développer ce secteur de manière durable et profitable pour les pêcheurs, les citoyens et le milieu marin.

Certains éléments sont impératifs pour assurer une gestion raisonnable de la pêche, comme la reconstitution des stocks halieutiques par exemple, sans quoi la pêche devient impossible. Pour ce faire, il est nécessaire que les pêcheurs respectent leurs quotas, optent pour la politique du non-rejet et réduisent ainsi le gaspillage.

À l'heure actuelle, nous sommes tous concernés par les problèmes environnementaux, il me semble donc également vital d'accorder un intérêt tout particulier aux petites entreprises



de pêche, qui, par le biais de leurs techniques non industrielles, contribuent au respect et à l'équilibre de la nature.

Adopter cette réforme, c'est faire du secteur de la pêche un secteur durable, profitable et écologique.

3-252-500

**Alexander Mirsky (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The current common fisheries policy (CFP) has failed to a large extent. That is why the main objective of our Group is reform of the CFP. It should ensure the recovery of fish stocks and bring an end to overfishing, ensuring that fishing and aquaculture activities are sustainable and managed consistent with achieving a healthy marine and freshwater environment, in order to provide long-term sustainable environmental, economic and social benefits and contribute to the availability of food supplies. Though the report has a few points with which I disagree, I voted in favour.

3-253-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Auch wenn die neue Grundverordnung eine ambitionierte Basis bilden soll, um die seit langem bestehenden Probleme (Überfischung, Überkapazitäten, schlechte wirtschaftliche Lage vieler Unternehmen im Fischereisektor, soziale Probleme durch den Rückgang der Fischerei in vielen Küstenregionen) zu lösen, steht zu erwarten, dass ihr dies wohl nicht besser gelingen wird als die Vorgängerregelung. Wenngleich es natürlich wichtig ist, dass die EU diesbezüglich mit gutem Vorbild vorausgeht. Es wäre sinnvoll, zunächst zu versuchen, an der besseren Umsetzung der bisherigen Maßnahmen zu arbeiten. Nichtsdestotrotz habe ich für den vorliegenden Bericht gestimmt, da die Union in diesem Bereich mit gutem Beispiel vorangehen sollte.

3-254-000

**Claudio Morganti (EFD)**, *per iscritto*. – È innegabile che la Politica comune della pesca fin qui intrapresa dall'Unione europea si sia dimostrata piuttosto fallimentare. Una riforma era quindi necessaria e la relazione approvata oggi va proprio in questa direzione. I mari europei hanno visto ridursi drasticamente gli stock ittici negli ultimi anni, con il rischio che si debba fare sempre più ricorso a importazioni extra-Unione europea. Inoltre, la pesca ha dimostrato una redditività decrescente, con il rischio che sempre meno persone si dedichino a questo tipo di attività che ha una sua grande importanza economica e commerciale che purtroppo spesso non è valorizzata.

Sono soddisfatto che nella riforma della PCP abbia trovato la giusta importanza anche la pesca artigianale, che rappresenta una preziosa fonte di sostentamento per molte famiglie e che negli ultimi anni è stata troppo spesso trascurata a vantaggio delle grandi flotte di pescherecci. Mi auguro quindi che la pesca abbia un nuovo impulso, perché per molte località di mare si tratta di un'attività essenziale con ricadute significative, che speriamo siano sempre maggiori, sia da un punto di vista economico che occupazionale.

3-254-250

**Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)**, *raštu*. – Šiandien patvirtinome savo poziciją itin svarbiu klausimu, lemsiančiu ES bendros žuvininkystės ateitį. Nors dokumente daug svarbių nuostatų, kuriomis siekiama išsaugoti žuvų išteklius ateinančioms kartoms, noriu atkreipti dėmesį į vieną tokią priemonę. Moksliniais duomenimis pagrįstas žuvų išteklių valdymas ir kvotų nustatymas leis užtikrinti, kad ištekliai ne tik nemažės, bet ir atsikurs.

Ši priemonė ypač aktuali tokiai jūrai kaip Baltijos jūra, kurioje dėl itin intensyvio žvejybos pastaruoju metu pradėjo ženkliai mažėti žuvų ištekliai. Tikiu, jog šių metodų taikymas leis ateinančioms kartoms išsaugoti žuvų išteklius ir kitose jūrose.

3-254-500

**Katarína Neveďalová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Existující spoločná rybárska politika je viac neudržateľná. V posledných rokoch sme si vyčerpali naše moria, pričom mnohí rybári ostali bez práce alebo sa stali závislí od dotácií. Európa je zo 66 % závislá od importu rýb. Preto pevne verím, že reformou spoločnej rybárskej politiky a stanovením určitých spoločných zásad nielen v rámci Európy, ale aj mimo vôd EU zaistíme ukončenie nadmerného rybolovu, obnovíme populácie rýb a minimalizujeme negatívne vplyvy na morské prostredie. Nadmerný rybolov poškodzuje morské prostredie a ohrozuje životaschopnosť komúní závislých od rybolovu. Mali by sme preto podporovať činnosti malých pobrežných rybárov s nízkym vplyvom na výlov, stanoviť dlhodobé plány riadenia a hlavne zabrániť plytvaniu vylovených rýb, čo v praxi znamená zaznamenávať všetky vylovené úlovky. Na druhej strane by všetky plánované opatrenia mali smerovať k zatraktívneniu odvetvia rybolovu a vytvoreniu nových pracovných miest v tejto sfére. V dobe, keď bojujeme proti neustále narastajúcej miere nezamestnanosti, musíme využiť všetky možnosti zapojenia ľudí do trhu práce. Zatraktívnenie rybárskeho sektora zaistí dlhodobú životaschopnosť pobrežných komúní aj vďaka podpore hospodárskeho rastu a zamestnanosti.

3-255-000

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Am votat împotriva raportului. Consider că Parlamentul trebuie să susțină o reformă corectă, a cărei prioritate să fie conservarea resurselor de pește. Modul corect de a asigura această prioritate ar fi fost adoptarea soluției propuse prin amendamentul 297, care respectă principiul obligației de debarcare, dar stabilește totodată măsuri care să permită sectorului pescuitului să se adapteze la această obligație. În același timp, salut adoptarea amendamentelor referitoare la înființarea unui Consiliu al Mării Negre, măsură pe care am solicitat-o cu numeroase ocazii. De asemenea, salut introducerea în acest text a unor importante prevederi privind acvacultura, sector defavorizat în UE, care trebuie încurajat.

3-256-000

**Franz Obermayr (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Das Stichwort bei dieser Abstimmung ist einzig und allein Nachhaltigkeit. Die bisherige Fischereipolitik versuchte kurzfristige Gewinne zu maximieren und führte zu einer schwerwiegenden Überfischung. Es ist aber nicht nur notwendig, die Überfischung zu beenden, sondern ebenso den Bestand wieder zu erhöhen. Auf diese Weise können die Fehler und die Gier der Vergangenheit wieder wettgemacht werden. Auch wird mehr Wert auf Selektivität und die Vermeidung von unerwünschtem Beifang gelegt. Dieser unnütze und verschwenderische Tod vieler Fische war bisher ein gebilligter Kollateralschaden. Auch dem versucht man nun deutlich entgegenzuwirken.

3-256-250

**Kristiina Ojula (ALDE)**, *in writing*. – I supported this report wholeheartedly as it represents a crucial reform of the EU's current common fisheries policy. Fish stocks in the EU have decreased drastically over the years and it is evident that serious changes must be implemented in order to maintain fish stocks above levels capable of producing maximum

sustainable yield. This report also corresponds well to the principles of long-term environmental sustainability.

3-256-500

**Wojciech Michał Olejniczak (S&D)**, *na piśmie*. – Wspólna polityka rybołówstwa, po raz ostatni gruntownie zreformowana w 2002 r., w dużej mierze zawiodła. Błędnie ustalone, zawyżone kwoty połowowe oraz nieefektywne mechanizmy ochrony żywych zasobów morskich doprowadziły do znacznego przełowienia zasobów śródziemnomorskich (na poziomie 80%) i atlantyckich (na poziomie 40%) oraz do niedopuszczalnie wysokiego poziomu odrzutów zdrowych ryb z powrotem do morza.

Alarmujący stan środowiska naturalnego oraz trudna sytuacja gospodarcza rybaków i przedsiębiorców skłoniły Komisję do podjęcia w 2011 r. prac nad reformą wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa. Proponowane zmiany polegają przede wszystkim na wprowadzeniu zrównoważonych kwot połowowych do 2015 r. w celu odbudowy zasobów ryb do zrównoważonego poziomu do 2020 r. oraz na ustanowieniu zakazu odrzutów wszystkich poławianych gatunków. Pozwoli to poprawić stan środowiska i odbudować zasoby morskie, a równocześnie wpłynie korzystnie na sytuację rybaków – zwiększając ich zyski – oraz konsumentów, zapewniając im łatwiejszy dostęp do tańszych ryb.

Biorąc powyższe pod uwagę, z pełnym przekonaniem zagłosowałem za reformą wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa i poprawkami do rozporządzenia przedstawionymi przez sprawozdawczynię Komisji Rybołówstwa, posłankę Ulrikę Rodust z grupy S&D. Następny krok należy do ministrów państw członkowskich, którzy zajmą stanowisko odnośnie do proponowanych regulacji. Parlament Europejski pokazał w toku negocjacji, że reforma jest dla niego priorytetem, dając również wyraźny sygnał Radzie, która będzie musiała uwzględnić jego stanowisko.

3-256-562

**Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport relatif à la Politique commune de la pêche. Ce rapport prend des directions similaires à celles qui se dégagent de mon rapport pour avis sur la PCP en commission du développement régional. Je me réjouis aussi que ma proposition demandant la création d'un Comité consultatif pour les régions ultrapériphériques aient été adoptée à une large majorité par la plénière du Parlement européen. Concernant les enjeux globaux de la refonte de la PCP, il nous faut garder à l'esprit que la disparition des poissons entrainera avec elle celle des pêcheurs. Or, si nous continuons au rythme de prédation actuel, il n'y aura, en 2050, plus aucun poisson disponible pour la pêche commerciale. Il y a urgence à limiter la surpêche et garantir la reconstitution des stocks de poisson. C'est un enjeu majeur visant la protection de la biodiversité et la pérennisation de la filière pêche, dont le Parlement a pleinement tenu compte. Je regrette cependant que des mesures de compensations pour les pêcheurs, et notamment pour les plus fragiles d'entre eux, n'aient pas été prévus. Pour autant, ce rapport constitue une réelle avancée en matière environnementale.

3-256-687

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Pritariu šiai rezoliucijai. Tam, kad būtų užtikrintas tausūs jūrų išteklių naudojimas, turi būti efektyviau taikomas didžiausio galimo tausios žvejybos laimikio principas. Manau, kad Taryba kiekvienais metais nustatydama kvotas, turėtų privalomai atsižvelgti į regionus, kurių vietos bendruomenė priklauso nuo

žuvininkystės ir su ja susijusios veiklos. Labai svarbu užtikrinti, kad jūrų biologiniai ištekliai būtų apsaugoti nuo neigiamo žvejybos poveikio. Taigi, pritariu, kad būtų taikomos tam tikros specialios išsaugojimo priemonės, suteikiant išskirtines ar lengvatines prieigas tam tikroms laivyno dalims ir suteikiant teisę naudoti tik tam tikrus žvejybos įrankius. Prieiga prie žuvų išteklių turi būti paremta skaidriais ir objektyviais aplinkosaugos ir socialiniais kriterijais. Didesnį dėmesį reikia skirti moksliniams tyrimams ir inovacijoms, siekiant sukurti geresnius, inovatyvius žvejybos ir skerdimo metodus. Valstybėms turi būti skiriamas pakankamas finansavimas žuvininkystės, mokslinių duomenų rinkimo ir mokslinių tyrimų bei inovacijų programų įgyvendinimui.

3-256-750

**Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D)**, *in writing*. – Overfishing has created a large issue in the socio-economical aspect of the European Union and has adversely affected multiple areas. The environment is becoming less sustainable due to the decrease in fish. Many small and large fisheries are becoming less and less profitable and are in turn creating more unemployment. These two elements create a large economy. The amount of fish caught has dropped from 8.1 million tonnes in 1995 to 4.9 million tonnes in 2010. The EU, while not the largest, still has 68 % of overfished stocks. The majority of this lies in the northeast Atlantic because that is the location with the most volumes in kilotonnes of live weight. Denmark, Spain, the UK and France are the countries that catch the most fish. I voted for this report, because it will address these issues: the obligation to land all catches and the discard ban will help increase sustainability of fish. Therefore, with these amendments we will see the greatest improvements within the fishing industry in the European Union as long as they are adopted in a harmonious manner.

3-257-000

**Αντιγόνη Παπαδοπούλου (S&D)**, *γραπτώς*. – Υπερψήφισα τον νέο βασικό κανονισμό γιατί θέτει φιλόδοξους στόχους ώστε να αντιστρέψει το αρνητικό κλίμα που δημιούργησε η ισχύουσα Κοινή Αλιευτική Πολιτική (ΚΑΛΠ). Τα διαχρονικά συσσωρευμένα προβλήματα της υπεραλίευσης, της παρακμής της αλιείας και της συνεπαγόμενης ασθενούς οικονομικής κατάστασης πολλών αλιευτικών επιχειρήσεων, πρέπει να αντιμετωπιστούν μέσα από αναγκαίες μεταρρυθμίσεις της κοινής αλιευτικής πολιτικής. Στο σχέδιο έκθεσης προτείνονται στόχοι, φιλόδοξα μέτρα και τροποποιήσεις στην πρόταση της Επιτροπής, ώστε να υπάρχει περιορισμός της εντατικής υπεραλίευσης, ανάκαμψη των αποθεμάτων στο επίπεδο της μέγιστης βιώσιμης απόδοσης έως το 2015, διαφανές σύστημα ατομικών και συλλογικών αλιευτικών παραχωρήσεων, βελτίωση της συνεργασίας μεταξύ κρατών μελών και εμπλεκόμενων φορέων και κυρίως μεταβατικά μέτρα για τη Μεσόγειο.

3-257-250

**Paulo Rangel (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Considerando as dificuldades de longa data na atividade piscatória e considerando ainda que tais dificuldades não encontraram solução no quadro em vigor da Política Comum das Pescas, o relator desenha uma proposta alternativa que pretende orientar as práticas de pesca de modo a garantir o abastecimento alimentar, no compromisso de uma abordagem sustentável. Contudo, a imposição relativa ao rendimento máximo sustentável que obriga os pescadores a "assegurar a manutenção das unidades populacionais acima de níveis que possam produzir o rendimento máximo sustentável", não reúne o equilíbrio que o Partido Popular Europeu gostaria de garantir aos eleitores. Ainda no que se refere aos 3 pilares da PCP, defendo que a proibição de devoluções e a obrigação de desembarque de todas as capturas afigura-se impossível de cumprir, no caso

das pescarias mistas características do Sul da Europa onde a seleção por tamanho é difícil – e exige um estudo particular que investigue a situação/impacto atual das devoluções em cada pescaria antes mesmo que tais procedimentos possam ser regulados. Pelo exposto, e atendendo ao prazo que o relatório impõe para a implementação das proibições, votei contra a proposta de regulamento, pois a ser aprovado acarretará o perigo de incumprimento, agravando-se em sanções para os pescadores portugueses, imprevistos para a implementação desta medida.

3-257-500

**Britta Reimers (ALDE)**, *schriftlich*. – Auf dem Wege der Stimmänderung habe ich mich nachträglich für den Änderungsantrag 234 ausgesprochen. Meine ursprüngliche Ablehnung dieses Änderungsantrags erfolgte versehentlich; die Abstimmungsleitung durch die agierende Vizepräsidentin verlief chaotisch, und die Übersetzung erfolgte mit einiger Verspätung. Um derartige Situationen bei den Abstimmungen zu vermeiden, halte ich es für wichtig, dass die Vizepräsidenten des Europäischen Parlaments eine der drei Arbeitssprachen beherrschen.

3-258-000

**Frédérique Ries (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai soutenu ce matin un vote historique du Parlement européen en faveur d'une réforme ambitieuse de la politique commune de la pêche, avec un seul mot d'ordre: stop à la surpêche! Partant du constat que la politique de la pêche a jusqu'à présent été un échec, les députés européens ont posé les jalons d'une "Europe bleue" durable en faveur des pêcheurs, des consommateurs, et du milieu marin.

Parmi les mesures préconisées: la reconstitution des stocks, l'encadrement des quotas de pêche annuels, un terme à la pratique intolérable du rejet de milliers de tonnes de poissons consommables dans les eaux européennes, et l'utilisation de programmes à long terme basés sur des données scientifiques plus fiables. Cela signifie plus de poissons, de meilleures prises et, par conséquent, des emplois plus nombreux dans le secteur.

La nouvelle politique devrait entrer en vigueur en 2014 et d'ici 2020 elle permettra une augmentation de 15 millions de tonnes de poissons, et une hausse de 25% des revenus des pêcheurs si elle est correctement appliquée. Entre-temps la balle est dans le camp des États Membres qui devront laisser de côté certains intérêts nationaux et se prononcer résolument pour une pêche européenne moderne et à taille humaine.

3-259-000

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *por escrito*. – He votado a favor. La flota europea está sobredimensionada y, en consecuencia, ha sobrepescado hasta límites dramáticos.

Era necesario corregir el rumbo y lo hemos hecho. El Parlamento ha votado hoy, finalmente, en favor de una política pesquera de la UE que sea sostenible. En concreto, el Parlamento ha respaldado los planes que exigen niveles sostenibles de pesca a partir de 2015, para permitir que las poblaciones de peces se restablezcan en niveles abundantes para 2020.

Esta es la clave: más peces en el mar significa una pesca más rentable para los pescadores, por lo que esta situación beneficiará tanto al medio ambiente como al sector. También ha votado a favor de poner fin al sinsentido de los descartes masivos, poniendo especial énfasis en que la prioridad radica en promover artes más selectivas.

Los Verdes celebramos también que el Parlamento haya apoyado nuestra propuesta de condicionar el derecho de pesca a la garantía de mejores prácticas sociales y ambientales, con vistas a recompensar al sector de la pesca artesanal, más sostenible. Así pues, el resultado global es ciertamente positivo.

3-259-500

**Licia Ronzulli (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – La riforma della politica comune della pesca è una priorità per tutta l'Unione europea. A partire dal 2014 sarà più semplice pianificare uno sviluppo sostenibile del settore che porrà fine allo scarico in mare dei cosiddetti "rigetti". Le pratiche di pesca intensiva saranno ora contrastate con nuove regole che terranno in considerazione gli indici di riproduzione delle diverse specie, riportando la pesca a una dimensione più qualitativa e sostenibile.

3-260-000

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I welcome this report from the Fisheries Committee and the efforts of colleagues to strengthen the Commission's proposal on the reform of the Common Fisheries Policy. The amendments adopted in committee would bring the CFP into line with the 2020 objectives of the Marine Framework Strategy Directive because of the legal requirement for Member States to adopt measures to rebuild fish stocks to healthy levels by the end of this decade. This would represent a significant step on the road to repairing our damaged seas, replenishing fish stocks, and protecting fishing industries in the long-term. This is just one of a series of amendments which would bring improvements, along with those banning discards and ensuring the establishment of Marine Protected Areas. I would like to thank those colleagues who have worked hard to improve the Commission's proposal, and I wish them every success in the negotiations with Council.

3-260-500

**Amalia Sartori (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Il processo di riforma della Politica Comune della Pesca (PCP) è una priorità per l'Italia e l'auspicio è di poterla adottare già a fine 2013. Ho votato a favore perché la proposta della Commissione ben risponde agli interessi del nostro Paese. Ci impegniamo per tutelare soprattutto la "piccola pesca", concetto che ha avuto una definizione unitaria a livello europeo e che vuole valorizzare la specificità del bacino del Mediterraneo. Anche paesi come il Regno Unito, nel Consiglio Pesca dello scorso 28 gennaio, hanno riconosciuto la necessità di trattare con metodologie differenti queste particolari realtà. Questa riforma è rivolta in primo luogo ai pescatori, i soggetti principali che devono sostenere i costi sociali ed economici dell'attuazione della nuova politica europea della pesca. Questa riforma deve mirare a valorizzare il più possibile le potenzialità del settore.

3-260-750

**Vilja Savisaar-Toomast (ALDE)**, *kirjalikult*. – Toetasin tänasel hääletusel kalanduspoliitika põhjaliku reformi vastuvõtmist. Mul on hea meel, et parlamendi enamus toetas senise kalanduspoliitika asendamist uue jätkusuutliku poliitikaga, mis tagab mitte ainult kalavarude säilimise, vaid ka nende suurenemise. Oli aeg asendada liikmesriikide suva järgi antavad kvoodid teadusuuringutel põhinevate kvootidega, mis aitab kaasa kalavarude taastumisele. Ligi 80% Vahemere ja 47% Atlandi kalavarudest on ülepüütud ning samas visatakse keskmiselt 25% kogupüügist merre tagasi. Kuna kalad on merre tagasiviskamise ajaks enamasti juba surnud, on reform äärmiselt oluline ja vajalik samm

Euroopa kalanduse tuleviku jaoks. Väikese pettumuse valmistas see, et toetust ei leidnud muudatusettepanek 253, mis käsitles kalavarude taastamispiirkonna suuremat kaitset sellisel määral, mis oleks olnud vajalik. Kokkuvõtvalt on tegemist hea poliitikaga ning seetõttu toetasin kogu paketi vastuvõtmist.

3-261-000

**Birgit Schnieber-Jastram (PPE)**, *schriftlich*. – Jahrzehnte des intensiven Fischfangs in den europäischen Gewässern haben zu einem dramatischen Rückgang der Fischbestände geführt. Die Überfischung muss beendet werden, denn sie verschlechtert nicht nur die wirtschaftliche Situation in der EU, sondern hat auch Defizite bei den Fischereipartnerschaftsabkommen mit den Entwicklungsländern zur Folge. Wir brauchen einen grundlegenden Kurswechsel. Deshalb habe ich für den Bericht, so wie ihn die Berichterstatterin vorgestellt hat, gestimmt. Nur mit klarer rechtlicher Verpflichtung und mit klarer Frist können wir die Nachhaltigkeit des Fischereissektors erreichen. Vorschriften ohne eindeutige Fristen oder mit vagen Vorgaben würden nur Rechtsunsicherheit in der Fischereindustrie schaffen. Auch destruktiven Fischfangmethoden, vor allem dem Rückwurfverbot und damit verbundenen Anlande Verpflichtungen, muss ein Ende bereitet werden. Sie machen in manchen Fischereien über 50 Prozent der Fänge aus. Es ist eine große Verschwendung unserer Meeres-Ressourcen. Wir müssen sicherstellen, dass auch zukünftige Generationen diese Ressourcen angemessen nutzen können.

3-261-500

**Salvador Sedó i Alabart (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – He votado en contra de la reforma de la Política Pesquera Común (PPC) porque no se ha diseñado teniendo en cuenta las diferentes realidades territoriales, ni se ha adaptado a las grandes diferencias entre los segmentos de la flota europea. Considero que la aplicación en 2014 de la PPC tendrá consecuencias lesivas para el sector pesquero y acuícola mediterráneo, y especialmente para el sector de la pesca catalana. La presente PPC establece una política dirigida muy prioritariamente a las características de la flota de altura y gran altura, dejando de lado la flota costera o litoral característica del mar Mediterráneo. Por otro lado, el método de los descartes propuesto no tiene en cuenta la problemática singular de los descartes en cada pesquería. Sin perjuicio de los avances relativos a los aspectos ambientales, es necesario tener en cuenta, de forma equitativa, las vertientes económica, ambiental y social. El sector se enfrenta en el presente a una fuerte desigualdad de precios y a elevados costes de producción. Por este motivo, no conviene reservar de manera exclusiva los Fondos Estructurales a políticas y actuaciones de protección del medio ambiente, a fin de garantizar el desarrollo y el mantenimiento del sector pesquero y acuícola.

3-263-000

**Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)**, *por escrito*. – En la votación de la enmienda 242 me he abstenido, porque el asunto tratado en ella exigirá para mí un estudio más detenido. He votado en contra de la enmienda 233, aunque, evidentemente, estoy en contra del sufrimiento innecesario de la fauna marina, y ello lo expreso votando a favor de las enmiendas que exigen una pesca responsable y que faene con las técnicas menos perjudiciales para el medio ambiente marino y su fauna, como se demuestra en la votación de la enmienda 234.

3-264-000

**Bart Staes (Verts/ALE)**, *schriftelijk*. – Zopas keurden we een historisch voorstel goed om de overbevissing en het overboord gooien van onbedoelde bijvangst te voorkomen. Bijna een kwart van alle visvangst wordt half levend of dood teruggegooid om zo onder de visquota te blijven of omdat het niet de gewenste vissen zijn. Daar komt met dit voorstel gelukkig een einde aan. Drie decennia wanbeleid van Europese visserijministers zorgde ervoor dat de Europese visserij grotendeels afhankelijk is van subsidies, terwijl 75 tot 90% van de Europese visbestanden wordt overbevist en ecosystemen geruïneerd worden. De jaarlijkse onderhandelingen tussen ministers waarbij visquota veel te hoog wordt vastgesteld, zullen voortaan verleden tijd zijn omdat de visvangst op wetenschappelijk advies gebaseerd moet zijn. De Europese Visserijministers negeerden tussen 1987 en 2011 in zo'n 70% van de besluiten die wetenschappelijke adviezen. Om overbevissing te stoppen en visbestanden op een gezond niveau te herstellen, moeten tot 2015 vangstlimieten worden doorgevoerd. Dan kunnen de visbestanden zich tegen 2020 herstellen. Te vrezen valt echter dat Europese visserijministers deze hervormingen toch zullen proberen te verwateren. Dat is nu de politieke inzet: het EP-akkoord overeind houden in de onderhandelingen met de Raad.

3-261-250

**Catherine Stihler (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour as this report is the key piece of legislation for CFP reform. It includes important points such as a legal requirement to stop overfishing and a discard ban that will make sure that all catches are recorded. The reform of the CFP is crucial for sustainable fishing and a sustainable marine environment.

3-262-000

**József Szájer (PPE)**, *írásban*. – Az elmúlt évek bebizonyították, hogy az Unió közös halászati politikája kudarcot vallott. Lehetetlennek bizonyult a már régóta fennálló problémák, így különösen a túlhalászás és túlkapacitás megoldása. A tengeri halászat a jelenlegi szinten nem fenntartható. A Fidesz európai parlamenti delegációja ezért elutasítja azon javaslatokat, amelyek lehetővé tennék a tengeri halászatnak a természetes vizek túlhalászását eredményező folytatását. A tengeri halászattal szemben az akvakultúra fenntartható módon biztosítja a halak iránti piaci igény kielégítését. Az édesvízi haltenyésztés, amelyhez Magyarország kiváló adottságokkal rendelkezik, nemcsak az élelmiszer-biztonsághoz járul hozzá, hanem jelentős számú munkahelyet is teremthet.

3-265-000

**Hannu Takkula (ALDE)**, *kirjallinen*. – Äänestin Ulrike Rodustin kalastuspolitiikan uudistamista koskevan mietinnön puolesta. Pidän EU:n kalastuspolitiikan kehittämistä tärkeänä ja tietyiltä osin jopa hyvin välttämättömänä. Liikakalastuksen estäminen järkevin kalastusta rajoittavin keinoin on edellytyksenä kalakantojen säilymiselle. Samalla se on keino varmistaa kalastuksen ja siihen liittyvien elinkeinojen säilyminen myös tulevaisuudessa. Olen esittelijän uudistamislinjan kannalla useista syistä. Ajattelen ympäristön tilaa, luonnon monimuotoisuutta, taloudellisen toiminnan järkevyyttä ja kestävyyttä. Olen arvioinut kalastuspolitiikan uudistamista sekä ekologian että talouden kannalta.

3-266-000

**Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I totally support a strong CFP reform, therefore a more sustainable fisheries policy. The preservation of biodiversity, and not least



of endangered species, is of great importance. The current fisheries policy has led to a big number of wasted fish, and now Parliament had a great opportunity to vote for a long-term supply of sustainable seafood in Europe, as well as for a more secure future for our fishermen.

3-267-000

**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – Non seulement la surpêche est un fléau qui détruit le milieu marin, mais elle risque aussi de faire disparaître près de 100 000 emplois européens et de précariser des communautés entières qui dépendent directement de la mer. À force de puiser dans les stocks de poissons, on diminue leur taille et le volume des captures. Les 4 millions de tonnes de poissons capturés n'arrivent pas à satisfaire la demande toujours plus grande des Européens, qui consomment 23,1 kilos de poisson par an et par personne. 90 % des stocks de Méditerranée font l'objet d'une surpêche. Il n'est pas trop tard pour agir, mais il est temps, sans quoi le mal de mer sera permanent!

3-267-250

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A reforma da Política Comum das Pescas é uma das mais esperadas reformas no seio da União Europeia no próximo período plurianual. Área de competência exclusiva da União Europeia, a política das pescas reformada visa uma sustentabilidade económica, social e ambiental a longo prazo que garanta um equilíbrio entre a exploração dos recursos e a garantia da qualidade de vida das populações, assegurando a disponibilidade de recursos e o abastecimento dos consumidores a preços razoáveis. A Política Comum das Pescas deve imperativamente contribuir para o abastecimento do mercado da União de alimentos de elevado valor nutricional, diminuindo a dependência alimentar do mercado interno, para a criação direta e indireta de emprego e para o desenvolvimento económico das zonas costeiras. Pelos motivos expostos, votei a favor do documento.

3-267-375

**Isabelle Thomas (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté contre la proposition sur le règlement de base de la Politique commune de la pêche, car malgré les avancées obtenues en commission, ce texte ne respectait pas l'équilibre entre le nécessaire renouvellement de la ressource et la pérennité des activités de pêche européenne, qui participe de notre autonomie alimentaire. Je regrette notamment que le Rendement maximal durable (RMD), outil qui permet de mesurer scientifiquement ce qui peut être pêché sans mettre en péril le renouvellement de la ressource, ait subi une telle surenchère qui a mené à viser l'"au delà" RMD pour 2020, notion vague et renvoyant à l'arbitraire. Je regrette également qu'aucune proposition concrète n'ait été faite pour améliorer la connaissance scientifique des stocks. Je regrette enfin que le Parlement ait validé le débarquement obligatoire de tous les rejets, mesure destructrice d'emplois, qui légalisera la commercialisation des rejets transformés en farines animales. Il existait de meilleures solutions pour éliminer les rejets en les gardant en vie, grâce à l'augmentation de la sélectivité des engins, à la modernisation des navires et de leurs technologies, aux plans de gestion. Je resterai mobilisée pour que les discussions du trilogue continuent à faire évoluer positivement cette réforme.

3-267-500

**Derek Vaughan (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I wholeheartedly support a significant reform of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP), which aims to end overfishing and to promote

sustainable practices. Measures must be put in place to stop overfishing – figures show that around 80% of Mediterranean stocks and 47% of Atlantic ones are overfished. I support the introduction of a discard ban – discards currently account for almost a quarter of all catches and I believe the Parliament is right to call for this practice to be phased out, starting in 2014. Furthermore, I welcome measures to make fishing more sustainable and agree that fishermen should respect a 'maximum sustainable yield'. This should hopefully lead to stocks recovering by 2020, and after that point we need to make sure they remain sustainable. Finally, the recovery of fish stocks will enable millions more tonnes of fish to be caught and could create up to 37 000 new jobs in the industry.

3-268-000

**Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL)**, *par écrit*. – Le vote sur la réforme de la politique commune de la pêche (PCP) améliore la proposition de la Commission en liant l'attribution des droits de pêche à une gestion respectueuse écologiquement et socialement. La proposition des quotas de pêche transférables a été rejetée, et les rejets de poissons ne correspondant pas aux espèces recherchées sont fortement encadrés. Des amendements adoptés prennent en compte la pêche artisanale, et demandent de la distinguer de la pêche industrielle.

Mais j'aurais souhaité que le Parlement aille plus loin en adoptant les amendements de la GUE/NGL sur une meilleure prise en compte des aspects socioéconomiques de la préservation des ressources halieutiques, notamment par des indemnisations des pêcheries et économies locales. Je regrette aussi que les TOM/RUP français ne soient pas traités comme les autres RUP européennes.

Ce vote du Parlement européen est un signal clair que la PCP actuelle est un désastre et que la réforme proposée par la Commission européenne est insuffisante pour mettre fin à la surpêche dont le rythme actuel fait peser une réelle menace sur les ressources halieutiques. La balle est dans le camp du Conseil dont les atermoiements laissent craindre le report d'une vraie réforme de la PCP à 2020.

3-269-000

**Oldřich Vlasák (ECR)**, *písemně*. – V rámci reformy společné rybářské politiky kladně vnímám předložení celého balíčku legislativních dokumentů, jehož součástí je i návrh nařízení EP a Rady o společné rybářské politice. Pro náš stát a ostatní vnitrozemské státy, pro něž akvakultura hraje velmi významnou roli, je klíčové, aby tato oblast rybářství, která má do budoucna značnou perspektivu, byla více zviditelněna a bylo zajištěno její dostatečné financování. Proto jsem tuto zprávu podpořil.

3-270-000

**Glenis Willmott (S&D)**, *in writing*. – This vote represented the first time that Parliament has had an equal say with the European Council on the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP). Along with my Labour colleagues, I was pleased to have a chance to support the introduction of far-reaching reforms to help preserve European fish stocks, and the fishing industry, for future generations. The reforms called for an end to the hugely wasteful practice of discarding fish back into the ocean to keep within quota limits and also introduce a legal requirement to end overfishing by obliging fisheries ministers to set sustainable quotas which respect the Maximum Sustainable Yields (MSY) for each species. The reforms will also allow day-to-day management of fisheries to be done at a regional level, by people

who know the local area, and will allow Member States to award larger quotas to fleets that practise sustainable fishing methods – helping our small-scale fishermen.

3-271-000

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD),** *na piśmie*. – Obecna polityka UE w sprawie wspólnego rybołówstwa ma kłopoty z rozwiązaniem wielu istniejących od lat problemów. Propozycja, jaka pada w tym rozporządzeniu, czyli zbliżenie wszystkich połowów do maksymalnej liczby połowów (MSY) oraz obniżenie tych zbyt wysokich, jest dobrym rozwiązaniem. Konieczne jest również utrzymanie zasady wyładunku, tak by uniknąć niepożądanego przyłowu. Proponuje się również zmniejszenie komercjalizacji powstałej w związku z „przekazywalnymi koncesjami połowowymi”. Jeśli chodzi o koncesje połowowe, to reguły ich przyznawania powinny być bardziej przejrzyste, tak by ograniczyć ryzyko podejrzeń dyskryminacji jednych rybaków względem drugich.

Niezbędne jest również dopasowanie zdolności połowowej do panujących warunków. W ramach odnawiania zasobów rybnych proponuje się wyłączenie od 10 do 20% swoich wód jako rejonów połowowych. Myślę, że odpowiednie regulacje zawarte w tym rozporządzeniu przyczynią się do mądrego i sprawiedliwego zarządzania gospodarką morską w zakresie rybołówstwa.

3-271-250

**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD),** *na piśmie*. – Wspólna polityka rybołówstwa potrzebuje zmiany. 2/3 zasobów mórz jest przełowionych, co od dłuższego czasu powoduje zwiększenie cen ryb oraz kosztów połowów. Jak alarmują organizacje chroniące bioróżnorodność, koszty nieracjonalnej polityki morskiej to około 865 milionów euro rocznie, a zasoby w ciągu ostatnich 10 lat zmniejszyły się o 26%. Cieszę się, że w końcu Parlament Europejski ma szansę zdecydować o polityce morskiej. Mam nadzieję, że podjęliśmy dziś dobrą decyzję. Decyzję służącą przed wszystkim wzmocnieniu sektora rybołówstwa przy jednoczesnej odbudowie równowagi morskiej. W ciągu kilku lat opłacalność zawodu rybaka powinna się zwiększyć, a co za tym idzie, cały sektor powinien wyjść na prostą, tworząc nowe miejsca pracy.

3-271-500

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL),** *por escrito*. – Este regulamento terá profundas implicações no futuro do setor, desde logo em Portugal – o país da UE com a maior ZEE. Apesar das melhorias introduzidas relativamente à proposta inicial da Comissão, como a eliminação das concessões de pesca transferíveis, o documento agora aprovado não resolve os principais problemas com que as pescas nacionais se confrontam, e pode inclusivamente gerar novos problemas. Insiste-se numa gestão centralizada da PCP, distante da realidade complexa e diversificada que caracteriza as pescas na UE. A pesca de pequena escala é tratada de forma muito insatisfatória neste regulamento. É significativo que tenha sido eliminada qualquer referência a este segmento da frota, contrariando as orientações constantes do Relatório Ferreira sobre a pequena pesca, recentemente aprovadas por este mesmo Parlamento. Por estas razões, e por entendermos que assim o exigia a defesa dos interesses nacionais, votámos contra.

## 8.5. Ηχοστάθμη των μηχανοκίνητων οχημάτων (A7-0435/2012 - Miroslav Ouzký)

3-273-000

### Προφορικές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

3-274-000

**Jim Higgins (PPE).** - Madam President, noise pollution can have a major impact on people's lives and can lead to many illnesses, as we know. The noise made by motor vehicles is one of the main contributors to noise pollution; reducing the noise emitted by vehicles is an absolute necessity and we must facilitate such a reduction in any way that we can.

These noise levels do not only come from the vehicles themselves. For instance we have other contributory factors such as road surface, and the type of tyres used on a vehicle can significantly contribute to the noise levels from a vehicle. Vehicles need to have a sound identification system where consumers can see which vehicles emit various sound levels. There are already labelling systems in place to identify the levels of CO<sub>2</sub> created and the tyre noise associated with it, so why is there not a labelling system already in place to deal with the sound level of motor vehicles?

I think this report is good but I do not think it goes far enough, and it is only if we adopt its basic tenets, but also actually add to it, that we are going to have for the future a more positive outcome than we have had up to now.

3-275-000

**Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR).** - Madam President, I am pleased that level heads have prevailed and a sensible schedule for reducing sound levels has been adopted. Noise pollution is a serious issue which can lead to hearing damage, sleep disturbance and even cardiovascular disease. I believe it is in our interests to reduce sound levels of vehicles. However, we need to ensure that we do not cut limits too fast and too far. A gradual reduction of over seven years is a sensible approach which will both improve the quality of life for our citizens while ensuring the car industry has sufficient time to make the necessary changes.

I also voted for the amendments to include safeguards for the blind and partially sighted. While cars are too noisy and can be dangerous, cars that are too quiet can be equally dangerous. Introducing a sound generator on all quiet hybrid and electric cars can prevent thousands of collisions and protect vulnerable road users.

3-276-000

**Vicky Ford (ECR).** - Madam President, I have long argued that we need to make sure that our smaller companies are exempted from European legislation.

A few months ago I went to visit a company called Radical Cars. It is a fantastic flagship for the single market. They were the first company to get single-type approval, which means that, instead of getting their new car adopted in 27 countries, they just do the paperwork once.

But then this Noise Directive arrives, and a bit of legislation which is meant to deal with Golfs, Fiestas and Renault Clios is suddenly imposed on this little tiny company which sells

100 cars, not thousands or tens of thousands, every year. Suddenly their entire business model is under threat.

I am so glad that the amendment to help these smaller cars went through today. But it went through with only 15 votes, and we have left them with months of uncertainty. So colleagues, please, when we ask to exempt small businesses from EU legislation, let us be serious about this.

3-277-000

**Agnès Le Brun (PPE).** - Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je suis évidemment favorable aux mesures qui permettent de mieux protéger la santé publique et l'environnement en réduisant le niveau sonore des véhicules à moteur. Nous savons tous que les nuisances sonores sont un facteur de stress, d'anxiété, même de maladie, que c'est un sujet qui préoccupe beaucoup de nos concitoyens.

Cependant, avons-nous réellement le sens des priorités? Nous peinons à sortir d'une crise économique et financière qui a laissé nos industries totalement exsangues ou bien fortement affaiblies. La croissance dans l'Union européenne est quasiment nulle, le taux de chômage stagne à un niveau historiquement élevé.

Est-ce bien la priorité, dans un tel contexte, d'ajouter encore et encore de nouvelles contraintes, de nouvelles normes à nos industries automobiles? Fixer un seuil maximal est, de ce point de vue, tout à fait irréaliste. Un consensus existe, aujourd'hui, sur les priorités des années à venir, à savoir la croissance et l'emploi. Nous devons donc travailler en cohérence avec ces objectifs et ne pas adopter, me semble-t-il, de dispositions législatives contradictoires.

Essayons de ne pas tirer une balle dans le pied d'une Union européenne qui, à l'heure actuelle, a déjà tant de difficultés à avancer, tant de difficultés à être lisible face à nos concitoyens.

3-278-000

**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE).** - Madam President, noise pollution is an annoyance with adverse health effects that has plagued people for a long time. A leading cause of this form of pollution is transportation. The noise from planes, motor vehicles and trains is a disturbance to citizens especially at night. Just because noise pollution is unlike other types of pollution and cannot be seen, tasted or smelt does not mean that it deserves less of our attention.

I voted for regulating certain types of motor vehicle because action must be taken to diminish this growing problem. I truly believe that the transportation industries – and I mean the big industries – must invest money here in responding to citizens' wishes and to their need to live in a healthy environment.

3-279-000

**Erminia Mazzoni (PPE).** - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in questo caso io ho votato invece a favore della relazione e credo che sia un risultato importante per il nostro Parlamento. Combattere l'inquinamento acustico è un obiettivo che non può non sostenersi e però tale obiettivo può dirsi compiutamente raggiunto solo se noi lo rendiamo compatibile con il dovere di rendere la nostra società e il nostro mondo più uguali per tutti, meno impari.

Mi sono fatta carico insieme alla maggioranza dei colleghi di questo Parlamento della questione relativa alla tutela dei diritti e alla libera circolazione delle persone cieche e ipovedenti che noi ci siamo impegnati a garantire anche sottoscrivendo, tra l'altro, la relativa convenzione ONU. Fortunatamente è passato un emendamento e si è evitata una svista da parte del Parlamento, delle Istituzioni europee, sulla garanzia dei diritti fondamentali.

Io credo che con questo provvedimento abbiamo fatto un passo avanti, ma concordo con le obiezioni formulate dalla collega Le Brun che in futuro, rispetto a queste politiche, bisognerà stare più attenti alla tutela anche degli interessi delle piccole imprese e regolare i settori economici in modo tale da non creare squilibri e avvantaggiare sempre e comunque le grandi imprese.

3-280-000

**Julie Girling (ECR).** - Madam President, I was very happy to support this report, particularly as I recognise that the increase in noise pollution that we are all suffering – particularly those who live in urban areas or near busy roads – is a genuine scourge and a real danger to health. So I am delighted that we are taking action to reduce vehicle noise, but we must recognise that this is only one small part of the issue of vehicle noise.

We also have issues with tyres, with road surface levels and with many of the parts of the road changes that are supposed to be for road safety, but actually mean that cars have to slow down and speed up. We need to look at all of those issues concerning vehicle noise in the round.

I would particularly like to welcome the introduction of the Acoustic Vehicle Alerting system (AVAS) that we voted for. It is a vehicle- and noise-alert system for people who are visually impaired, for children and for cyclists. It is very important for these groups to be able to use their sense of hearing to find out what else is on the road with them. So I think we can go forward with this report and develop something meaningful.

3-281-000

**Oreste Rossi (EFD).** - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la proposta prevede l'introduzione di un nuovo metodo di prova per misurare il livello sonoro dei veicoli a motore e nuovi valori limite di rumorosità per diverse categorie. In un momento così sfavorevole per il mercato delle auto in Europa, non era assolutamente necessario produrre un ulteriore regolamento che comporta ulteriori aggravii alle imprese costruttrici di veicoli a motore. Il provvedimento, già di per sé in origine negativo per un'economia in crisi, è stato ulteriormente aggravato da un emendamento proposto dalla sinistra e approvato per pochi voti in commissione ENVI. Il testo uscito dalla commissione era talmente negativo che il relatore, il collega Ouzký, aveva espresso voto contrario. In Aula sono stati poi presentati degli emendamenti per ricondurre il regolamento in condizioni di accettabilità. Questa mattina quegli emendamenti sono stati votati positivamente e quindi, di conseguenza, anche il nostro voto è stato a favore.

3-282-000

**Charles Tannock (ECR).** - Mr President, anyone who has visited my region of London can attest to the fact that the capital city is plagued by noise pollution. My constituents and I would certainly appreciate reduced noise levels in the city, but Londoners also have a love of motor sports and luxury vehicles and many are connected to the UK's substantial auto

industry. Ultimately they would not be willing to trade economic growth for slightly quieter streets.

The strict guidelines of Annex 3 force this ultimatum. While it is important to address the issue of environmental noise caused by motor vehicles, we must remember to do so in a pragmatic and balanced way. New regulations regarding the sound level of motor vehicles must be reasonable and have a reasonable impact on the industry. In these trying economic times we cannot afford to sacrifice jobs or revenue. Any new noise limits introduced must not adversely affect employment or productivity in Britain or its auto industry, or the greater European sector for that matter. So I also support some minimum noise levels being mandatory for electric vehicles to protect the blind and other vulnerable groups, but overall this package is a mixed one.

3-283-000

**Diane Dodds (NI).** - Madam President, I firmly believe that the noise produced by cars and lorries should be at levels that are generally consistent with public health. However, as vehicles get quieter it goes without saying that they become ever more dangerous for those individuals who are blind or partially sighted.

I find it deplorable that the Commission proposal would substantially reduce the permissible noise limit values for motor vehicles without making acoustic vehicle alerting systems compulsory in electric or hybrid cars. These systems alert vulnerable road users to the presence of oncoming vehicles, thus ensuring their safety. Their omission therefore threatens the capacity of blind and partially sighted people to go about their everyday lives in the knowledge that their safety is not in jeopardy when they use our roads. I find it ironic that, despite the abundance of unnecessary red tape already placed on manufacturing businesses by the EU, the provision which is most urgently needed is absent in these proposals. I therefore supported Amendment 66, which would make acoustic vehicle alerting systems mandatory for quiet vehicles.

3-284-000

**Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE).** - Ochrana verejného zdravia, životného prostredia, ako aj Zmluva o fungovaní Európskej únie zakotvuje ochranu ľudského zdravia, ktorá sa vzťahuje na všetkých bez výnimky a dovoľuje znižovať aj hladiny hluku aj vplyv na ľudské zdravie. Tu je veľmi dobré, že sme prijali aj pozmeňujúci návrh 66, ktorý hovorí o zavedení hlukovej hladiny pozitívnym spôsobom u elektromobilov a u hybridov, pretože ľudia so zdravotným zrakovým postihnutím alebo celkom slepí ľudia, alebo deti a cyklisti musia počuť bazálny hluk približujúceho sa vozidla. Myslím, že takýmto spôsobom sme ošetrili aj tú druhú stránku veci. Samozrejme sa prihovám a hlasoval som za túto normu, ktorá tiež obmedzuje aj veľkú hlučnosť u veľkých nákladných vozidiel, a som rád, že sme veľkou väčšinou túto novelu prijali.

3-285-000

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** - A Uachtaráin, bhí áthas orm freisin tacaíocht a thabhairt do na moltaí seo a bhaineann le truailliú agus is dóigh liom gur thug Bean Yannakoudakis an-achóimre ar fad ar na príomhphointí.

Madam President, we have been concerned, obviously, about pollution, and the environment has probably got most of our attention. But it would be good for us to move on to noise pollution – particularly in open areas, caused by vehicles of all sorts. It is a good idea to try

to reduce this over a period of time so that it will not discommode the manufacturers too quickly. We also have to be conscious of small enterprises, as was pointed out by Vicky Ford, and ensure that they would not be put out of business by trying to comply with directives too quickly.

Nevertheless, what we are doing is a good thing. I think we should also move on to look at noise indoors, especially from music bands and so forth, who often confuse noise with talent. We should move onto that next.

3-287-000

**Jacqueline Foster (ECR).** - Madam President, I welcomed this positive vote. The reason I wanted to give a short explanation is because of the importance of this issue for the motor manufacturing industry in the United Kingdom, and particularly in the north-west of England.

Of course we should all continue to strive to mitigate further noise from vehicles and I think that goes without saying. However, we could have been in a position where we would have had unrealistic and arbitrary rules which would have restricted and perhaps put out of business our manufacturers of these sports cars. These manufacturers make a huge impact in the UK and – as mentioned – particularly in the north-west of England, employing thousands of constituents in highly skilled jobs and creating top-quality vehicles with advanced engineering and highly intelligent technology. So the implications of the vote going the wrong way would have been pretty catastrophic.

I would just finally like to say to the Commission that they should think very carefully when putting forward their draft regulations and directives on issues such as this and they should think through the impact when votes could go the wrong way, when we have an agenda for growth.

3-288-000

**President.** – Ladies and Gentlemen, we will now take the explanations of vote for three more reports: the report by Mr Gallagher on the conservation of fishery resources; the resolution on the elimination and prevention of all forms of violence against women and girls; and the report by Ms Liotard on the European Innovation Partnership on Active and Healthy Ageing. All the other explanations of vote will be taken tomorrow. I shall start with the Gallagher report.

3-289-000

### **Written explanations of vote**

3-289-500

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D), *por escrito.*** – Aprovo a presente proposta, tendo em consideração que a proposta de regulamento da Comissão relativo ao nível sonoro dos veículos a motor tem como principal objetivo a proteção da saúde pública e do ambiente através da implementação de medidas que reduzam o nível sonoro dos veículos a motor. A proposta introduzirá um novo método de ensaio para medir o nível de ruído dos veículos a motor e novos valores-limite para as diferentes categorias de veículos, designadamente veículos ligeiros, médios e pesados. Apoio ainda a orientação geral da proposta da Comissão, que representa um importante avanço na luta contra os efeitos nocivos das emissões sonoras dos veículos a motor para a saúde pública e o ambiente. No entanto, considero que a



proposta da Comissão beneficiaria com a introdução de um conjunto de aditamentos e de adaptações técnicas, nomeadamente no que respeita à criação de incentivos para o fabrico e a aquisição de veículos com níveis sonoros mais reduzidos.

3-290-000

**Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL)**, *in writing*. – Whilst there is no doubt that noise pollution is a serious issue for the environment across the EU, it is essential that when implementing this regulation, we do not forget the impact it could have on vulnerable sections of society. I voted in favour of the amendment making AVAS (Acoustic Vehicle Alerting System) mandatory for manufacturers of quiet vehicles. Blind and partially sighted people are particularly reliant on audible clues to judge when it is safe to cross the road. They have the right to independent mobility, a right which would be worryingly jeopardised if mandatory AVAS were not adopted. As was the case with seatbelt legislation – road safety measures do not work if they are voluntary. Many concerned citizens have contacted me to ask that I support mandatory AVAS and I have done so.

3-290-500

**Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Autoritățile europene au consemnat în anii recenti impactul tot mai semnificativ al poluării fonice asupra sănătății cetățenilor europeni. Faptul că nu mai puțin de 20% dintre cetățenii europeni, în special din mediul urban, se confruntă cu probleme de sănătate ca urmare a expunerii la niveluri ridicate ale poluării fonice, reprezintă un semnal pe care atât autoritățile naționale, cât și cele europene trebuie să îl ia în calcul. Susțin în acest context propunerea de modificare a reglementărilor din domeniu, în interesul protejării sănătății publice, atât în ceea ce privește procedura de omologare a autovehiculelor, cât și în ceea ce privește reducerea nivelurilor de zgomot. Consider că orice politică europeană în domeniu trebuie să realizeze un echilibru între protejarea sănătății și a stilului de viață al cetățenilor europeni și susținerea industriei auto, care rămâne unul dintre pilonii dezvoltării și competitivității europene. În consecință, am votat în favoarea raportului.

3-290-750

**Sophie Auconie (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce rapport qui visait à limiter le bruit des véhicules à moteur tout en permettant aux constructeurs de bénéficier de délais pour s'adapter. Le Parlement européen a aussi recommandé d'introduire un système d'étiquetage pour informer les consommateurs des niveaux de bruit des nouvelles voitures. Le bruit constitue un enjeu de santé publique qu'il convient d'encadrer.

3-291-000

**Liam Aylward (ALDE)**, *in writing*. – The European Commission Green Paper on Noise from 1996 estimated that around 20% of the then EU population suffered from noise levels that scientists and health experts consider to be unacceptable and a 2012 WHO Report stated that traffic noise is the most widespread environmental problem, harming the health of more than one in three EU citizens. 210 million people, over 44% of the EU population, are regularly exposed to road noise over 55 decibels, a level recognised to pose considerable risk to health according to WHO. In this regard I voted this support this timely report on the protection of public health and the environment through measures to reduce the sound level of motor vehicles. Furthermore, as noise standards for road vehicles have not been updated for 20 years, it is clear that this Regulation is long over due. I support

the additions in this Report regarding the provision of information to consumers on the sound level of motor vehicles. The commitment to simplification is also to be commended as Directive 70/157/EEC and 12 related directives will be rescinded and replaced with this new comprehensive regulation.

3-292-000

**Zoltán Bagó (PPE)**, *írásban*. – Szavazatommal támogattam a jelentést, mely javasolja a megengedett zajszintek harmonizációját a gépjárművek és kipufogórendszereik típusjövahagyásának műszaki követelményeit illetően. Ez elengedhetetlen a belső piac megfelelő működéséhez, továbbá a környezetvédelem és a közbiztonság magas szintű biztosítása, az egészség és az életminőség javulása érdekében. Egyetértek a jelentés javaslatával, miszerint a Bizottságnak hatásvizsgálatot kell végeznie a levegő- és zajszennyezési szintekre alkalmazandó címkézési feltételeket illetően. A címkézés megkönnyíti a fogyasztók tájékozódását a jármű vásárlását megelőző informálódás során. Azt is fontosnak tartom, hogy a vásárlást követően a fogyasztókat információkkal lássák el arról, hogy a használat és a karbantartás minősége miként hat az autó kibocsátására, és miként csökkenthető mind a fogyasztás, mind a zajkibocsátás. A megengedett zajszint hatékonyan működő harmonizációjához elengedhetetlen a megfelelő infrastruktúra, ezért fontos az útfelület típusa és megfelelő minősége. Habár a zajszennyezés inkább lokális problémát jelent, mégis uniós szintű megoldást igényel. A helyi kellemetlenségekre megoldást jelenthet a Bizottság által javasolt zajvédő falak kiépítése.

3-292-125

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį siūlymą dėl transporto priemonių garso lygio, kuriuo siekiama mažinti automobilių keliamo triukšmo poveikį visuomenės sveikatai ir aplinkai. Apie pusę ES miestų gyventojų kenčia automobilių eismo sukeltą, 55 decibelų lygį viršijantį triukšmą. Siūlymu numatoma palapsniui mažinti automobilių triukšmo ribas: po šešerių metų nuo šio dokumento įsigaliojimo naujų lengvųjų automobilių triukšmingumo lygis negalės viršyti 68 decibelų (dabar leistini 74 decibelai), po aštuonerių metų ši riba bus nustatyta visoms naujoms transporto priemonėms. Pritariu siūlymui sukurti ženklinimo sistemą, pagal kurią pirkėjai būtų informuojami apie naujų automobilių skleidžiamą triukšmą ir taip būtų skatinami įsigyti mažai triukšmingas transporto priemones. Taip pat pritariu siūlymui nustatyti minimalius elektrinių automobilių, kurie yra tylūs ir kelia pėstiesiems grėsmę, skleidžiamo garso reikalavimus.

3-292-250

**Regina Bastos (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O principal objetivo do presente regulamento é a proteção da saúde pública e do ambiente através da implementação de medidas que reduzam o nível sonoro dos veículos a motor. Nesse sentido, será introduzido um novo método de ensaio para medir o nível de ruído dos veículos a motor e novos valores-limite para as diferentes categorias de veículos. Com o propósito de promoção de veículos com baixas emissões sonoras e para facultar aos consumidores uma escolha informada antes da compra, deverá igualmente introduzir-se um sistema de rotulagem das emissões dos veículos. Por outro lado, uma vez que as características do pavimento exercem influência decisiva sobre as emissões sonoras, defende-se a introdução de um sistema de classificação das estradas que permita aos Estados-Membros e às respetivas autoridades nacionais e locais colocar e avaliar melhor a qualidade da superfície das suas estradas com vista à redução do seu impacto nos níveis globais de ruído. Pelo exposto, apoiei o presente relatório.

3-292-375

**Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Des millions d'européens souffrent quotidiennement des nuisances sonores issues des transports automobiles. Or les techniques existent désormais pour réduire considérablement ces désagréments. Les délais évoqués dans ce rapport me semblent raisonnables et aisément digérables par l'industrie automobile. A contrario, un amendement important adopté ce jour par le Parlement européen permettra d'installer sur les véhicules électriques des seuils minimaux pour prévenir les accidents avec des personnes ayant une audition délicate. Je me suis donc prononcé pour ce rapport qui a su faire émerger un bon compromis.

3-292-500

**Sergio Berlato (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – La proposta di regolamento relativa al livello sonoro dei veicoli a motore della Commissione ha l'obiettivo principale di tutelare la salute pubblica e l'ambiente mediante misure finalizzate a ridurre il livello sonoro dei veicoli a motore. Essa prevede l'introduzione di un nuovo metodo di prova per misurare il livello sonoro dei veicoli a motore e nuovi valori limite di rumorosità per diverse categorie di veicoli leggeri, medi e pesanti.

Pur accogliendo con favore l'orientamento generale della proposta, in quanto importante passo aventi nel contrastare gli effetti sulla salute pubblica e sull'ambiente delle emissioni di rumore dei veicoli a motore, ritengo che essa non presti sufficiente attenzione all'informazione dei consumatori per quanto concerne il livello sonoro dei veicoli a motore. Pertanto, concordo con il relatore sull'introduzione di un sistema di etichettatura riguardante le emissioni sonore dei veicoli che promuova i veicoli poco rumorosi e consenta ai consumatori di compiere una scelta informata prima dell'acquisto di un veicolo.

Sollevo l'attenzione della Commissione circa l'opportunità di aggiornare i requisiti tecnici che disciplinano i metodi di misurazione dei livelli sonori dei veicoli a motore, al fine di adeguare la proposta agli sviluppi tecnici nelle procedure di prova e di migliorare l'attuabilità generale dei requisiti.

3-292-750

**Nora Berra (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport de Miroslav Ouzký qui soutient la proposition de la Commission concernant la lutte contre les émissions sonores des véhicules à moteur, en particulier pour la population dans les zones urbaines. Je me permets en outre de souligner l'importance d'une réduction du bruit émanant de la surface de la route via les pneus et non pas seulement de la voiture elle-même.

3-293-000

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Poluarea sonoră constituie apanajul orașelor mari, unde afectează mediul, nu numai în timpul orelor de muncă, ci și în cele de destindere. În general putem discuta despre o extindere a poluării sonore la nivelul global al mediului ambiant. Cu toate că motoarele autovehiculelor sunt mai silențioase decât în trecut, zgomotul pe străzi și în special pe autostrăzi este în continuă creștere nu numai din cauza creșterii traficului, ci și a vitezei autovehiculelor. În momentul de față, pe unele autostrăzi moderne nivelul zgomotului a depășit 80 dB în perioadele de vârf ale traficului. Față de cele mai sus menționate, salut propunerea Comisiei de a introduce o nouă metodă de încercare pentru măsurarea nivelului sonor al autovehiculelor și noi valori-limită ale zgomotului pentru diferitele categorii de vehicule ușoare, de mărime medie și grele.

3-294-000

**Philippe Boulland (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce rapport car des améliorations peuvent être mises en place en matière de bruit généré par les véhicules. Il faut cependant être attentif à ce que toute nouvelle législation ne vienne pas aggraver la situation économique de nos entreprises européennes, comme l'industrie automobile est déjà fragilisée par la crise. J'ai voté notamment en faveur de l'amendement 66, qui met l'accent sur les véhicules hybrides et électriques. Ils sont trop silencieux et de ce fait sont sources d'accident pour les personnes mal voyantes et pour les jeunes enfants, nous souhaitons donc un dispositif sonore ad hoc pour prévenir ce genre de risque.

3-294-250

**Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – W głosowaniu poparłem przedstawione przez posła Mirosława Ouzkłego stanowisko dotyczące poziomu hałasu pojazdów silnikowych. Uważam, że proponowane zmiany, mające na celu wprowadzanie niższych limitów hałasu pojazdów silnikowych oraz nowych metod pomiaru hałasu, poprawią jakość życia, zdrowia oraz stan środowiska naturalnego. Należy dostarczyć jasnych i rzetelnych informacji dotyczących dopuszczalnego poziomu hałasu zarówno producentom samochodów, jak i konsumentom. Dodatkowo prawo w państwach członkowskich powinno zostać zharmonizowane, aby wymogi techniczne odnośnie do poziomu hałasu pojazdów silnikowych były spójnie stosowane w całej Unii Europejskiej. Potrzebny jest bodziec do rozpoczęcia konstruowania innowacyjnych pojazdów silnikowych emitujących mniej hałasu. Należy jednak wziąć pod uwagę, że może to spowodować wzrost cen pojazdów, co w konsekwencji może doprowadzić do spadku popytu.

3-294-500

**John Bufton (EFD)**, *in writing*. – This is a flawed and poorly thought-out report that falls significantly short in its attempt to outline comprehensive and effective environmental noise reduction measures. It completely overlooks the issue of traffic volume which ultimately determines road noise-pollution levels. Instead, it concentrates on individual micro-elements, the manipulation of which is highly unlikely to produce the 25 % reduction in traffic noise levels outlined. The report also shows no regard for the cost to the taxpayer. It seems to suggest that it is possible to simply replace existing roads, once again drawing on taxpayers' seemingly bottomless resources to do so.

3-294-625

**Cristian Silviu Buşoi (ALDE)**, *în scris*. – Poluarea sonoră are un impact major asupra sănătăţii şi, în acelaşi timp, asupra bunăstării cetăţenilor europeni; consider că este de datoria noastră să facem tot ce ne stă în putinţă pentru a reduce pe cât posibil efectele acestui tip de poluare. Autovehiculele reprezintă o mare parte din responsabilitatea producerii poluării sonore; prin urmare, trebuie luate măsuri pentru a reduce zgomotul pe care îl emit. Acest lucru trebuie să se întâmple fără a pune extraordinar de multă presiune pe industria constructoare de maşini, aflată şi așa într-un impas economic pe piaţa europeană.

3-294-687

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A proposta de regulamento relativo ao nível sonoro dos veículos a motor tem como objetivo promover a proteção da saúde

pública e do ambiente através da implementação de medidas que reduzam o nível sonoro dos veículos a motor, através da atualização dos valores-limite para as diferentes categorias de veículos e introdução de um novo método de teste para medir o nível da emissão de ruído nos veículos a motor. O relator propõe um conjunto de aditamentos e de adaptações técnicas a esta proposta, no que respeita à criação de incentivos para o fabrico e a aquisição de veículos com níveis sonoros mais reduzidos, uma vez que a excessiva poluição sonora tende a promover o aumento de doenças, deficiências e perturbações várias nos cidadãos, e por isso devendo ser evitada. Também é proposto um sistema de rotulagem das emissões sonoras dos veículos, com vista a permitir aos consumidores uma escolha informada antes da compra, bem como uma classificação das estradas mais ou menos propensas à geração de ruídos. O relatório considera ainda que a fixação dos valores-limite deve ser um elemento a ser determinado por co-decisão (processo legislativo ordinário) e não através de atos delegados na Comissão. Voto favoravelmente o presente relatório.

3-294-750

**Françoise Castex (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – Le bruit est pour moi une question de santé publique. Il peut provoquer un épuisement, poser des problèmes de santé et entraîner le développement de maladies. Or, plus de la moitié de la population de l'Union européenne est exposée à des niveaux de bruit supérieurs à 55 dB. 1,8% des crises cardiaques en Europe sont attribuées à un niveau sonore excessif, le bruit du transport ferroviaire et routier est à l'origine de 50 000 attaques cardiaques mortelles chaque année en Europe et de 200 000 cas de maladie cardio-vasculaires. Il était donc urgent de réviser ces normes, vieilles de presque 20 ans : la technologie permet des avancées et des progrès afin de réduire ces drames humains. Bien sûr, il ne faut pas faire abstraction des techniques et de la productivité : dans la période de crise que traverse l'industrie automobile européenne, il nous a paru crucial, à nous socialistes, d'accorder aux constructeurs des délais suffisants pour s'adapter aux nombreuses législations environnementales. Ainsi, réduire le niveau sonore de 4 décibels en 8 ans me semble être le point d'équilibre responsable pour la santé des Européens et l'avenir de notre industrie automobile.

3-295-000

**Minodora Cliveti (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Poluarea fonică este una dintre cele mai mari probleme cu care se confruntă europenii la ora actuală, problemă care trebuie abordată cu toată responsabilitatea, având în vedere efectele negative certe pe care le are asupra sănătății populației și asupra mediului. În acest context, reglementarea nivelului de zgomot al traficului, ca factor principal de poluare fonică, este un element-cheie al unei politici responsabile privind protecția cetățenilor și a mediului. România este una dintre cele mai gălăgioase țări europene. Peste 60% din populația urbană este afectată de zgomot din cauza traficului rutier intens, iar București, capitala țării, are procentul cel mai ridicat de locuitori expuși zgomotului, 85%, la nivele de zgomot aflate peste normele de poluare fonică acceptate de Organizația Mondială a Sănătății. Această situație o regăsim în multe alte orașe europene. Dacă luăm în calcul și faptul că traficul rutier este însoțit de poluare atmosferică, atunci factorii de risc sunt și mai importanți. Prin urmare, este important ca Uniunea Europeană să aibă o strategie ambițioasă și realistă în ceea ce privește nivelul sonor al autovehiculelor, strategie care să creeze cu grijă un echilibru durabil între un nivel ridicat de protecție a sănătății și a mediului pe de o parte și competitivitatea industriei auto pe de altă parte.

3-295-125

**Emer Costello (S&D)**, *in writing* . – I welcome the provisions of the Ouzky report introducing acoustic vehicle alerting systems (AVAS) for electric and electric-hybrid cars to better protect pedestrians, cyclists and especially people with sight problems. However, I voted against the resolution as a whole because the progressive report adopted in committee, which proposed ambitious noise limits for new vehicles, was overturned in Plenary in the face of strong industry lobbying. Research by the European Environment Agency shows road traffic exposes half of the population in large cities such as Dublin to noise levels above 55 decibels, while a 2007 Dutch study on Traffic noise reduction in Europe reported that 1.3 million people in Ireland are exposed to traffic noise above these levels. After air pollution, traffic noise has the biggest impact on health, especially for people living on low incomes or in disadvantaged areas as these are usually closer to roads with heavy traffic. High levels of road traffic noise can cause disturbed sleep, stress, cardiovascular disease, strokes and psychiatric problems – the 2007 Dutch study linked noise pollution to 50 000 fatal heart attacks across Europe. I do regret that Parliament did not adopt a more ambitious first reading resolution on vehicle noise.

3-295-250

**Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)**, *na piśmie* . – Sprawozdanie w sprawie dopuszczalnych poziomów dźwięku z pojazdów silnikowych zostało wypracowane w Komisji Ochrony Środowiska. Gratuluję sprawozdawcy, gdyż przedmiot prac był przede wszystkim techniczny, a w dyskusję zostały włączone zarówno głosy obywateli, jak i przemysłu oraz organizacji ekologicznych. Dobrze, iż ostatecznie zwycięża rozsądek i argumenty na rzecz wsparcia zanikającej w Europie branży przemysłu samochodowego. Również w Polsce od decyzji produkcyjnych w tym sektorze zależy wiele miejsc pracy.

3-295-625

**Rachida Dati (PPE)**, *par écrit* . – La position qu'a adoptée le Parlement européen par ce vote est courageuse et ambitieuse. En votant en faveur de ce texte, nous faisons un choix clair, celui de ne brader ni la santé de nos citoyens, ni notre compétitivité. Nous refusons de fixer des objectifs environnementaux irréalistes : nous ne voulons pas sacrifier nos emplois, alors qu'une voie médiane existe qui ne met pas en péril notre santé. Le Parlement européen veut une réduction réaliste des émissions sonores, pour une Europe qui protège ses citoyens, leur santé et leurs emplois.

3-295-500

**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)**, *în scris* . – Consider că, pentru unele vehicule grele, nivelurile de reduceri de zgomot sugerate nu sunt fezabile chiar dacă ar fi aplicate ultimele tehnologii în materie. Consider că trebuie dezvoltate noi materiale pentru a îmbunătăți nivelul de izolare fonică.

3-295-750

**Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)**, *par écrit* . – Il est désormais prouvé que l'exposition persistante à des niveaux élevés de bruit de la circulation nuit à la santé humaine, générant aussi bien des maladies physiques que psychiques. Or, la moitié de la population urbaine de l'Union est exposée à des bruits du trafic routier supérieurs à 55 décibels et la valeur limite du bruit sur une automobile fixée par la législation européenne est de 74 décibels. Il était donc nécessaire de légiférer pour limiter encore les nuisances sonores provoquées

par les véhicules à moteur. En se penchant également sur la qualité du revêtement routier, l'aérodynamique et les pneumatiques, l'Union européenne promeut une approche équilibrée pour réduire la production de bruits, les nuisances sonores et préserver la qualité de vie des habitants des zones urbaines mais aussi en faveur des acteurs du marché de l'automobile. Des seuils limites d'émissions sonores seront échelonnés en fonction des types de véhicules et un étiquetage concernant le niveau sonore des véhicules permettra d'informer de manière adéquate les acheteurs d'automobiles. Enfin, il est à noter que les véhicules hybrides et électriques seront dotés de systèmes d'avertissement acoustique, afin de maintenir un niveau sonore suffisant pour assurer la sécurité des piétons non voyants.

3-295-875

**Edite Estrela (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Votei contra o relatório relativo ao "nível sonoro dos veículos a motor", porque as propostas apresentadas reduzem claramente o nível de ambição e exigência da proposta legislativa da Comissão, ficando assim aquém do objetivo de garantir um elevado nível de proteção da saúde e do ambiente.

3-296-000

**Göran Färm, Anna Hedh, Olle Ludvigsson, Jens Nilsson, Marita Ulvskog och Åsa Westlund (S&D)**, *skriftlig*. – Skadliga bullernivåer är ett av de mest utbredda hälsoproblemen i EU och vi svenska socialdemokrater vill se åtgärder för att minska människors negativa påverkan från buller. Sänkta bullernivåer är även viktigt för framtida bostadsbyggande. Därför stöder vi lägre gränsvärden för motorfordons ljudnivåer, en linje som även den svenska regeringen håller. Vi vill dock påpeka att vi hade velat se längre ledtider för när dessa gränsvärden ska införas, för att ge fordonsindustrin bättre möjlighet till anpassning. Detta är något som vi kommer att fortsätta arbeta för i förhandlingar med rådet.

Vidare röstade vi svenska socialdemokrater för att kommissionen ska göra en översyn och en konsekvensbedömning av de nu fastslagna gränsvärdena för att bedöma följderna för fordonsindustrin och närliggande branscher. Det innebär att förordningen och gränsvärdena kan ändras om kommissionen finner det nödvändigt med hänsyn till exempelvis tekniska förutsättningar.

3-296-250

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A presente proposta pretende alcançar um elevado nível de proteção da saúde pública e do ambiente através de medidas que reduzam o nível sonoro dos veículos a motor, nomeadamente pela introdução de um novo método de ensaio para medir o nível de ruído dos veículos a motor e novos valores-limite para as diferentes categorias de veículos, designadamente veículos ligeiros, médios e pesados.

3-296-375

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A proposta de regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo ao nível sonoro dos veículos a motor tem, como principal objetivo, a proteção da saúde pública e do ambiente através da implementação de medidas que reduzam o nível sonoro destes veículos. Esta proposta prevê uma redução gradual das emissões sonoras dos veículos em função da respetiva categoria, aplicando-se, numa primeira fase, aos modelos de veículos novos e, depois, a todos os veículos que entrem em circulação. Ao mesmo tempo, defende a introdução de um sistema de rotulagem das emissões sonoras dos veículos para que os consumidores possam fazer uma escolha

informada à semelhança do que já acontece com as emissões de CO<sub>2</sub> e o consumo de combustível. É, também, importante ter em consideração que o ruído emitido pelos veículos a motor emana de diversas fontes, entre as quais o motor, os pneus, o pavimento e a aerodinâmica. Tendo em conta que a exposição prolongada a níveis elevados de ruído aumenta a incidência de doenças cardiovasculares, deficiências cognitivas e perturbações do sono, considero fundamental proteger a saúde dos cidadãos e, por isso mesmo, votei favoravelmente.

3-296-500

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – A poluição sonora consiste no efeito nocivo, para a saúde pública e o ambiente, provocado por sons em determinado volume que supera os níveis considerados normais para os seres humanos e outros animais. Esta proposta de regulamento visaria garantir um elevado nível de proteção da saúde e do ambiente, no que respeita em particular ao nível sonoro dos veículos a motor. Todavia, se o relatório inicialmente compreendia disposições importantes no sentido de reduzir a emissão de ruído em 4dB para veículos ligeiros e 3dB para veículos pesados, o chumbo destas disposições durante a votação em plenário desvirtuou o conteúdo do relatório e os seus efeitos positivos. No que respeita à verificação da conformidade da produção de veículos, o relatório aprovado acrescenta 1dB aos valores-limite indicados no anexo ao regulamento, ficando aquém da proteção da saúde que inicialmente se pretendia. Votámos a favor da alteração que torna obrigatória (e não voluntária) a instalação de sistemas de aviso sonoro nos veículos (AVAS), nomeadamente no caso dos veículos elétricos, que emita um “som contínuo que assinale um veículo em funcionamento” por razões de segurança de peões e de utentes mais vulneráveis das vias públicas.

3-297-000

**Ashley Fox (ECR)**, *in writing*. – I support the aim of the proposed regulation of reducing environmental noise by lowering the noise limit values and by introducing a new and refined test method for measuring noise emissions to lower noise pollution from cars in general. I also voted to make the AVAS system compulsory for silent vehicles to protect the visually impaired, children and cyclists. In addition I voted for plenary amendments to Annex III which give much more realistic noise limit values for the sports car industry over the coming years. This will prevent a regulatory burden that would have been impossible to fulfil for small-volume car manufacturers, potentially costing thousands of highly-skilled manufacturing jobs in Britain.

3-297-750

**Elisabetta Gardini (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Facciamo attenzione alle aggiunte e gli adeguamenti tecnici finalizzati a incentivare la fabbricazione di veicoli con rumorosità più bassa. Questo può rendere l'industria più competitiva e di alto livello ma potrebbe significare oneri e costi aggiuntivi per le industrie soprattutto automobilistiche che stanno vivendo un momento di crisi. Il rumore è la conseguenza di più fattori, le macchine non possono essere i soli imputati. E' fuori dubbio che al primo posto vi è la salute dei cittadini ed è nostro obbligo migliorare la loro qualità di vita ma facciamo attenzione ai tecnicismi poiché si potrebbero avere conseguenze in termini occupazionali in Europa.



3-297-875

**Nathalie Griesbeck (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – La dernière fois que les limites de bruit ont été réduites pour les véhicules, c'était en 1995. Aussi, si le résultat obtenu n'est peut être pas à la hauteur des attentes de tous, je crois que le résultat final parvient à trouver un équilibre acceptable entre les impératifs de santé publique et la prise en compte des intérêts des fabricants d'automobiles qui rencontrent de profondes difficultés en Europe actuellement.

3-298-000

**Mathieu Grosch (PPE)**, *schriftlich*. – Wenn wir die Gesundheit der Menschen schützen und gleichzeitig den Produktionsstandort Europa stärken wollen, dann brauchen wir einen gesunden Kompromiss, der eine Reduzierung des Geräuschpegels ins technisch Mögliche legt. Innerhalb der nächsten sechs Jahre kann eine Reduzierung von 3–4 db erreicht werden. Diese Werte sind eine wesentliche Verbesserung und sichern unseren Unternehmen im globalen Wettbewerb eine machbare und haltbare Konkurrenzlage.

3-299-000

**Małgorzata Handzlik (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Bez wątplenia transport silnikowy jest jedną z głównych przyczyn hałasu w środowisku. Zdecydowanie popieram redukcję hałasu, który jest przecież tak szkodliwy dla naszego zdrowia. Obniżanie wartości granicznych hałasu jest ważnym czynnikiem, jednak wartości te muszą być tak ambitne, jak i realne do wykonania. Konieczne są na pewno ulepszone metody badania emisji hałasu, systematyczne kontrolowanie nawierzchni dróg, która również przyczynia się do hałasu powodowanego przez pojazdy, a także lepsze informowanie konsumentów o poziomach hałasu pojazdów.

Lepiej poinformowani konsumenci będą mieli możliwość podejmowania bardziej świadomych decyzji o zakupie w oparciu o dane na temat poziomu emisji hałasu. Lepsza informacja powinna też przyczynić się do umożliwienia władzom publicznym ustanowienia odpowiednich zachęt do nabywania cichszych pojazdów, dzięki czemu sukcesywnie będą znikaly z naszych dróg pojazdy najbardziej hałaśliwe.

Korzystne mogłoby się również okazać wprowadzenie oznaczenia poziomu hałasu emitowanego przez pojazd. Bardzo istotne są również unijne wymogi homologacji typu, które powinny wprowadzić równowagę pomiędzy różnymi celami i być zgodne z ogólnym podejściem polegającym na dążeniu do wytwarzania cichszych, bezpieczniejszych i bardziej przyjaznych środowisku pojazdów. Jestem pewna, że nowe przepisy będą korzystne dla obywateli i środowiska oraz staną się ważnym krokiem na drodze do redukcji hałasu.

3-299-015

**Jim Higgins (PPE)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this report as a reduction in the sound level of motor vehicles will help to protect public health and will inevitably reduce levels of noise pollution. It has been found that the noise level of motor vehicles can contribute to the development of many illnesses and, hopefully, by reducing permitted noise levels, we can work towards making society healthier in the future. Perhaps this will allow for the introduction of a labelling system to allow consumers to identify which vehicles are big noise polluters and which are not. There are already labelling systems in place to identify the levels of CO2 created and tyre-noise emitted. I believe that this is something which must be done in relation to the sound level of motor vehicles. Also, placing minimum

noise levels on hybrid and electric cars is important, as it ensures pedestrians will be able to hear these vehicles and it will therefore increase safety levels on our streets.

3-299-031

**Brice Hortefeux (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Mercredi 6 février, le Parlement européen a adopté le rapport portant sur le niveau sonore des véhicules à moteur. Je comprends l'intérêt d'abaisser les seuils maximaux en décibels selon les catégories de véhicules, car cette pollution sonore peut empoisonner la vie des citoyens en particulier. Cependant, l'industrie automobile française traverse une grave crise. Ses ventes ne cessent de chuter et la contraignent, pour certaines entreprises historiques, à opérer des restructurations et à fermer des sites. Cette situation alarmante ne doit pas être aggravée par des propositions irréalistes qui ne feraient que porter le coup de grâce à une industrie déjà affaiblie. C'est pourquoi j'ai rejeté les amendements préconisant un abaissement des seuils maximaux en décibels à un niveau qui me paraît immodéré dans le contexte actuel. J'ai également rejeté l'amendement sur les conditions d'essai pour mesurer le niveau sonore des véhicules qui se fondait sur des pneus neufs, ce qui ne correspondait pas aux conditions réelles de circulation.

3-299-046

**Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį dokumentą. Pagrindinis jo tikslas yra visuomenės sveikatos ir aplinkos apsauga taikant priemones, kuriomis sumažinamas variklinių transporto priemonių garso lygis. Variklinės transporto priemonės yra vienas iš pagrindinių akustinės taršos šaltinių. Manoma, kad dėl nuolatinių didelių triukšmo lygių didėja sergamumas širdies ir kraujagyslių ligomis, prastėja pažintinės funkcijos, atsiranda miego sutrikimai ir ūžesys ausyse. Turėtų būti nustatomas naujas variklinių transporto priemonių garso lygio matavimo bandymo metodas ir naujos ribinės triukšmo vertės skirtingų kategorijų lengvosioms, vidutinio dydžio ir sunkiosioms transporto priemonėms. Tai be abejonės būtų svarbus žingsnis pirmyn mažinant variklinių transporto priemonių sklaidžiamo triukšmo poveikį visuomenės sveikatai ir aplinkai.

3-299-062

**Kent Johansson, Marit Paulsen, Olle Schmidt och Cecilia Wikström (ALDE)**, *skriftlig*. – Det är viktigt med sänkta gänser för buller från motorfordon, och tydliga bullermärkningar för nya bilar skulle innebära stora hälsovinster. Vi stod bakom det ambitiösa förslaget från Europaparlamentets miljöutskott, och även om viktiga delar av förslaget inte fick stöd röstade vi för betänkandet. Det slutliga betänkandet är inte vad vi önskat, men är en grund att bygga vidare på.

3-299-125

**Jarosław Kalinowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Długotrwałe narażenie na wysoki poziom hałasu może być przyczyną znaczących zaburzeń zdrowotnych, prowadzących nie tylko do bezsenności czy uszkodzeń narządu słuchu, ale również chorób układu krążenia i poważnych schorzeń psychicznych. Transport z wykorzystaniem pojazdów silnikowych stanowi dla wielu mieszkańców Europy jedno z największych źródeł hałasu. Dlatego tak ważne są odpowiednie regulacje prawne i właściwe wykorzystanie dostępnych technologii, by jak najlepiej chronić zdrowie obywateli.

Omawiany wniosek Komisji powinien być uzupełniony m.in. o zapisy umożliwiające efektywne i czytelne informowanie konsumentów o poziomie hałasu wytwarzanym przez

dany pojazd, na przykład poprzez odpowiedni system oznakowania stosowany przez producentów i ujednolicony we wszystkich państwach członkowskich. Dobre rezultaty mogłoby również przynieść wprowadzenie systemu klasyfikacji dróg, uwzględniającego wpływ nawierzchni na poziom wytwarzanego hałasu, a także ograniczającego wjazd ciężkich pojazdów dostawczych np. na tereny mieszkalne w określonych porach dnia. Niezbędne jest też uaktualnienie obecnego systemu kategorii i podkategorii pojazdów, ustanawiającego maksymalne wartości emisji hałasu, powstałego w 1970 r. i niezmiennego od roku 1985.

3-299-250

**Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this report. The Commission proposal for a Regulation on the sound level of motor vehicles has as its principal objective the protection of public health and the environment through measures to reduce the sound level of motor vehicles. The proposal would introduce a new testing method for measuring the sound level of motor vehicles and new noise limit values for different categories of light, medium-sized and heavy vehicles. I believe that this is something that will benefit European citizens, but I also think that the EU must give realistic guidelines to the industry for the coming years.

3-299-500

**Tunne Kelam (PPE)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this report. It has come to my attention that the noise caused by different motor vehicles has recently started to disturb more and more Estonians. I believe this report will contribute to reducing the excessive noise stemming from motor vehicles and more generally help to encounter the public health and environmental concerns related to noise emissions. I believe this report has a comprehensive approach to noise reduction, as it takes into account road surfaces, tires and car machinery used. Furthermore, the report also proposes concrete methods to put in place a unified measurement of noise levels, which will facilitate the uniform application of the regulation. Importantly, manufacturers will now have to provide the consumers with the necessary information on motor vehicles sound levels by providing sufficient labelling. The report's main aim is to bring the Commission's proposal concerning sound level of motor vehicles in line with the latest technical developments. By taking these developments into account, the sound level of motor vehicles will be better regulated in the future. In my view, the report also improves the overall feasibility of these requirements for the industry, which remains dependent on production cycles.

3-299-750

**Giovanni La Via (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Ho espresso voto favorevole alla relazione della collega Liotard perché ritengo ponga in essere alcune importanti iniziative volte a contrastare gli effetti sulla salute pubblica e sull'ambiente delle emissioni di rumore dei veicoli a motore. Nel dettaglio, vengono poste sotto la lente di ingrandimento le problematiche legate al livello sonoro dei veicoli a motore, rendendo i consumatori consapevoli e informati per quanto concerne la possibilità di acquistare veicoli a motore con un basso livello di emissione di rumore. Trovo inoltre interessante la proposta di introdurre un sistema di etichettatura riguardante le emissioni sonore dei veicoli, finalizzata alla promozione delle tipologie di mezzi poco rumorosi.

3-300-000

**Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The Commission’s proposal, supported by Commissioner Tajani, the ENVI Report and the amendments proposed for plenary set limit values for all new car models. The current vehicle noise standards date back to 1995 and are therefore urgently in need of being updated. Around a quarter of cars and a third of trucks tested over the past five years already meet the levels proposed by the committee. However, unfortunately, my vote could not stop the intent of mainly PPE and ECR MEPs to weaken the balanced proposal in favour of the automobile industry, bringing in much longer phasing-in periods. This clearly shows a lack of ambition in order to create a level-playing field between the modes!

3-300-500

**Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Apreciez inițiativa Comisiei de a actualiza valoarea limită a emisiilor de zgomot ale autovehiculelor, având în vedere creșterea traficului în Europa, în special în marile centre urbane. Cred însă că, pe viitor, ar trebui să avem în vedere și întreținerea corespunzătoare a străzilor care poate duce la o reducere de peste 5 dB(A). De asemenea, utilizarea unor asfalturi speciale ar putea reduce zgomotul traficului stradal cu până la 10 dB(A). O reducere semnificativă s-ar obține și prin decongestionarea traficului cu ajutorul unor drumuri ocolitoare, al unor benzi rutiere preferențiale și al sistemului de transport inteligent. Trebuie să avem în vedere o perspectivă integrată în privința acestui sector, pentru că astfel se pot obține rezultate semnificative și vizibile pentru cetățeni.

3-301-000

**David Martin (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I welcome the fact that this proposal meets concerns that quiet electric and hybrid car engines can pose a threat to pedestrians and that it wants compulsory requirements in future to add sound to these vehicles.

3-301-500

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J’ai voté en faveur du rapport sur le niveau sonore des véhicules à moteur. L’exposition permanente à de hauts niveaux de bruit de trafic ayant un impact négatif sur la santé, il est important de diminuer les limites sonores des voitures. Une première phase s’appliquerait aux nouveaux modèles de véhicules, et une seconde phase à tous les nouveaux véhicules entrant en service. Les émissions sonores des véhicules dépendent également du revêtement routier, du bruit des pneumatiques et de l’aérodynamique. Les nouvelles voitures devraient par ailleurs être dotées d’un système d’étiquetage pour leurs caractéristiques sonores en vue d’informer le consommateur. Enfin, les véhicules électriques et hybrides constituent une menace pour les piétons et devraient à l’avenir être audibles avec un système d’avertissement acoustique du véhicule.

3-301-750

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A presente proposta de regulamento prevê uma redução gradual das emissões sonoras emitidas pelos veículos em função da respetiva categoria, aplicando-se numa primeira fase aos modelos de veículos novos e depois a todos os veículos que entrem em circulação. Com esta proposta, o nível sonoro dos automóveis não deverá ultrapassar os 68 decibéis (dB), abaixo do atual valor-limite de 74 dB. O objetivo é, assim, proteger a saúde dos cidadãos, tendo em conta que a exposição prolongada a níveis elevados de ruído aumenta a incidência de doenças cardiovasculares, deficiências cognitivas e

perturbações do sono. A introdução de um sistema de rotulagem das emissões sonoras dos veículos, para permitir aos consumidores uma escolha informada antes da compra, também é aqui prevista. A rotulagem já existe para as emissões de CO<sub>2</sub>, o consumo de combustível e o ruído dos pneus, devendo agora ser criado um rótulo semelhante para os níveis de ruído dos veículos. Daí o meu voto favorável.

3-302-000

**Alajos Mészáros (PPE)**, *írásban* . – Az egyre erősödő gépjárműforgalom zajszennyezettségünk egyik leggyakoribb forrása. Tartós zajszennyeződés esetén növekedhetnek a szív- és érrendszeri betegségek, a kognitív zavarok, az alvászavar és a fülzúgás előfordulása is. A környezeti zajok előfordulásának mérséklésére, illetve a maximális európai határértékek harmonizációja érdekében készített jelentés kedvező változásokat hoz a polgárok egészségvédelme és a környezetvédelem terén. A járművek CO<sub>2</sub>- és szennyezőanyag-kibocsátására különböző jóváhagyási követelmények léteznek, amelyek sok esetben ellentétesek a zajszint csökkentése érdekében hozott intézkedésekkel. Ennek következtében nőhet a járművek súlya, ami magasabb CO<sub>2</sub>-kibocsátást eredményezhet. Ezeknek az intézkedések azonban nem szabad, hogy a közlekedésbiztonság kárára váljanak. A hosszú távú zajkibocsátási határértékek bevezetése, amely tükrözi a személygépkocsik és a tehergépjárművek fejlesztésében és gyártásában fennálló különbségeket, segít az új követelményekre történő átállásban. Az új szabályozás egyensúlyba hozza a közlekedésbiztonsági, környezetvédelmi és nem utolsó sorban az autóiipar-barát rendelkezéseket. Az új szabályozás nem róhat teljesíthetetlen terheket a gépkocsigyártókra, hiszen ez negatívan befolyásolná versenyképességünket. A néppárti javaslatokat támogattam az előbbieket mellett az elektromos és a hibrid elektromos járművek minimális zajszintjének meghatározásával kapcsolatban is, amely egy fontos szempont minden gyalogos számára, fogyatékoságára való tekintet nélkül.

3-302-250

**Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito* . – He votado a favor de este informe que respalda una propuesta legislativa que tiene como objetivo la reducción del nivel sonoro de los vehículos de motor. Este texto incluye medidas como la creación de un sistema de etiquetado de ruido para los vehículos nuevos, a la vez que establece límites de sonido más bajos para los vehículos nuevos de pasajeros y de carga. Además, fija normas para la fabricación de vehículos híbridos y eléctricos que deben ser audibles para los peatones. Medidas como las que establece este reglamento son muy necesarias, puesto que la exposición continuada a los niveles elevados de ruido que causa el tráfico conlleva problemas de salud para la población urbana, y es que se calcula que más de la mitad de los habitantes de las ciudades de la UE están expuestos a niveles de ruido que superan los 55 decibelios. Por ello, he apoyado esta propuesta que recoge medidas con el objetivo de proteger la salud pública, así como el medio ambiente.

3-302-500

**Louis Michel (ALDE)**, *par écrit* . – Le marché intérieur européen est constitué d'un espace sans frontières intérieures dans lequel la libre circulation des biens, des personnes, des services et des capitaux doit être assurée. Etant donné que les véhicules routiers sont les principaux moyens d'acheminement et qu'ils constituent la principale source de bruit au sein du secteur des transports, il est important de prendre sans tarder des mesures visant leur réglementation. L'Union européenne applique déjà des critères de réception par type

dans la législation relative aux émissions de CO<sub>2</sub>, notamment le règlement (CE) n° 715/2007 du Parlement européen et du Conseil du 20 juin 2007 relatif à la réception des véhicules à moteur au regard des émissions des véhicules particuliers et utilitaires légers. Le problème engendré par ces véhicules n'est pas que dû aux particules polluantes. Le bruit dû à la circulation aussi provoque à maints égards des dommages de santé. Sachant que le type et la qualité du revêtement influencent aussi les émissions sonores du trafic routier, il est donc nécessaire d'adopter une approche européenne globale qui prenne en compte les performances acoustiques du revêtement routier.

3-302-750

**Alexander Mirsky (S&D)**, *in writing*. – Traffic noise is one of the most widespread environmental problems in the EU, harming the health of more than one in three EU citizens. Setting targets for industry to reduce vehicle noise is very important. I am in favour.

3-303-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Man muss festhalten, dass manche der hier aufgenommenen Ideen unterstützenswert sind und auch forciert werden sollten. Fahrzeuge mit elektrischem Antrieb oder auch mit Hybridantrieb wurden in den letzten Jahren massiv beworben. Auf Grund ihres fast lautlosen Antriebes können sie allerdings für Menschen mit eingeschränktem Gehör zu einer Gefahr werden. Der Motorenlärm anderer Fahrzeuge warnt Fußgänger, Radfahrer und andere Verkehrsteilnehmer vor nahender Gefahr, im Besonderen natürlich auch Personen, die unter einer Sehschwäche leiden oder blind sind. Für sie ist der Lärm der Fahrzeuge von essenzieller Bedeutung, um unbeschadet den Straßenverkehr überstehen zu können. Einen akustischen Warnton für derartige Fahrzeuge oder künstlichen Motorenlärm einzuführen, scheint angemessen zu sein, um die Sicherheit im Verkehr zu erhalten. Der Wunsch, den Verkehrslärm insgesamt zu senken, ist nachvollziehbar. Unserer Industrie innerhalb kürzester Zeit strikte Lärmgrenzen für alle Kraftfahrzeuge aufzwingen zu wollen, erscheint jedoch überschießend und unsinnig. Sinnvoller erscheint es hier jedenfalls, leiseren Straßenbelag zu forcieren. Aufgrund der Unausgegorenheit des gesamten Vorschlages habe ich mich meiner Stimme enthalten.

3-303-500

**Claudio Morganti (EFD)**, *per iscritto*. – Nelle nostre città l'inquinamento acustico causato dal normale traffico quotidiano ha raggiunto livelli oramai molto difficili da sostenere ed è quindi giusto che vengano presentate proposte che vadano nella direzione di ridurre anche questo tipo di inquinamento.

Il testo votato oggi può essere considerato un buon compromesso, poiché si è riusciti a eliminare alcuni eccessi ultraecologisti che avrebbero potuto creare non pochi danni ai costruttori di veicoli a motore, che già non versano in condizioni ottimali in questo periodo.

Si deve sempre cercare un giusto equilibrio tra il rispetto dell'ambiente e della salute e la salvaguardia di industrie e lavoratori. Il caso dell'ILVA di Taranto emerso negli ultimi mesi è forse l'esempio più eclatante, ma vi sono spesso situazioni analoghe e questa, con i dovuti paragoni, poteva essere una di quelle.

In qualità di vicepresidente dell'Intergruppo disabilità all'interno di questo Parlamento sono inoltre particolarmente soddisfatto che sia stato inserito all'interno della relazione un emendamento sostenuto dall'Unione italiana ciechi e ipovedenti. Tutelare l'autonomia

e la sicurezza negli spostamenti per le persone con difficoltà visive è senza dubbio di fondamentale importanza.

3-303-750

**Katarína Neveďalová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – V týchto dňoch máme ako poslanci Európskeho parlamentu jedinečnú príležitosť zlepšiť kvalitu života európskych občanov, a to vyjadrením svojho súhlasu s novými pravidlami upravujúcimi množstvo hluku pochádzajúceho z motorových vozidiel. Zníženie hluku automobilov predstavuje popri riadení dopravy, tichých a nepoškodených povrchoch vozoviek dôležitý krok k zníženiu hladiny dopravného hluku v európskych mestách. Sprísnenie limitov sa týka hlavne hluku z pneumatík, motora a výfukového systému. Počas posledných 40 rokov má hluk motorových vozidiel v dôsledku rastu dopravy rastúci negatívny vplyv na zdravie a blahobyt európskych občanov. Normy emisií hluku vozidiel neboli spresnené od začiatku 90. rokov. Vedecký výskum ukázal, že hluk z dopravy spôsobuje približne 50 000 smrteľných infarktov za rok a viac ako 250 000 prípadov kardiovaskulárnych ochorení v Európe. Dbajme však aj na to, aby toto nariadenie Európskej únie reálne zohľadňovalo technické a fyzikálne možnosti. Pri znížení hluku z vozidiel je potrebné brať do úvahy aj faktory, ako je bezpečnosť vozidiel – tichšie autá sú menej rozpoznateľné zrakovo postihnutými chodcami, tvrdšie pneumatiky majú zas dlhšiu brzdnú dráhu a pod. Buďme teda tí, ktorí svojim hlasom podpora nielen zdravšie životné prostredie, ale aj dlhší a hodnotnejší život obyvateľov Európy.

3-304-000

**Rareș-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Nu ignor importanța acestui raport și cred că trebuie să fim preocupați de confortul cetățenilor, mai ales al celor din marile orașe sau din preajma arterelor foarte circulante. Am votat însă împotriva tuturor amendamentelor care stabilesc obiective nerealiste pentru industria auto. Astfel, am votat împotriva amendamentelor 51, 61, 67 și 68. Industria auto europeană are deja, din toate punctele de vedere, standarde deosebit de înalte. Standardele nerealiste vor face producția de automobile mai scumpă, ceea ce înseamnă prețuri mai mari pentru cumpărătorii de autoturisme.

3-304-500

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Pritariu šiai rezolucijai. Tam, kad būtų sumažintas aplinkos triukšmas ir užtikrintas saugumas keliuose ir darbe, būtina nustatyti griežtus metodus, naujas ribines vertes vienodai taikomus visoje ES. Siekiant apsaugoti variklinių transporto priemonių vidaus rinką atsižvelgiant į jų skleidžiamo garso lygį ir remti mažatriukšmes transporto priemones, gamintojai ir platintojai turėtų būti įpareigojami nurodyti transporto priemonės triukšmo lygį. Atkreiptinas dėmesys į tai, kad reglamento pakeitimai, susiję su hibridinių ir elektrinių transporto priemonių keliamu garsu, yra labai svarbūs aklių ir silpnai matančių žmonių saugumui. Elektriniai ir hibridiniai automobiliai yra per tylūs ir iš garso aklieji jų atpažinti negali. Jie nemato ir negirdi jų prisiartinant. Tai kelią grėsmę jų pačių ir aplinkinių sveikatai bei gyvybei. Atsižvelgiant į tai, pritariu pasiūlymui, kad tyliuosiuose automobiliuose būtų įrengtos akustines perspėjimo sistemos, kurių garsai aiškiai parodytų automobilio būseną. Tai yra vienas iš efektyviausių būdų apsaugoti akluosius.

3-305-000

**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this proposal which aims to drastically lower motor vehicle noise limits in order to protect citizens' health and well-being. This comes in due time given the fact that noise standards for road vehicles have not been updated for 20 years. It is also very important that a noise labelling scheme will be introduced for new cars as well as standards for making electric vehicles audible to pedestrians and other vulnerable road users. Overall environmental noise, and the noise generated by transport in particular can cause anxiety, psychological problems, cardiovascular diseases and cognitive impairment of children. According to the World Health Organization, more than one million healthy years of life are lost every year in western European cities due to noise. It is therefore important to combine vehicle noise limits with effective traffic management, speed limits, improved road surfaces and adapted driver behaviour.

3-305-500

**Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE)**, *γραφτικώς*. – Στόχος της παρούσας έκθεσης είναι η προστασία της δημόσιας υγείας και του περιβάλλοντος μέσω μέτρων που θα μειώσουν το επίπεδο ηχοστάθμης των μηχανοκίνητων οχημάτων. Υπερψήφισα την έκθεση η οποία για την πραγματοποίηση του στόχου προτείνει και εισάγει μια νέα μέθοδο δοκιμών για τη μέτρηση του επιπέδου θορύβου των εν λόγω οχημάτων καθώς και οριακές τιμές θορύβου για διαφορετικές κατηγορίες ελαφρών, μεσαίων και βαρέων οχημάτων. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο προσθέτει επίσης επιπλέον δύο σημαντικές προβλέψεις που δεν περιείχε η αρχική πρόταση της Επιτροπής. Πρώτον, την εισαγωγή ενός συστήματος σήμανσης όσον αφορά τις εκπομπές θορύβου των οχημάτων, έτσι ώστε να προωθήσει οχήματα χαμηλού θορύβου και να επιτρέψει στους καταναλωτές να προβούν σε μια ενημερωμένη επιλογή πριν από την αγορά ενός οχήματος. Δεύτερον, την εισαγωγή ενός συστήματος κατάταξης των οδών, το οποίο θα επέτρεπε στα κράτη μέλη και στις εθνικές και τοπικές αρχές να ελέγχουν και να αξιολογούν κατά τρόπο πλέον αποτελεσματικό την ποιότητα των οδοστρωμάτων τους με σκοπό να μειώσουν την επίπτωση στα γενικότερα επίπεδα θορύβου.

3-305-750

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A proposta de regulamento da Comissão relativo ao nível sonoro dos veículos a motor tem como principal objetivo a proteção da saúde pública e do ambiente através da implementação de medidas que reduzam aquele nível sonoro. Votei favoravelmente a proposta que no seu conjunto é muito positiva, mas faço-o com a ressalva de que deve ser devidamente acautelada a segurança dos peões com deficiência visual. De facto, o projeto de regulamento, ao abordar a questão da audibilidade dos veículos híbridos e elétricos, deve prever sistemas de controlo destes riscos como, por exemplo, equipar os veículos silenciosos com um Sistema Alerta Acústico do Veículo (AVAS, "Acoustic Vehicle Alerting System") cujo som poderá com simplicidade indicar o estado de ação do veículo (aceleração, travagem, inversão de marcha, paragem temporária).

3-305-875

**Paulo Rangel (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A proposta de regulamento relativo ao nível sonoro dos veículos a motor atualiza os valores-limite para as diferentes categorias de veículos, e introduz um novo e sofisticado método de teste para medir o nível da emissão de ruído nos veículos a motor. Na origem desta proposta de regulamento está o cuidado com a proteção da saúde pública e do ambiente, uma vez que os transportes motorizados são uma das principais fontes de poluição sonora cuja incidência propende o aumento de



doenças, deficiências e perturbações várias nos cidadãos. O relator apoia a proposta, considerando que o regulamento beneficiaria com a introdução de um conjunto de aditamentos e adaptações técnicas para favorecer o fabrico e aquisição de veículos com níveis sonoros mais reduzidos; e assinala ainda o interesse de um sistema de rotulagem das emissões sonoras dos veículos, com vista a permitir aos consumidores uma escolha informada antes da compra. Votei favoravelmente o presente relatório, concordando com a posição do relator que considera a fixação de valores-limite como um elemento a ser determinado em co-decisão pelos co-legisladores (no processo legislativo ordinário) e não através de atos delegados na Comissão.

3-306-000

**Frédérique Ries (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Le Parlement européen a voté ce jour un projet de rapport sur les nouvelles normes de bruit pour les voitures, les camions et les bus. L'objectif de réduire le bruit ambiant en abaissant les valeurs limites de bruit, et en instaurant une méthode d'essai nouvelle et affinée pour mesurer les émissions sonores est important pour la protection de l'environnement et la santé publique.

Je me suis, toutefois, opposée à l'amendement 51 qui impose des mesures de réduction radicales (réduction de 5 décibels), irréalistes et non nécessaires pour la santé publique. Une telle baisse pourrait notamment mettre en danger le statut de la Belgique en tant que centre de fabrication.

Je suis en faveur d'une décision équilibrée évoluant vers une protection de l'environnement et de la santé publique et intégrant les facteurs de l'économie, sans négliger les pertes d'emploi que cela pourrait occasionner pour certains pays si les fabricants devaient faire faillite ou s'installer ailleurs.

3-307-000

**Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Oggi durante la sessione plenaria di Strasburgo abbiamo votato il dossier dell'on. Ouzký. Il disegno di legge propone di introdurre gradualmente nuovi limiti sonori entro sei (per l'omologazione di nuovi tipi di veicoli) e otto anni (per l'immatricolazione, la vendita e la messa in circolazione di veicoli nuovi) dall'entrata in vigore della legislazione. Il limite per le automobili standard sarà ridotto da 74 db a 68 db. I veicoli più potenti avranno un margine di massimo da 2 o 6 decibel in più. Tuttavia, i deputati hanno mantenuto il limite per i camion più pesanti (oltre le 12 tonnellate) a 81 db. Rimane tuttavia il fatto che il rumore dei veicoli è anche causato dall'asfalto, degli pneumatici e dall'aerodinamica. Inoltre si propone di introdurre un sistema di etichette per le nuove auto, in modo da informare i consumatori sul livello sonoro. Etichette simili sono già usate per il consumo di carburante, il rumore degli pneumatici e le emissioni di CO<sub>2</sub>.

3-307-250

**Robert Rochefort (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – La moitié de la population européenne vivant en zone urbaine est exposée à des émissions sonores dues au trafic supérieures à 55 décibels. Or une exposition permanente à de hauts niveaux de bruit peut provoquer une fatigue corporelle, des perturbations du fonctionnement des organes et le développement de maladies cardiovasculaires. J'ai soutenu le rapport de mon collègue Ouzký, qui propose de nouvelles limites sonores pour les véhicules (diminution de 74 à 68 décibels pour les voitures standards). Ces nouvelles normes seraient introduites de façon progressive pour

que l'industrie puisse s'adapter (6 ans à 8 ans de délai). Le texte prévoit aussi que les nouvelles voitures soient dotées d'un système d'étiquetage sur leurs caractéristiques sonores en vue d'en informer les consommateurs. Les véhicules électriques et hybrides sont, eux, trop silencieux, ce qui met en danger les piétons et les malvoyants. L'introduction d'un "système d'avertissement acoustique du véhicule" est prévue par le texte, ce qui me paraît bénéfique pour assurer la sécurité de tous. Même si ces éléments me paraissent positifs, il me semble également important de porter une certaine attention au revêtement routier, au bruit des pneumatiques ainsi qu'à l'aérodynamique des véhicules, qui ont un impact sur leurs émissions sonores.

3-307-500

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing* . – Against. Centre-right MEPs have shamelessly backed the demands of noisy carmakers and voted to weaken draft EU rules on vehicle noise. This vote may be a victory for the noisy car industry, with the din of its intense lobby still echoing around parliament, but it is clearly a loss for public health and the environment. Despite clear evidence on the negative impact of noise pollution on public health, a majority of MEPs backed proposals for weaker noise limit values. Combined with various other exemptions, which were also endorsed today, the overall result will lead to no meaningful improvement in EU rules on vehicle noise. Given this is the first time this legislation has been updated in 20 years, this makes today's vote all the more irresponsible. By voting to put the interests of noisy carmakers and drivers ahead of public health and the environment, centre-right MEPs have made a mockery of their role as supposed representatives of European citizens. We call on EU governments to put public health first, when environment ministers consider the draft legislation.

3-307-750

**Licia Ronzulli (PPE)**, *per iscritto* . – Ritengo necessario che i limiti ai rumori delle automobili debbano essere ridotti per proteggere la salute pubblica. Oggi, infatti, numerosi studi scientifici dimostrano come l'esposizione prolungata ad alti livelli d'inquinamento acustico possa limitare le funzionalità degli organi interni, facilitando l'insorgere di malattie come quelle cardiovascolari. Allo stesso modo è necessario informare i consumatori sui livelli acustici delle autovetture, rendendo ad esempio più udibili i veicoli ibridi ed elettrici per una maggior tutela dei pedoni.

3-308-000

**Daciana Octavia Sârbu (S&D)**, *in writing* . – Today I voted to improve the restrictions on sound levels from motor vehicles. We know that noise pollution is a serious public health issue which disproportionately affects those living in urban areas and near busy roads. We must therefore encourage the car industry to make quieter engines in order to help achieve lower levels of noise pollution, but without imposing unreasonable costs in what are already difficult economic circumstances, and bearing in mind that traffic noise depends on a number of factors, such as engine noise, tyres, and road surface. Paradoxically, very quiet cars, namely electric cars travelling at very low speeds, can present a particular risk for children, cyclists and blind people. That is why I also voted in favour of mandatory electric-vehicle warning sounds, so that very quiet engines can still be heard.

3-309-250

**Amalia Sartori (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Ho appoggiato la proposta di regolamento sul livello sonoro dei veicoli a motore poiché ritengo abbia centrato l'obiettivo di trovare un giusto equilibrio tra, da una parte, il rispetto per l'ambiente e la salute dei cittadini europei e, dall'altra, la tutela del mercato interno dei motoveicoli e degli interessi dell'industria europea, in particolare in questo periodo di crisi per l'intero settore.

Per quanto riguarda il livello sonoro dei veicoli a motore, ci siamo impegnati in una dura negoziazione sui limiti, i controlli e il calendario delle scadenze previsti nell'iniziale proposta della Commissione europea. Questi, infatti, risultavano troppo onerosi per le imprese e non tenevano debitamente conto dei mezzi e dei tempi a loro disposizione. L'Italia ha l'appoggio di altri Stati membri, tra cui la Germania, nella sua volontà di favorire le imprese in un graduale e ragionevole passaggio alla nuova legislazione.

3-309-000

**Petri Sarvamaa (PPE)**, *in writing*. – Parliament has voted today on the sound levels of motor vehicles. I heard some say that the report had been watered down by automobile companies and this is something that worries me. Nevertheless, I think it is important that health standards like these are being bought up for discussion and the direction is forward. When this legislation comes next under discussion, I would call for an objective study to be done on the topic to clear up any misunderstandings, as we are trying to work for the citizens of the Member States.

3-309-125

**Vilja Savisaar-Toomast (ALDE)**, *kirjalikult*. – Toetasin tänasel hääletusel mootorsõidukite mürataseme piiramist käsitleva raporti vastuvõtmist, et tagada suurem keskkonnasääst ning vähendada müra mõju inimeste tervisele. Samas on mürataseme piiramine äratanud suurt tähelepanu nii sõidu- kui ka veoautode tootjate ja nende esindusorganisatsioonide hulgas. On hea meel tõdeda, et lõpuks sai antud selge signaal uute normide kehtestamise kohta ning et antud otsuse puhul sai arvestatud ka sõidukitootjate võimalustega. Kuigi lõplik otsus on keskkonnanõuete seisukohast sõidukitootjatele natuke leebem, väärib siiski märkimist asjaolu, et III lisa sai asjakohased kategooriad nii sõidukite, busside kui ka veokite osas. Need muudatused viisid õigusakti kooskõlla reaalse olukorraga, kus eriti veokite puhul on tegemist rohkem kui kahe kategooria sõidukitega, kuna kaupade ja veodistantside mahud võivad olla märkimisväärselt erinevad. Kuna täiesti uute tehnoloogiate väljatöötamiseks võib kuluda ligi kümme aastat, siis on oluline, et rakendusaja puhul arvestatakse seda, et tootjad oleksid valmis õigeaks ajaks nõuetele vastavat toodangut pakkuma. Kokkuvõtteks soovin kinnitada, et seisan mürataseme ja keskkonnasaaste vähendamise eest, ent see peab käima käsikäes transpordisektori efektiivse toimimisega.

3-309-500

**Nicole Sinclair (NI)**, *in writing*. – Whilst I am hesitant to support any new EU legislation, in this case the safety of the visually impaired, children, and others is paramount. I would, however, prefer this to be a Member State competence.

3-310-000

**Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI)**, *por escrito*. – He votado a favor de una normativa europea más estricta con los niveles de ruido de los vehículos a motor, ya que este afecta gravemente

al bienestar y a la salud de los ciudadanos europeos y porque la tecnología permite –desde hace una década– realizar las adaptaciones necesarias sin dañar la competitividad de la industria automovilística.

Los plazos de adaptación son, además, suficientemente generosos con esta última. Denuncio que la Directiva no contemple el ruido que las motos producen con el llamado «escape libre». Se trata de unas molestias perfectamente gratuitas que no están destinadas más que a crear el desasosiego entre la población que las padece.

Según me han informado ingenieros especialistas, la reducción o supresión de los llamados «escapes libres» es técnicamente posible para los fabricantes. Lamento que esta preocupación siga sin tener el adecuado eco en la legislación –por cierto, extraordinariamente dispersa– que se está promoviendo desde la Comisión y desde este Parlamento.

3-310-500

**Bart Staes (Verts/ALE),** *schriftelijk* . – Ik ben ontgoocheld dat we vandaag geen meerderheid hebben gevonden om de geluidsnormen voor motorvoertuigen behoorlijk aan te scherpen. Verkeerslawaai is schadelijk voor de gezondheid, maar toch zijn sinds de jaren '90 de geluidsnormen niet meer aangescherpt. Vandaag liet een meerderheid van het Europe Parlement zijn oren weer eens hangen naar de autolobby. Dat is slecht nieuws voor de Europeanen die worden blootgesteld aan verkeerslawaai. Volksgezondheid zou altijd zwaarder moeten wegen dan de belangen van de auto-industrie. Helaas denkt een meerderheid van conservatieven daar anders over. Volgens het Europees Milieuagentschap, wordt de helft van de EU-bevolking in stedelijke gebieden blootgesteld aan ondraaglijk verkeerslawaai. Geluidsoverlast door verkeer kost jaarlijks 50.000 Europeanen het leven. Ondertussen blijft het verkeer, en daarmee het lawaai, toenemen. Het verminderen van het lawaai van auto's wordt al jaren tegengewerkt door de autolobby, ook tijdens deze onderhandelingen. Zo konden eerder de voorstellen van Porsche om zelfs de bestaande (vijftien jaar oude) geluidsnormen af te zwakken, op steun rekenen van het conservatieve deel van het Europe Parlement. Meteen is aangetoond wie hier in dit Huis opkomt voor het algemeen belang en wie voor het kortetermijnbelang van een bepaald deel van de industrie.

3-310-750

**Catherine Stihler (S&D),** *in writing* . – I voted against this report as I believe it should contain stricter rules on noise level reductions and the text should not be as watered down.

3-311-000

**Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu (S&D),** *in writing* . – I welcome the awareness-raising and action on health issues related to environmental noise. However, I voted against Amendment 51 and 68 because of the large-scale impact on the automobile industry in a time of crisis. I consider that Amendment 51 would have set unrealistic objectives for the automobile industry. Regarding Amendment 68, not only do tyres already have to comply with the General Safety Regulation that already sets minimum requirements for noise, but also, testing conditions for tyres proposed in this AM would have created a discrepancy throughout the Regulation in discussion.

3-312-000

**Marc Tarabella (S&D),** *par écrit* . – La proposition de règlement de la Commission concernant le niveau sonore des véhicules à moteur a pour principal objectif de protéger

la santé publique et l'environnement au moyen de mesures destinées à réduire le bruit de ces véhicules. Elle vise à introduire une nouvelle méthode d'essai pour mesurer les émissions de bruit et de nouvelles valeurs limites de bruit pour différentes catégories de véhicules légers, de taille moyenne et lourds. Je souscris à l'orientation générale de cette proposition, qui constitue un progrès dans la neutralisation des effets des émissions sonores émises par les véhicules à moteur sur la santé publique et l'environnement.

Je regrette toutefois vivement que la proposition actuelle de la Commission ne mette pas suffisamment l'accent sur les informations communiquées aux consommateurs sur le niveau sonore des véhicules à moteur. Je serais par exemple favorable à l'introduction d'un système d'étiquetage sur les émissions sonores des véhicules, de manière à promouvoir les véhicules peu bruyants et à permettre aux consommateurs de choisir en connaissance de cause avant l'achat d'un véhicule.

3-312-250

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Este relatório pretende assegurar a proteção da saúde pública e do ambiente, no que diz respeito ao nível sonoro dos veículos a motor, através da aplicação de medidas que reduzam o nível sonoro dos veículos a motor. Para além de uma calendarização adequada, tanto aos consumidores como à própria indústria, este relatório pretende introduzir novos métodos para medir o ruído dos veículos nas categorias de ligeiros, médios e pesados. A proposta é de redução de 4dB para veículos ligeiros e médios e de 3dB para veículos pesados, através de três fases, que cubram um período de 8 anos, englobando todo o parque automóvel e não apenas os novos veículos. Por último, gostaria de frisar a importância de garantir que os carros denominados silenciosos tenham um equipamento de AVAS para garantir a máxima proteção dos cidadãos, em especial das pessoas cegas e amblíopes.

3-312-500

**Derek Vaughan (S&D)**, *in writing*. – Excessive noise pollution is damaging to public health, which is why I voted in favour of a new legislation that will tighten up current regulations and ensure that EU citizens are better protected from the harmful effects of loud vehicles. Around half of those living in large towns and cities are exposed to unacceptably high levels of noise pollution, contributing to severe sleep deprivation and stress, and also linked to 250 000 heart attacks and 50 000 early deaths annually across the EU, therefore I welcome these proposals to reduce existing decibel limits. Furthermore, the report also proposes manufacturers of electric cars be required by law to add sound to their quiet electric and hybrid engines, a recommendation I fully support.

3-312-750

**Dominique Vlasto (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Les émissions sonores constituent un enjeu de santé publique. Près de 70 millions d'Européens souffrent, du fait d'une d'exposition au bruit trop élevée, de graves problèmes de sommeil, d'anxiété ou encore de problèmes cardiaques. La circulation de véhicules en ville est l'une des principales sources de ces nuisances: la moitié de la population urbaine européenne est ainsi exposée à des niveaux sonores supérieurs à 55 dB. Aussi, j'ai soutenu la proposition de directive de la Commission visant à limiter les émissions sonores des véhicules à moteur. J'ai toutefois tenu, avec ma famille politique, à corriger et à améliorer cette proposition, en tenant compte des dernières innovations techniques et de la faisabilité globale des objectifs. Il convenait également de créer une catégorie spécifique pour les voitures produites en série limitée. Je crois que nous

sommes parvenus à proposer des objectifs réalistes, qui garantiront à la fois le perfectionnement et l'innovation des véhicules, sans imposer des contraintes démesurées à nos constructeurs, et une meilleure protection des citoyens européens.

3-313-000

**Glenis Willmott (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The Commission's proposed regulation aims to reduce noise pollution from traffic, which has a severely detrimental effect on public health. Problems such as anxiety, tinnitus, sleep disturbance, psychological problems and cardiovascular diseases are all linked to excessive road noise and it is estimated that 70 million people across the EU are exposed to road noise levels that can have an adverse effect on their health. By lowering the maximum permissible noise level for motor vehicles, these proposals will have the equivalent noise-reduction effect of halving the level of traffic. I understand concerns regarding the impact of the legislation on the car industry, and in committee I supported an amendment to give the industry more time in which to meet the targets. Nevertheless, the European Commission's impact assessment of the proposed regulation found that the benefits for society as a whole would be more than 20 times higher than the costs for industry. There are also concerns about silent electric or hybrid vehicles and their safety implications for visually-impaired people. For this reason I also supported an amendment that would make it mandatory for electric and hybrid vehicles to be fitted with artificial sound systems.

3-314-000

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Komisja Ochrony Środowiska Naturalnego, Zdrowia Publicznego i Bezpieczeństwa Żywności pragnie wprowadzenia nowych standardów przy wyznaczaniu norm hałasu. Wprowadzenie nowej metody badawczej ma na celu pomiar poziomu hałasu pojazdów silnikowych oraz wytyczenie nowych wartości granicznych hałasu, kategoryzując pojazdy na lekkie, średnie i ciężkie. Wniosek należy uzupełnić o kilka elementów zachęcających do zakupu pojazdów o niższym poziomie hałasu.

Nadmienia się również, że nie jedynie silniki są źródłem hałasu, ale także opony, nawierzchnia drogowa etc. Obecny wniosek nie informuje o ilości hałasu, jaką produkuje dany pojazd. Niezbędne jest więc wprowadzenie na pojazdach silnikowych oznakowań mówiących, jaka emisja hałasu charakteryzuje dany pojazd. Wniosek komisji można również wzbogacić o system klasyfikacji dróg, biorąc pod uwagę jakość ich nawierzchni.

Z psychologicznego punktu widzenia hałas jest dźwiękiem bardzo nieprzyjemnym i niepożądanym, powoduje drażliwość oraz zmęczenie całego organizmu, a w szczególności słuchu. Ma także wpływ na zdrowie, jak również na kondycję człowieka. Dlatego wszelkiego rodzaju kroki zmierzające do obniżenia hałasu są jak najbardziej pożądane. Popieram takie rozwiązanie.

3-314-500

**Iva Zanichchi (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Il rumore del traffico incide sulla salute e sul benessere dei cittadini europei e, dunque, la Commissione europea ha presentato una proposta di regolamento che mira a ridurre di circa il 25% le emissioni rumorose dei veicoli a motore. Tale proposta prevede una diminuzione progressiva e molto ambiziosa delle emissioni acustiche, che in alcuni casi creerebbe problemi di attuazione nei tempi prefissati alle imprese del settore coinvolte.

Pur votando in modo favorevole, poiché la salute dei cittadini europei deve essere tutelata sempre e comunque, avrei quindi suggerito una leggera riduzione dei valori limite proposti. Sono inoltre a favore di un approccio integrato che sia in grado di fornire una combinazione tra limiti di rumore dei veicoli, efficace gestione del traffico, limiti di velocità, superfici stradali più adeguate, pneumatici più efficienti e comportamento di guida adeguato.

3-315-000

**Janusz Władysław Zemke (S&D)**, *na piśmie*. – Zamysł, by obniżyć poziom hałasu pojazdów silnikowych, jest słuszny, gdyż poprawi stan zdrowia publicznego i ochronę środowiska. Trzeba jednak zwrócić uwagę, że wiążą się z tym co najmniej dwa poważne problemy. Po pierwsze, nie wystarczy poprawić jakości samych silników. Hałas pochodzi także z innych źródeł, w tym z opon oraz nawierzchni dróg. Dlatego też równocześnie trzeba podnosić normy unijne dotyczące opon i jakości nawierzchni.

Drugi problem jest innej natury, ale także musimy o nim koniecznie pamiętać. Skuteczne ograniczenie hałasu może oznaczać, że niektóre osoby, zwłaszcza gorzej słyszające, mogą nie mieć świadomości, że zbliża się pojazd, i stać się jego ofiarą. Jest to szczególnie istotne w przypadku pojazdów elektrycznych lub hybrydowych. Dlatego też, zakładając postęp w ograniczaniu hałasu, trzeba by rozważyć wprowadzenie systemów dźwiękowych ostrzegających o zbliżaniu się pojazdu.

3-315-250

**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Nowa dyrektywa dotycząca ograniczenia hałasu jest ważnym elementem ochrony zdrowia, niemniej wciąż zastanawiam się nad skutkami jej wprowadzenia dla producentów samochodów. Jakie koszty poniosą też państwa takie jak Polska, gdzie stan samochodów pozostawia wiele do życzenia? Brakuje odpowiedniej analizy pokazującej te koszty. Niemniej głosowałem za.

3-315-500

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – A poluição sonora consiste no efeito nocivo, para a saúde pública e o ambiente, provocado por sons em determinado volume que supera os níveis considerados normais para os seres humanos e outros animais. Esta proposta de regulamento visaria garantir um elevado nível de proteção da saúde e do ambiente, no que respeita em particular ao nível sonoro dos veículos a motor. Todavia, se o relatório inicialmente compreendia disposições importantes no sentido de reduzir a emissão de ruído em 4dB para veículos ligeiros e 3dB para veículos pesados, o chumbo destas disposições durante a votação em plenário desvirtuou o conteúdo do relatório e os seus efeitos positivos. Votámos a favor da alteração que torna obrigatória (e não voluntária) a instalação de sistemas de aviso sonoro nos veículos (AVAS), nomeadamente no caso dos veículos elétricos, que emitam um “som contínuo que assinale um veículo em funcionamento” por razões de segurança de peões e de utentes mais vulneráveis das vias públicas.

## **8.6. Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Προσφύγων, Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Επιστροφής και Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο Ένταξης Υπηκόων Τρίτων Χωρών (A7-0004/2013 - Nils Torvalds)**

3-317-000

### **Written explanations of vote**

3-317-125

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Aprovo o presente relatório, tendo em conta que, em alguns Estados-Membros, a crise económica e financeira se tem repercutido severamente nas finanças públicas. Enquanto a maioria dos Estados-Membros se viu forçada a tomar medidas mais drásticas para diminuir a dívida e reduzir o défice orçamental, de modo a relançar as finanças públicas numa trajetória sustentável, alguns países foram de tal modo afetados que tiveram de recorrer aos mecanismos de assistência financeira da UE. Na sequência das enormes dificuldades financeiras, estes Estados-Membros têm-se deparado com problemas em satisfazer as exigências de cofinanciamento. Estas dificuldades são igualmente evidentes no que se refere aos fundos no quadro do programa geral "Solidariedade e gestão dos fluxos migratórios". Por conseguinte, sou a favor da proposta da Comissão que admite a possibilidade de aumentar as taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros que beneficiam de um mecanismo de apoio financeiro. Esta proposta visa permitir um aumento da taxa de cofinanciamento da União em vinte pontos percentuais e, conseqüentemente, diminuir as necessidades de cofinanciamento por parte dos Estados-Membros em questão.

3-317-250

**Χαράλαμπος Αγγουράκης (GUE/NGL)**, *γραφτώς*. – Η ευρωκοινοβουλευτική ομάδα του ΚΚΕ καταψήφισε τις δύο εκθέσεις σχετικά με την αύξηση της ευρωενωσιακής συμμετοχής, για τα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ που βρίσκονται σε «μνημόνιο», όπως η Ελλάδα, στην χρηματοδότηση έργων που εντάσσονται στα αντιδραστικά Ταμεία της ευρωενωσιακής «μεταναστευτικής πολιτικής». Πρόκειται για τα ταμεία που υλοποιούν όλες τις αντιδραστικές πολιτικές αποφάσεις, για την ενίσχυση των κατασταλτικών μηχανισμών, τα προγράμματα της ΕΕ και των κυβερνήσεων του κεφαλαίου διαχρονικά και της τρικομματικής κυβέρνησης ΝΔ-ΠΑΣΟΚ-ΔΗΜΑΡ, όπως για παράδειγμα τον «φράχτη» του Έβρου, τα στρατόπεδα συγκέντρωσης μεταναστών, τη φύλαξη των συνόρων από δυνάμεις της FRONTEX, τις μαζικές απελάσεις μεταναστών στις χώρες καταγωγής τους, ακόμη και όταν κινδυνεύει η ζωή τους. Σκοπός της αύξησης της συγχρηματοδότησης της ΕΕ είναι η απρόσκοπτη συνέχιση της καταστολής ενάντια στους μετανάστες. Όπως χαρακτηριστικά αναφέρει η αιτιολογική έκθεση και των δύο νομοθετικών προτάσεων: «... την ανακαίνιση των κέντρων κράτησης που βρίσκονται σε κακή κατάσταση και τη βελτίωση του τεχνικού εξοπλισμού που είναι απαραίτητος για την αποτελεσματική εποπτεία των συνόρων. ... τα κράτη μέλη που αντιμετωπίζουν σημαντικές οικονομικές προκλήσεις να μπορούν να φέρουν σε πέρας τα καθήκοντα που αφορούν τη διαχείριση των μεταναστευτικών ροών». Η ΕΕ θέλει ελεγχόμενη μετανάστευση, μετανάστευση - ομηρία για να τροφοδοτεί το κεφάλαιο με πάμφθινη εργατική δύναμη.

3-317-500

**Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Criza economică și financiară curentă a afectat major statele europene și, în numeroase circumstanțe, a pus sub semnul întrebării viabilitatea sau chiar finalizarea mai multor proiecte europene vitale pentru Uniune. Gestionarea fluxurilor migratorii și a problemei refugiaților este unul dintre nivelurile la care implementarea politicilor naționale, respectiv europene, se confruntă cu dificultăți în creștere, pe fundalul aplicării politicilor de austeritate sau reducerii cheltuielilor publice.

În aceste condiții, susțin majorarea ratei de cofinanțare a Uniunii Europene în cadrul Fondului european pentru refugiați, a Fondului european de returnare și a Fondului european de integrare a resortisanților. Adoptarea deciziei este legitimată și de faptul că ea nu presupune presiuni suplimentare asupra bugetului UE. Totodată, măsura este



justificată nu numai de imperativul solidarității între statele membre, ci și de poziția cu totul specială pe care Uniunea Europeană și-o asumă în planul politicii sale externe, motiv pentru care am votat în favoarea acestui raport.

3-317-531

**Pino Arlacchi (S&D)**, *in writing* . – The global financial crisis provoked a marked deterioration in economic and social conditions in several Member States. Nevertheless it is essential that Member States with significant economic challenges retain the capacity to handle the tasks related to management of migration flows. Therefore it is in the interest of all Member States that the commitments made with regards to migration are not compromised as a result of economic difficulties. Thus, we support the Commission proposal to increase the co-financing rate of the European Refugee Fund, the European Return Fund and the European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals for Member States experiencing serious financial stability difficulties. The proposal is also an expression of solidarity between Member States when it comes to the management of migration flows.

3-317-538

**Sophie Auconie (PPE)**, *par écrit* . – J'ai voté en faveur de ce rapport qui vise à augmenter le taux de cofinancement par le Fonds européen pour les réfugiés, par le Fonds européen pour le retour et par le Fonds européen d'intégration des ressortissants de pays tiers. Cela concerne certaines dispositions ayant trait à la gestion financière pour certains États membres qui connaissent ou risquent de connaître de graves difficultés quant à leur stabilité financière et doivent rester en mesure de gérer les demandes des ressortissants d'États tiers.

3-317-542

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)**, *raštu* . – Balsavau už šį siūlymą dėl bendro finansavimo iš Europos pabėgėlių fondo, Europos grąžinimo fondo ir Europos fondo trečiųjų šalių piliečių integracijai normos padidinimo valstybėms narėms, kurios turi didelių finansinio stabilumo sunkumų arba kurioms gresia tokie sunkumai. Šiandien ES išgyvenant krizę, daugeliui išorės sienas turinčių valstybių narių tampa vis sunkiau susitvarkyti su didėjančiu migrantų srautu. Siekiant padėti šioms valstybėms gerinti perpildytų pabėgėlių centrų padėtį pritariu papildomų lėšų skyrimui migracijos srautų valdymui. Šiuo siūlymu siekiama sukurti ES valstybių narių solidarumo mechanizmą šiuo klausimu. Kadangi migracijos srautai šalyse ne vienodi, tačiau vienos valstybės nesugebėjimas užtikrinti tinkamą migracijos srautų valdymą daro įtaką ne tik šiai šaliai, bet ir kitoms valstybėms narėms, todėl pritariu finansavimo didinimui didelių ekonominių sunkumų turinčioms šalims. Pritariu išdėstytiems siūlymams dėl veiksmingesnės išteklių naudojimo kontrolės. Svarbu stiprinti finansavimo valdymo ir kontrolės sistemas, vykdyti patikrinimus ir stebėseną.

3-317-546

**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**, *în scris* . – Am votat în favoarea raportului deoarece gestionarea eficientă a fluxurilor migratorii este de mare importanță pentru UE. Criza economică a avut un impact diferit pentru fiecare stat membru. Astfel, dacă majoritatea țărilor au adoptat măsuri cuprinzătoare pentru a scădea nivelurile datoriei și deficitul bugetare, celelalte au fost nevoite să apeleze la mecanismele de sprijin financiar ale UE. Este esențial ca statele membre care se confruntă cu provocări economice semnificative să-și poată asuma în continuare sarcini legate de gestionarea fluxurilor migratorii. De aceea, sprijin propunerea

de modificare a ratei de cofinanțare pentru țările vizate. Țin să subliniez că este în interesul tuturor statelor membre ca angajamentele luate în ceea ce privește migrația să nu aibă de suferit de pe urma dificultăților economice din unele state membre.

3-317-562

**Regina Bastos (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A crise económica e financeira tem tido efeitos severos nas finanças públicas de vários Estados-Membros da União Europeia, tendo alguns países recorrido ao mecanismo de assistência financeira da UE. Isso levou vários Estados-Membros a ter problemas em satisfazer as exigências de cofinanciamento associadas ao financiamento da União. Tendo em consideração esta realidade, propõe-se o aumento das taxas de cofinanciamento da União Europeia e consequentemente a diminuição das necessidades de cofinanciamento por parte dos Estados-Membros em questão, ascendendo, deste modo, aos 70%. No caso dos projetos destinados a prioridades específicas e dos Estados-Membros abrangidos pelo Fundo de Coesão, a taxa atingirá um máximo de 95%. Sublinhe-se que as alterações das taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros confrontados com dificuldades graves de estabilidade financeira não implicam o aumento dos montantes totais dos fundos em questão. Apoiei o presente relatório, por concordar com a importância da diminuição das necessidades de cofinanciamento aos Estados-Membros que tenham recorrido ao mecanismo de assistência financeira da UE.

3-317-625

**Nora Berra (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur des rapports de Nils Torvalds qui contiennent des dispositions qui permettraient d'accroître le taux de cofinancement de l'Union et de diminuer ainsi les besoins de cofinancement pour la part des Etats membres en question.

3-317-750

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį pranešimą, kadangi dėl krizės padarinių dauguma valstybių narių turėjo imtis įvairių priemonių, siekdamos sumažinti išiskolinimų dydį bei biudžeto deficitą ir atkurti valstybės finansinį tvarumą. Dėl didelių ekonominių sunkumų šios valstybės narės susidūrė su problemomis, tenkinant su Europos Sąjungos lėšomis susijusius bendro finansavimo reikalavimus. Dėl šios priežasties Komisija pasiūlė galimybę padidinti bendro finansavimo normą valstybėms narėms, gaunančioms pagalbą iš finansinės paramos mechanizmo. Pasiūlymu siekiama leisti padidinti Sąjungos bendro finansavimo normą 20-čia procentinių punktų ir taip sumažinti tam tikros dalies atitinkamų valstybių narių bendro finansavimo poreikį. Taip bendro finansavimo norma būtų padidinta iki 70 procentų. Projektams, kurie yra skirti konkrečioms prioritetinėms užduotims bei valstybėms narėms, gaunančioms finansavimą iš sanglaudos fondo, padidinta norma galėtų siekti iki 95 procentų. Svarbu pažymėti, jog panašūs bendro finansavimo reikalavimų pakeitimai jau buvo patvirtinti struktūrinių fondų, Sanglaudos fondo, Žuvininkystės fondo ir Žemės ūkio fondo kaimo plėtrai atvejais. Taigi prasminga leisti atlikti panašius pakeitimus ir fondų, susijusių su migracijos srautais, atvejais. Tinkamai veikiantis migracijos srautų valdymas yra labai svarbus visai Europos Sąjungai. Vienos valstybės narės nesugebėjimas užtikrinti veiksmingą migracijos srautų valdymą turi poveikio ne tik atitinkamai šaliai, bet ir daugeliui kitų valstybių narių.

3-318-000

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Finanțele publice din mai multe state au fost puternic afectate de criza economică și financiară. Cu toate că majoritatea statelor membre au fost nevoite să adopte măsuri cuprinzătoare pentru a scădea nivelurile datoriei și deficitele bugetare, unele țări au fost afectate în așa măsură încât au apelat la mecanismele de sprijin financiar ale UE. Ca o consecință a marilor dificultăți economice, aceste state membre au întâmpinat dificultăți în îndeplinirea cerințelor de cofinanțare asociate cu finanțarea din partea UE. Aceste dificultăți sunt evidente, de asemenea, în ceea ce privește fondurile din cadrul programului general „Solidaritatea și gestionarea fluxurilor migratorii”. Consider că o gestionare funcțională a fluxurilor migratorii este de mare importanță pentru Uniunea Europeană în ansamblul său, deoarece incapacitatea unui stat membru de a asigura gestionarea eficientă a fluxurilor migratorii nu va afecta doar țara respectivă, ci și alte state membre.

3-318-125

**Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – W głosowaniu opowiedziałem się za przyjęciem sprawozdania pana posła Nilsa Torvaldsa w sprawie wniosku dotyczącego decyzji Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady w celu zwiększenia stawki współfinansowania w ramach Europejskiego Funduszu na rzecz Uchodźców, Europejskiego Funduszu Powrotów Imigrantów oraz Europejskiego Funduszu na rzecz Integracji Obywateli Państw Trzecich w odniesieniu do pewnych przepisów dotyczących zarządzania finansowego dla niektórych państw członkowskich doświadczających poważnych trudności w zakresie swojej stabilności finansowej lub nimi zagrożonych.

Skutki obecnego kryzysu finansowego nie pozwoliły niektórym państwom skorzystać z dostępnych środków w ramach wspomnianych funduszy, gdyż nie były one w stanie sprostać wymogom dotyczącym współfinansowania, towarzyszącym tej pomocy. W związku z tym popieram propozycję zwiększenia stawki współfinansowania ze strony UE wobec projektów powstałych w ramach wyżej wymienionych funduszy. Wierzę, że przyczyni się to do skutecznego zarządzania przepływami migracyjnymi. Jest to niezwykle ważne, ponieważ niezdolność jednego państwa do skutecznego działania w tym zakresie wpływa na mniejsze bezpieczeństwo w całej UE.

3-318-250

**John Bufton (EFD)**, *in writing*. – The combined budget for these three funds between 2008 and 2013 was EUR 2.131 billion. The Commission has proposed increasing co-financing rates by 70 %; this will see EU taxpayers having to increase their contribution by 40 %, the equivalent of around EUR 852 billion. The rationale seems to be that some countries are having austerity problems and must be given help to keep these schemes going – they are essentially being bailed out by the back door.

3-318-375

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Concordo com as propostas do Relator que visam um aumento das taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros que beneficiam de assistência financeira. Em alguns Estados-Membros, a crise económica e financeira tem-se repercutido severamente nas finanças públicas. Alguns países tiveram de recorrer aos mecanismos de assistência financeira da UE e têm-se deparado com problemas em satisfazer as exigências de cofinanciamento associadas ao financiamento da União.

3-318-500

**Carlos Coelho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Os sistemas de receção e proteção de vários Estados-Membros têm sido drasticamente postos à prova com a chegada às suas fronteiras de um enorme número de pessoas à procura de proteção internacional, tendo sido igualmente notória a existência de uma falta de solidariedade entre Estados-Membros para lidar com este tipo de situações. Daí a importância que reveste todo o conjunto de medidas aprovadas, com especial destaque para o programa geral de solidariedade e gestão dos fluxos migratórios, onde se incluem os quatro Fundos comunitários nesta área, de forma a assegurar uma repartição equilibrada do esforço assumido pelos Estados-Membros ao acolherem refugiados e pessoas deslocadas e para suportarem as consequências decorrentes desse acolhimento. Porém, a crise financeira e económica que se continua a prolongar tem vindo a aumentar a pressão sobre os recursos financeiros nacionais, que por sua vez têm sido alvo de restrições orçamentais, o que cria enormes dificuldades para alguns Estados-Membros conseguirem satisfazer as exigências de cofinanciamento no âmbito destes programas. Apoio esta proposta de aumento da taxa de cofinanciamento da União, de forma a reduzir o nível de financiamento que recai sobre o Estado-Membro (a beneficiar dum mecanismo de apoio financeiro), pois só assim se poderá assegurar uma execução adequada dos programas e uma gestão eficaz dos fluxos migratórios.

3-318-625

**Emer Costello (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I welcome the adoption of the Torvalds resolution. This approves the Commission's proposal to amend, until the end of 2013, the co-financing rate for the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals, the European Refugee Fund, and the European Return Fund for Member States (such as Ireland) taking part in Troika programmes or that have agreed bilateral loans with the EU. This would raise the standard co-financing rate for projects supported by these funds from 50 % to 70 %, and from 75 % to 95 % for projects addressing specific EU priorities. I would add that this does not adjust the overall allocations to those Member States under these funds. Nor does it prejudice co-financing rates for the 2014-2020 period. The 'New Communities Partnership' in Dublin is receiving much-needed EU support at present from the European Integration Fund to support the integration of third-country nationals in Ireland. I would hope that this amendment would allow continued EU support for this progressive project and similar projects across the EU.

3-318-750

**Rachida Dati (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – La gestion des flux migratoires est un enjeu qui concerne l'ensemble des pays européens: les États de l'Union doivent donc faire preuve de solidarité en la matière. Cela est d'autant plus vrai en période de difficultés économiques, alors que certains pays rencontrent des obstacles dans la mise en œuvre de leurs mécanismes de gestion des flux migratoires. Je me félicite donc de l'adoption de cette mesure, qui permettra de renforcer le cofinancement en faveur des fonds pour les réfugiés, pour le retour et pour l'intégration.

3-318-875

**Edite Estrela (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente este relatório por defender o aumento em 20 pontos percentuais do Fundo Europeu para os Refugiados. Este aumento vai permitir que os Estados-Membros disponham dos recursos financeiros necessários para dar resposta aos atuais desafios migratórios na medida em que, devido ao agravamento

da crise, alguns países têm demonstrado dificuldade na execução dos programas europeus no terreno.

3-319-000

**Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I voted for this report to increase the co-financing rate of the External Borders Fund, the European Refugee Fund and the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals. These funds are essential to ensure that provisions exist relating to financial management for Member States experiencing or threatened with serious difficulties with regard to their financial stability. There is excellent work being done in Wales by organisations working with refugees and I would not want to see this kind of work undermined in any Member State because of financial difficulties. Furthermore, I would not want the excellent work done by NGOs, in particular, in Wales or elsewhere to be threatened because of financial difficulties.

3-319-500

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Tal como o relator, o meu colega Nils Torvalds, eu apoio as propostas da Comissão Europeia, que têm por intenção o aumento das taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros que beneficiam de assistência financeira. Na base destes fundos está o princípio da criação de um mecanismo de solidariedade entre os Estados-Membros relativamente à gestão dos fluxos migratórios. Esta tarefa não é distribuída de forma equitativa pelos Estados-Membros, pelo que se justifica uma reavaliação das exigências de cofinanciamento no contexto das atuais dificuldades económicas. Estou de acordo, portanto, tal como proposto pela Comissão, com a possibilidade de aumentar as taxas de cofinanciamento em 20 pontos percentuais para os países que beneficiam de um mecanismo de apoio financeiro.

3-319-750

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Alguns Estados-Membros (EM) mais afetados pela crise económica e financeira como a Grécia e Portugal, entre outros, viram-se obrigados a recorrer a ajudas externas, nomeadamente ao mecanismo europeu de estabilização financeira (MEEF), e a adotar medidas drásticas de contenção orçamental que tiveram um enorme impacto negativo nos investimentos e originaram uma situação de recessão económica. No dia 1 de dezembro de 2011, o Parlamento Europeu (PE) aprovou uma proposta de regulamento do PE e do Conselho que elevava para 95% a taxa de cofinanciamento para os fundos estruturais da União Europeia a fim de impulsionar a competitividade das empresas e a criação de emprego nestes EM. O relatório em apreço, elaborado por Nils Torvalds, debruça-se sobre a proposta de decisão do PE e do Conselho que altera três decisões do Conselho de 2007 e visa aumentar a taxa de cofinanciamento do Fundo Europeu para os Refugiados, do Fundo Europeu de Regresso e do Fundo Europeu para a Reintegração de Nacionais de Países Terceiros, à semelhança do que aconteceu com os fundos estruturais em 2011, a favor dos Estados-Membros (EM) com graves dificuldades de estabilidade financeira. Saúdo mais esta manifestação de solidariedade e de apoio da União Europeia aos EM que se vêem confrontados com rigorosos e penosos programas de apoio financeiro.

3-320-000

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – A nossa votação neste relatório é indissociável da posição de princípio que temos relativamente aos Fundos em questão, para os quais se

pretende agora aumentar o cofinanciamento da UE. Desde sempre, criticámos uma política de emigração que criminaliza e reprime os imigrantes, que restringe a sua admissão e facilita a sua expulsão, que os expõe às redes de tráfico de seres humanos e à exploração como mão-de-obra ilegal, impondo-lhes uma situação próxima da escravatura. O Fundo Europeu de Regresso é uma das peças integrantes desta política. Desde sempre, defendemos uma política de imigração mais justa, mais humana e mais democrática, que assegure o respeito pelos direitos de todos os trabalhadores, sem discriminação quanto à sua origem nacional e com respeito pela sua dignidade e pelas suas legítimas aspirações a uma vida melhor. Por entendermos serem, apesar de tudo, distintos os objetivos do Fundo Europeu para os Refugiados e do Fundo Europeu para a Integração de Nacionais de Países Terceiros, e não obstante divergências que temos relativamente a alguns aspetos nestes domínios, abstivemo-nos na votação deste relatório. Saliente-se ainda que estes aumentos do cofinanciamento da UE não compensam o caminho de afundamento nacional que vem sendo imposto pelas troicas (ocupante e colaboracionista).

3-321-000

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Hospodárska a finančná kríza mala v mnohých členských štátoch vážny dosah na verejné financie. Kým väčšina členských štátov musela na dosiahnutie udržateľnosti verejných financií prijať rozsiahle opatrenia, aby sa znížilo zadlženie a rozpočtové deficity, niektoré štáty boli zasiahnuté tak vážne, že museli požiadať o pomoc v rámci mechanizmov finančnej podpory EÚ. V dôsledku vážnych hospodárskych problémov sa tieto členské štáty dostali do problémov pri plnení požiadaviek na spolufinancovanie, ktoré vyplývajú z financovania prostredníctvom EÚ. Tieto problémy sú evidentné, aj pokiaľ sa jedná o finančné prostriedky v rámci všeobecného programu Solidarita a riadenie migračných tokov. V danom kontexte Komisia navrhla možnosť zvýšiť mieru spolufinancovania pre členské štáty, ktoré využívajú mechanizmy finančnej podpory. Cieľom návrhu je umožniť zvýšenie miery spolufinancovania Únie o dvadsať percentuálnych bodov, a tým znížiť spolufinancovanie niektorých týchto členských štátov. Fungujúce riadenie migračných tokov je pre Európsku úniu ako celok veľmi dôležité. Neschopnosť jedného členského štátu zabezpečiť účinné riadenie migračných tokov neovplyvňuje iba tento jeden štát, ale má vplyv aj na množstvo ďalších členských štátov. I z tohto dôvodu je v záujme všetkých členských štátov, aby hospodárske ťažkosti v niektorých členských štátoch nenarušili ich záväzky v oblasti migrácie.

3-321-250

**Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce rapport afin de montrer que le nécessaire devoir de solidarité de toute l'Union Européenne sur la question essentielle des flux migratoires, notamment à l'égard des Etats qui sont les plus durement touchés par la crise économique et financière pour qu'ils puissent tenir leurs engagements aux frontières extérieures de l'Union européenne. Il est inadmissible de laisser des pays en proie à l'austérité comme la Grèce, seuls et sans moyens, pour accueillir décemment les candidats à l'asile ou à l'immigration, dans le respect des conventions internationales. Ainsi, je soutiens sans réserve la proposition de la Commission d'augmenter, pour les Etats-membres qui bénéficient d'une assistance financière de l'Union, de 20 points les taux de cofinancement pour le Fonds pour les frontières extérieures.

3-321-375

**Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Pritariau šiam dokumentui, kadangi kai kuriose valstybėse narėse ekonomikos ir finansų krizės poveikis valstybės finansams buvo labai

didelis, dėl kurio daugelis valstybių narių turėjo imtis plataus masto priemonių siekdamas sumažinti išskolinimų dydį bei biudžeto deficitą ir atkurti valstybės finansų tvarumą. O kai kurios šalys patyrė tokį poveikį, kad turėjo pasinaudoti ES finansinės paramos mechanizmais. Dėl didelių ekonominių sunkumų šios valstybės narės susidūrė su problemomis tenkinant su ES lėšomis susijusius bendro finansavimo reikalavimus. Šie sunkumai akivaizdūs ir „Solidarumo ir migracijos srautų valdymo“ bendrosios programos lėšų atveju. Todėl visoms valstybėms narėms yra naudinga, kad su migracija susiję įsipareigojimai nenukentėtų dėl kai kuriose valstybėse narėse jaučiamų ekonominių sunkumų. Tinkamai veikiantis migracijos srautų valdymas yra labai svarbus visai Europos Sąjungai. Vienos valstybės narės nesugebėjimas užtikrinti veiksmingą migracijos srautų valdymą turi poveikio ne tik atitinkamai šaliai, bet ir daugeliui kitų valstybių narių.

3-321-500

**Michał Tomasz Kamiński (ECR),** *in writing* . – Due to the economic crisis, some EU Member States find themselves in a position where they can no longer pay for their share of EU-funded projects and programmes. These are therefore at risk of being cancelled, with negative effects on the Member States' economies and the objectives of the projects and programmes. This report proposes to approve the Commission proposal which allows for increased co-financing rates for projects and programmes under the External Borders Fund, the European Refugee Fund, the European Return Fund and the European Integration Fund and for certain Member States experiencing or threatened with serious difficulties with respect to their financial stability (e.g. the countries under the various European rescue mechanism, such as Greece and Ireland). Very often, it is better that less money is spent on a project than to cancel it completely. For example, if a project for EUR 10 million that would previously have been financed with EUR 5 million from the EU and EUR 5 million from the Member State, this could now be EUR 5 million from the EU and only EUR 2 million from the MS, bringing the total amount down, but without altogether cancelling the project.

3-321-750

**Giovanni La Via (PPE),** *per iscritto* . – Tenendo in ferma considerazione l'attuale periodo di crisi economico-finanziaria che stiamo attraversando, si ritiene sempre più necessaria una risposta rapida per contrastare gli effetti della crisi sull'economia intesa sia nella sua globalità europea che a livello di singoli Stati. In tal senso, l'auspicio è che la decisione ratificata dal Parlamento in prima lettura entri in vigore il più presto possibile. Per alcuni Stati membri, il disavanzo del debito pubblico minaccia la crescita economica e una ripresa auspicabile quanto prima. Per agevolare la gestione dei finanziamenti dell'Unione nei settori regolati dal Fondo europeo per i rifugiati, dal Fondo europeo per i rimpatri e dal Fondo europeo per l'integrazione di cittadini di Paesi terzi, è opportuno consentire l'aumento del 20% del tasso di cofinanziamento dell'UE, così come previsto dal testo cui ho espresso voto favorevole.

3-321-875

**Agnès Le Brun (PPE),** *par écrit* . – Ce texte, en faveur duquel je me suis prononcée, introduit la possibilité d'augmenter le taux de cofinancement de l'Union européenne de 20 points de pourcentage pour certains programmes adoptés au titre du "Fonds européen pour les réfugiés", du "Fonds européen pour le retour" ou du "Fonds européen d'intégration des ressortissants de pays tiers", par les États membres bénéficiant d'une assistance financière de l'Union européenne. J'estime en effet que c'est dans les moments les plus difficiles qu'il

convient d'être les plus solidaires les uns envers les autres, et qu'une des missions premières de l'Union européenne est de favoriser la cohésion économique de l'ensemble des États membres, cohésion qui sera par ailleurs bénéfique à tous.

3-322-000

**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Am votat pentru majorarea cu douăzeci de puncte procentuale a ratei de cofinanțare aplicate fondurilor în domeniul migrației și azilului. Multe state membre se confruntă cu dificultăți grave în ceea ce privește stabilitatea lor financiară, însă acest lucru nu trebuie să afecteze gestionarea fluxurilor migratorii. Regret, totuși, că în unele state membre utilizarea fondurilor este abuzivă și creează probleme pe termen lung. De aceea, solicit Comisiei implementarea unor sisteme riguroase de gestionare și control, urmate de verificări și monitorizări permanente și adecvate.

3-323-000

**David Martin (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I supported this proposal. The impact of the economic and financial crisis on public finances has been severe in a number of Member States. While most Member States have had to take far-reaching measures to bring down debt levels and decrease budget deficits in order to bring public finances back to a sustainable path, some countries have been affected to the extent that they have had recourse to the financial support mechanisms of the EU. As a consequence of their great economic difficulties, these Member States have encountered problems in fulfilling the co-financing requirements associated with EU funding. These difficulties are evident also with regard to funds within the framework of the General Programme 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows'.

3-324-000

**Barbara Matera (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Il fenomeno dei flussi migratori in Europa non è equamente ripartito. Una gestione efficace dei flussi migratori è molto importante per tutta l'Unione europea. L'incapacità di uno Stato membro di assicurare una gestione efficiente dei flussi migratori non solo si ripercuote sul paese in questione, ma anche sul resto degli Stati membri. È negli interessi di tutti gli Stati membri far sì che gli impegni assunti in materia di migrazione non siano influenzati dalle difficoltà economiche di alcuni di essi. È pertanto necessario predisporre sistemi efficienti per controllare e valutare l'utilizzo delle risorse, con un monitoraggio efficiente e continuo. Dato che le condizioni di cofinanziamento sono state già modificate in misura analoga e approvate per diversi altri fondi (ad esempio, Fondo di coesione, Fondo per la pesca, Fondo agricolo, ecc.), ritengo sia ragionevole che anche i Fondi per i flussi migratori siano oggetto di analoghe modifiche.

3-324-500

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport sur le Fonds européen pour les réfugiés, pour le retour et pour l'intégration des ressortissants de pays tiers, afin d'augmenter le taux de cofinancement de l'Union européenne, et donc de permettre à certains États membres connaissant des difficultés financières de continuer à financer des projets dans ces domaines.

3-324-625

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A presente crise levou a que alguns Estados-Membros se vejam confrontados com dificuldades para fazer face às suas responsabilidades no que respeita aos fundos no quadro do programa geral "Solidariedade e gestão dos fluxos



migratórios”. Esta situação sofre um agravamento no caso dos Estados-Membros intervencionados. Assim, a presente proposta visa permitir um aumento da taxa de cofinanciamento da União de vinte pontos percentuais e, conseqüentemente, diminuir as necessidades de cofinanciamento por parte dos Estados-Membros em questão. A taxa de cofinanciamento ascenderá, deste modo, aos 70 %, e no caso de projetos destinados a prioridades específicas e dos Estados-Membros abrangidos pelo Fundo de Coesão, a taxa atingirá um máximo de 95 %. É o caso do Fundo Europeu para os Refugiados, do Fundo Europeu de Regresso e do Fundo Europeu para a Integração de Nacionais de Países Terceiros, daí o meu parecer favorável.

3-324-750

**Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – He votado a favor del Informe Torvalds sobre el aumento de la cofinanciación del Fondo Europeo para los Refugiados, del Fondo Europeo para el Retorno y del Fondo Europeo para la Integración de Nacionales de Terceros Países, puesto que en estos momentos de crisis del sistema capitalista, numerosos Estados miembros de la UE están experimentando dificultades para cofinanciar fondos europeos. En este caso, la Comisión ha presentado una propuesta que tiene por objeto que sea posible incrementar el porcentaje de cofinanciación de la Unión en veinte puntos porcentuales, disminuyendo de este modo las necesidades de cofinanciación de dichos Estados miembros. Si bien fondos como el Fondo Europeo para los Refugiados resultan insuficiente para asegurar en la práctica el respeto de los derechos de los refugiados que llegan a la UE, he votado a favor del aumento de cofinanciación por parte de la UE para este tipo de fondos, ya que introduce un mecanismo de solidaridad entre los Estados miembros en la financiación de los mismos.

3-325-000

**Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE)**, *písomne*. – Dočasné zvýšenie miery financovania je vhodným prostriedkom na zabezpečenie politiky v oblasti migrácie s kladným dosahom nielen pre členský štát, ktorý prostriedky získa, ale pre Úniu ako celok. Prísun ideálnej pracovnej sily má vplyv na spoločnosť a ekonomiku a predstavuje možnosť rýchleho rozvoja, čo v súčasnej dobe predstavuje jedno z riešení hospodárskej krízy. Z uvedených dôvodov vyzdvihujem prijatý návrh. Hospodárska kríza je jedným z tých období, keď musí Európska únia ukázať svoju schopnosť zomknúť sa v boji proti chudobe a spomaleniu ekonomiky. Vyžaduje si to našu aktívnu účasť, koordináciu v postupe vnútroštátnych orgánov a podporu opatrení, ktoré budú mať preukázateľne pozitívny dopad na riešenie tejto ekonomicky zložitej situácie.

3-325-500

**Alexander Mirsky (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The Commission has proposed a decision to amend the co-financing rate, for those Member States benefiting from EU financial support mechanisms, in respect of the European Refugee Fund, the European Return Fund and the European Fund for the Integration of third-country nationals. The purpose of the proposal is to ensure that those Member States receiving financial assistance under the European Financial Stabilisation Mechanism, the European Financial Stability Facility, the Balance of Payments Mechanism or from EU bilateral loans continue to implement the programmes established under those funds and continue to disburse funds to projects. It can prevent the flow of asylum seekers to the Europe. The funding should be continued. I am in favour.

3-326-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Die momentan anhaltende Wirtschaftskrise trifft die Mitgliedsstaaten der Europäischen Union unterschiedlich stark, dies ist bekanntlich auch bei den Migrationsströmen und den damit einhergehenden immensen Kosten der Fall. Es liegt im Interesse aller Mitgliedsstaaten, dass eine effiziente Steuerung der außereuropäischen Migranten-Ströme auch in der Krise gewährleistet wird. Es sind im Besonderen die südeuropäischen Staaten, die durch die Wirtschaftskrise besonders geschwächt sind, die nun auch noch die anhaltenden Flüchtlingsströme aus dem nordafrikanischen und arabischen Raum bewältigen müssen. Es besteht die reale Gefahr, dass die Einwanderungskontrolle durch akute finanzielle Engpässe einzelner Staaten zusammenbricht. Aus diesem Grund befürworte ich die Erhöhung der Finanzierung des *European Refugee Fund* und des *European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals*.

3-326-125

**Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai décidé de voter en faveur des deux rapports portant sur l'augmentation du taux de cofinancement, bénéficiant aux États membres en difficulté financière, et concernant le Fonds européen pour les réfugiés, le Fonds européen pour le retour et le Fonds européen d'intégration des ressortissants de pays tiers. En effet, les impacts de la crise économique et financière sur les finances publiques ont été sévères dans de nombreux États membres. La plupart d'entre eux ont dû prendre, ou ont été forcés d'appliquer des mesures drastiques d'austérité. En conséquence de ces difficultés économiques, les États ne peuvent plus remplir les exigences pour obtenir le cofinancement de l'Union européenne. Les rapports de la commission LIBE proposent d'augmenter le plus rapidement possible les taux de cofinancement pour les États membres qui connaissent de graves difficultés quant à leur stabilité financière. Je ne peux que soutenir.

3-326-250

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Manau, kad yra tikslinga padidinti bendro finansavimo normą toms valstybėms, kurios susiduria su dideliais ekonominiais sunkumais. Labai svarbu užtikrinti, kad su migracija susiję išpareigojimai būtų vykdomi sklandžiai ir nenukentėtų dėl ekonomikos nuosmukio, kuris gerokai pakenkė tam tikrų valstybių finansiniam stabilumui. Pažymėtina, kad tinkamas migracijos srautų valdymas yra svarbus ne tik pavienėms valstybėms narėms, bet ir visai ES. Išmintingai ir tikslingai valdoma migracija padeda sukurti ekonominę ir socialinę naudą. Atsižvelgiant į tai, didesnė finansinė parama yra garantas, kad migracijos srautų valdymo užduotis valstybės narės įvykdys operatyviai ir efektyviai.

3-326-500

**Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE)**, *γραφικώς*. – Η παρούσα απόφαση στηρίζει τις μεγάλες προσπάθειες που καταβάλλει η Ελλάδα το τελευταίο χρονικό διάστημα για την καταπολέμηση της παράνομης μετανάστευσης. Και είναι σημαντικό ότι, σε συνεργασία με τους εισηγητές των άλλων πολιτικών ομάδων, την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και το Συμβούλιο, προχωρήσαμε και ολοκληρώσαμε πολύ γρήγορα την διαδικασία ώστε η χώρα άμεσα να επωφεληθεί από τις νέες προβλέψεις. Με την αύξηση των ποσοστών κοινοτικής χρηματοδότησης, η Ελλάδα θα μπορέσει να υποστηρίξει έργα που μέχρι σήμερα απαιτούσαν μεγαλύτερη εθνική συμμετοχή και λόγω της οικονομικής κρίσης ήταν αδύνατον να χρηματοδοτήσει από μόνη της, όπως για παράδειγμα ανακαίνιση κέντρων κράτησης και βελτίωση του τεχνικού εξοπλισμού που είναι απαραίτητος για την αποτελεσματική εποπτεία των συνόρων. Είναι αισιόδοξο το γεγονός ότι οι εταίροι μας

αναγνωρίζουν ολοένα και περισσότερο την ανάγκη για επίδειξη αλληλεγγύης σε κράτη μέλη, όπως η χώρα μας, που σηκώνουν αρκετές φορές για λογαριασμό ολόκληρης της Ε.Ε. δυσανάλογο βάρος στον τομέα αντιμετώπισης των παράνομων μεταναστευτικών ροών. Και βεβαίως προς αυτήν την κατεύθυνση έχουν ιδιαίτερη σημασία η αποτελεσματικότητα, η αποφασιστικότητα και τα σημαντικά αποτελέσματα που έχει επιδείξει σε σύντομο χρονικό διάστημα η ελληνική κυβέρνηση και το αρμόδιο Υπουργείο.

3-326-750

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Na sequência das enormes dificuldades financeiras que vivemos, alguns dos Estados-Membros têm-se deparado com problemas em satisfazer as exigências de cofinanciamento associadas ao financiamento da União. Estas dificuldades são igualmente evidentes no que se refere aos fundos no quadro do programa geral "Solidariedade e gestão dos fluxos migratórios". Para fazer face a esta situação, a Comissão propôs a possibilidade de aumentar as taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros que beneficiam de um mecanismo de apoio financeiro. O financiamento neste âmbito dividia-se em 50/50. Propõe-se agora que a taxa de cofinanciamento ascenda aos 70 %. No caso de projetos destinados a prioridades específicas e dos Estados-Membros abrangidos pelo Fundo de Coesão, a taxa atingirá um máximo de 95 %. Desta forma, tenta garantir-se que o financiamento não deixe de ser feito pela conhecida falta de liquidez de alguns Estados-Membros. Por concordar e apoiar esta medida, votei favoravelmente o presente relatório.

3-326-875

**Paulo Rangel (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A crise económica perturbou as finanças públicas de todos os países da União, e alguns estados tiveram mesmo que recorrer aos mecanismos de assistência financeira da UE para fazer face às dificuldades. Sem surpresa, tais dificuldades estenderam-se às exigências de cofinanciamento associadas ao financiamento da União, sendo por isso necessário diminuir a comparticipação nacional prevista para os Estados-Membros mais afetados pela crise, do mesmo modo que se antecipa o reembolso dos fundos já autorizados para estes mesmos países. Assim, e por forma a assegurar aos Estados-Membros que beneficiam de um mecanismo de apoio financeiro a continuidade na implementação dos programas adotados, a proposta contém provisões que permitem o aumento da taxa de cofinanciamento em 20% para dar início ou continuidade a todos os programas que, por falta de financiamento nacional, estariam comprometidos. Aprovei o relatório, atendendo à importância que o bom funcionamento da gestão dos fluxos migratórios tem para toda a União Europeia.

3-327-000

**Mitro Repo (S&D)**, *kirjallinen*. – Kriisitilanteissa ihmisten sosioekonomisen tilanteen heikkeneminen voimistaa entisestään Eurooppaan suuntautuvaa muuttoliikettä. Toisaalta muuttoliike on Euroopassa vallitsevan kriisin myötä heikentynyt. Eurostatin tilastojen valossa ainakin turvapaikanhakijoiden määrä on vähentynyt viime vuosina. Tämä ei tarkoita, että meidän tulisi lopettaa suurista turvapaikkahakijamääristä kärsivien EU-maiden tukeminen. Kyse on koko Eurooppaa koskevasta haasteesta, johon on löydettävä yhteisiä ratkaisuja ja solidaarisuutta. Olemme nyt äänestäneet tärkeästä rahoitusvälineestä, jolla tuetaan apua tarvitsevia jäsenmaita maahanmuuttoa, ulkorajojen turvaamista sekä turvapaikanhakijoita koskevassa työssä. Olen tyytyväinen edustajakollega Torvaldsin työhön tämän tärkeän asian parissa.

3-328-000

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – In favour. The impact of the economic and financial crisis on public finances has been severe in a number of Member States. While most Member States have had to take far-reaching measures to bring down debt levels and decrease budget deficits in order to bring public finances back onto a sustainable path, some countries have been affected to the extent that they have had recourse to the financial support mechanisms of the EU. As a consequence of their great economic difficulties, these Member States have encountered problems in fulfilling the co-financing requirements associated with EU funding. These difficulties are evident also with regard to funds within the framework of the General Programme ‘Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows’.

3-329-000

**Monika Smolková (S&D)**, *pisomne*. – Účinky hospodárskej a finančnej krízy nepominuli. Sú tu a majú stály dosah na verejné financie. Tieto ťažkosti sú zjavné aj v súvislosti s fondmi v rámci všeobecného programu Solidarita a riadenie migračných tokov. Preto vítam a podporujem návrh Komisie zvýšiť sadzby spolufinancovania o 20 percentuálnych bodov, resp. pri Kohéznom fonde až na 95 %. Treba však pripomenúť, že niektoré štáty sa do stavu zlého hospodárenia s verejnými financiami dostali samé, a preto by sa zvýšenie sadzby malo použiť len na konkrétne priority a mali by byť časovo ohraničené. Zároveň k tomu bude potrebné vybudovať účinný systém na kontrolu použitia týchto finančných zdrojov.

3-329-500

**Catherine Stihler (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour as this report may potentially amend Decision No 573/2007/EC, Decision No 575/2007/EC and Council Decision 2007/435/EC and this may in turn provide additional financial resources to the Member States and will make it easier to continue implementing the programmes on the ground.

3-330-000

**Charles Tannock (ECR)**, *in writing*. – In the past year, the European economic crisis has taken many casualties and EU budget spending and the 2014-20 MFF must also be cut accordingly. As the EU continues to struggle through this crisis, it is important that we do our best to limit the collateral damage. For this reason, I can support reasonable temporary co-financing to maintain essential EU-funded programmes dealing with asylum and migration. We do not need the Eurozone currency crisis to lead to an additional migration crisis if these programmes are totally cancelled. Therefore the Member States that desperately need assistance to maintain these programmes should be given existing rates of co-financing rates for the current year. The importance of a selection of the listed programmes validates this provisional, budget-neutral proposal.

3-331-000

**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – La crise économique et financière a eu des incidences graves sur les finances publiques de nombre d'États membres. Si la plupart d'entre eux ont dû prendre des mesures draconiennes pour réduire leur niveau d'endettement et les déficits budgétaires, afin de remettre les finances publiques sur une voie viable, certains pays ont été touchés au point de devoir faire appel aux mécanismes de soutien financier de l'Union. Du fait de la gravité de leur situation économique, ces États membres se sont heurtés à des problèmes pour satisfaire aux exigences de cofinancement requises pour bénéficier de

fonds de l'Union. C'est notamment le cas en ce qui concerne les fonds alloués dans le cadre du programme général "Solidarité et gestion des flux migratoires".

En conséquence, l'Europe propose d'offrir la possibilité d'augmenter les taux de cofinancement pour les États membres bénéficiant d'un mécanisme de soutien financier. La proposition vise à permettre de majorer de 20 points de pourcentage le taux de cofinancement par l'Union et de diminuer d'autant les besoins de cofinancement de la part des États membres en question. Le taux de cofinancement serait ainsi porté à 70 %.

3-331-500

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Num panorama onde vários Estados-Membros se encontram em recessão ou estagnação económica, levando a pedidos de assistência financeira uma vez que não conseguiam cumprir as suas responsabilidades financeiras, é também necessário debater o aumento do co-financiamento da União no quadro do programa geral "Solidariedade e gestão dos fluxos migratórios", tal como já sucedeu com os fundos estruturais. Por estas razões, a Comissão propõe, temporariamente, o aumento do cofinanciamento em 20 pontos percentuais, tendo em devida consideração os Estados-Membros elegíveis para o Fundo de Coesão. Concordo em pleno com esta medida, uma vez que os países intervencionados necessitam de um apoio suplementar para não pôr em causa a gestão dos fluxos migratórios. Não devemos aceitar que os acontecimentos na Grécia em vários centros de detenção, devido à falta de recursos humanos, físicos e financeiros, sejam uma realidade. A solidariedade europeia neste domínio não deve ser esquecida, uma vez que há Estados-Membros que estão mais expostos que outros.

3-332-000

**Nils Torvalds (ALDE)**, *in writing*. – By agreeing to increase the co-financing rates for the External Borders Fund, the European Refugee Fund, the European Return Fund and the European Fund for Integration of third-country nationals, an important step has been taken to create a mechanism for solidarity among Member States in the management of migration flows. Properly functioning management of migration flows is of pivotal importance to the European Union as a whole. The effects of the economic and financial crisis have hit some Member States harder than others, even to the extent that they have experienced problems in fulfilling the co-financing requirements for EU funding. It is important that Member States facing significant economic challenges should still be able to deal with tasks related to the management of migration flows. The inability of one Member State to ensure efficient management of migration flows affects other Member States as well, which is why it is important that commitments made by one Member State with regard to migration are not adversely affected by economic difficulties in another Member State. Given the current economic challenges, therefore, reassessment of the co-financing requirements is justified, and I am glad to see that a decision to that effect has been taken.

3-333-000

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Komisja zaproponowała możliwość podwyższenia poziomu współfinansowania dla państw korzystających z mechanizmu wsparcia finansowego. Propozycja ta uwzględnia podniesienie poziomu współfinansowania przez Unię o 20 punktów procentowych. Roczny przydział krajowy funduszy zgodnie z aktami podstawowymi pozostanie niezmienny, natomiast krajowy poziom współfinansowania zostanie odpowiednio obniżony. Proponowane podniesienie poziomów współfinansowania

nie jest trwałe. Ma ono charakter tymczasowy i nie wpłynie na okres programowania 2014 – 2020. Ponadto taki układ może być podwaliną do stworzenia między państwami członkowskimi solidarności w zarządzaniu przepływami migracyjnymi.

Ponadto członkowie delegacji komisji LIBE sugerują, że wiele zaplanowanych przedsięwzięć wymaga zwiększenia poziomu współfinansowania. Mowa tu między innymi o poprawie wyposażenia technicznego służby celnej czy organów kontrolujących granice. Mam nadzieję, że takie działania przyczynią się do poprawy bezpieczeństwa na terenie Unii.

3-333-500

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Este relatório é perverso na sua fundamentação: utiliza a política de restrição orçamental e de destruição de direitos e conquistas sociais que está a ser imposta a países como Portugal para justificar o aumento da taxa de cofinanciamento da UE nestes fundos. Nada existe de solidariedade nesta decisão. Em primeiro lugar, porque ela mantém intocável uma política de emigração que criminaliza e reprime os imigrantes, que restringe a sua admissão e facilita a sua expulsão, que os expõe às redes de tráfico de seres humanos e à exploração como mão-de-obra ilegal, impondo-lhes uma situação próxima da escravatura. Em segundo lugar, nenhum aumento do cofinanciamento da UE nestes fundos poderá compensar a destruição de direitos sociais e laborais, a destruição de serviços públicos impostos pelas troikas (estrangeira e nacional), cujas consequências afetarão não apenas os trabalhadores e o povo destes países, mas igualmente os imigrantes, tendo em conta a sua situação social e laboral frágil. Pela nossa parte, consideramos fundamental uma política de imigração mais justa, mais humana e mais democrática, que assegure o respeito pelos direitos de todos os trabalhadores, sem discriminação quanto à sua origem nacional e com respeito pela sua dignidade e pelas suas legítimas aspirações a uma vida melhor.

### **8.7. Ταμείο Εξωτερικών Συνόρων (A7-0433/2012 - Nils Torvalds)**

3-335-000

#### **Written explanations of vote**

3-335-125

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Aprovo a presente proposta, tendo em conta que em alguns Estados-Membros, a crise económica e financeira tem-se repercutido severamente nas finanças públicas. Estas dificuldades são igualmente evidentes no que se refere aos fundos no quadro do programa geral "Solidariedade e gestão dos fluxos migratórios". Por conseguinte, aprovo a proposta da Comissão de permitir a possibilidade de aumentar as taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros que beneficiam de um mecanismo de apoio financeiro. Noto que as alterações às taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros confrontados com dificuldades graves de estabilidade financeira não implicam o aumento dos montantes totais dos fundos em questão. Além disso, assinalo ainda que já foram aprovadas alterações semelhantes às exigências de cofinanciamento no que se refere aos fundos estruturais, ao Fundo de Coesão, ao Fundo das Pescas e ao Fundo Agrícola de Desenvolvimento Rural. Por conseguinte, é razoável permitir que se efetuem alterações semelhantes nos fundos relacionados com os fluxos migratórios. O aumento proposto das taxas de cofinanciamento não compromete o período de programação 2014-2020, o que poderá ter de ser reanalisado.

3-335-250

**Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – În condițiile în care tot mai multe state europene se confruntă cu efectele nefaste ale crizei economice și financiare internaționale, sistemele de protejare a frontierelor Uniunii Europene sunt afectate semnificativ de politicile de austeritate sau de creșterea a eficienței cheltuielilor publice. Creșterea ponderii cofinanțării Uniunii Europene în proiecte punctuale de dezvoltare a supravegherii frontierelor este una dintre măsurile care pot asigura funcționalitatea acestui sector, fără a implica neapărat presiuni suplimentare asupra bugetului european. Chiar dacă imperativele redresării economice trebuie să ghideze în acest moment politicile statelor membre, nu trebuie omisă importanța majoră a menținerii unui sistem de protejare a frontierelor flexibil și eficient. O mare parte dintre problemele sociale sau de securitate cu care se confruntă statele membre pot fi agravate de o gestionare inadecvată a fluxurilor migratorii în condițiile unei crize globale, și nu doar europene. Am votat în favoarea acestui raport.

3-335-265

**Sophie Auconie (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce rapport visant à augmenter le taux de cofinancement par le Fonds pour les frontières extérieures pour certains États membres qui connaissent ou risquent de connaître de graves difficultés quant à leur stabilité financière. Ce fonds pour les frontières extérieures encourage un partage équitable, entre les États membres, des responsabilités découlant de l'instauration d'une gestion intégrée des frontières extérieures de l'Union européenne, ainsi que de la mise en œuvre de politiques communes en matière d'asile et d'immigration.

3-335-273

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį siūlymą dėl bendro finansavimo iš Išorės sienų fondo normos padidinimo valstybėms narėms, kurios turi didelių finansinio stabilumo sunkumų arba kurioms gresia tokie sunkumai. Šiandien ES išgyvenant krizę, daugeliui išorės sienas turinčių valstybių narių tampa vis sunkiau susitvarkyti su didėjančiu migrantų srautu. Siekiant padėti šioms valstybėms gerinti perpildytų pabėgėlių centrų padėtį, pritariu papildomų lėšų skyrimui migracijos srautų valdymui. Šiuo siūlymu siekiama sukurti ES valstybių narių solidarumo mechanizmą šiuo klausimu. Kadangi migracijos srautai šalyse nevienodi, tačiau vienos valstybės nesugebėjimas užtikrinti tinkamą migracijos srautų valdymą daro įtaką ne tik šiai šaliai, bet ir kitoms valstybėms narėms, todėl pritariu finansavimo didinimui didelių ekonominių sunkumų turinčioms šalims. Pritariu išdėstytiems siūlymams dėl veiksmingesnės išteklių naudojimo kontrolės. Svarbu stiprinti finansavimo valdymo ir kontrolės sistemas, vykdyti patikrinimus ir stebėseną.

3-335-281

**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Am votat în favoarea raportului deoarece consider necesară modificarea ratelor de cofinanțare a Fondului pentru frontierele externe pentru statele membre care se confruntă cu dificultăți grave în ceea ce privește stabilitatea lor financiară. Criza economică a avut un impact sever asupra finanțelor publice în mai multe state membre. Ele au fost nevoite să apeleze la mecanismele de sprijin financiar ale UE. Subliniez importanța deosebită a unor sisteme eficiente de control și evaluare a modului de utilizare a resurselor. De asemenea, trebuie menționată și importanța solidarității statelor membre care se confruntă cu provocări fiscale majore. România, ca parte a unui acord de asistență macro-financiară, va beneficia de creșterea cofinanțării.

3-335-312

**Regina Bastos (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A crise económica e financeira tem tido severos efeitos nas finanças públicas de vários Estados-Membros da União Europeia, tendo alguns países recorrido ao mecanismo de assistência financeira da UE. Isso levou vários Estados-Membros a ter problemas em satisfazer as exigências de cofinanciamento associadas ao financiamento da União. Tendo em consideração esta realidade, propõe-se o aumento das taxas de cofinanciamento da União Europeia e conseqüentemente a diminuição das necessidades de cofinanciamento por parte dos Estados-Membros em questão, ascendendo, deste modo, essa taxa aos 70%. No caso dos projetos destinados a prioridades específicas e dos Estados-Membros abrangidos pelo Fundo de Coesão, a taxa atingirá um máximo de 95%. Sublinhe-se que as alterações das taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros confrontados com dificuldades graves de estabilidade financeira não implicam o aumento dos montantes totais dos fundos em questão. A incapacidade de um EM assegurar uma gestão eficaz dos fluxos migratórios não só afeta o país em questão, como também se repercute em muitos outros Estados. Por concordar com a importância da diminuição das necessidades de cofinanciamento aos Estados-Membros que tenham recorrido ao mecanismo de assistência financeira da UE, apoiei o presente relatório.

3-335-375

**Sergio Berlato (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – In molti Stati membri le conseguenze della crisi economico-finanziaria hanno avuto ricadute negative sulle finanze pubbliche e comportato difficoltà nel soddisfare i requisiti di cofinanziamento connessi ai fondi dell'Unione europea. La Commissione ha pertanto proposto di aumentare i tassi di cofinanziamento per gli Stati membri che beneficiano di un meccanismo di sostegno finanziario.

Ritengo che una gestione efficace dei flussi migratori vada nell'interesse di tutta l'Unione. L'incapacità di un paese di assicurare una gestione efficiente dei flussi migratori non solo si ripercuote sul paese in questione, ma anche sugli altri Stati membri. Pertanto, è fondamentale che gli Stati membri che si trovano in una situazione di grave difficoltà economica siano comunque in grado di svolgere le attività connesse alla gestione dei flussi migratori.

Premesso che l'aumento dei tassi di cofinanziamento è un intervento temporaneo, accolgo con favore la proposta di aumentare il tasso di cofinanziamento per gli Stati membri che beneficiano di un sostegno finanziario creando, in tal modo, nell'ambito della gestione dei flussi migratori, un meccanismo di solidarietà tra Stati. Diviene fondamentale disporre di sistemi efficienti per controllare l'utilizzo delle risorse per evitare, come già accaduto, che l'utilizzo improprio dei fondi negli Stati membri provochi difficoltà nell'assorbimento dei fondi europei.

3-335-390

**Nora Berra (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur des rapports de Nils Torvalds qui contiennent des dispositions qui permettraient d'accroître le taux de cofinancement de l'Union et de diminuer ainsi les besoins de cofinancement pour la part des Etats membres en question.

3-335-406

**Adam Bielan (ECR)**, *na piśmie*. – Głosowałem za przyjęciem obydwu rezolucji, chociaż sceptycznie podchodzę do niektórych projektów, jak na przykład finansowanie w ramach



Europejskiego Funduszu na rzecz Integracji. Większość propozycji nie powoduje jednakże znaczących obciążeń budżetowych ani nie wpływa negatywnie na konstrukcję nadchodzącego okresu planowania, a szereg zaprezentowanych rozwiązań wydaje się bardzo cennych.

Wyszczególnione w sprawozdaniach fundusze dotyczą delikatnej sprawy zarządzania przepływami migracyjnymi wśród państw członkowskich. Kwestia ta ma znaczenie dla wszystkich krajów, ponieważ ewentualne problemy, których doświadcza dane państwo, przenoszą się zazwyczaj na jego sąsiadów i pozostałych członków Wspólnoty. Szczególnie istotne jest zabezpieczenie państw granicznych, co uwidoczniło się na przykładzie Grecji. Częścią unijnych granic jest również wschodnia granica Polski, dlatego zwiększenie stawki współfinansowania w ramach Funduszu Granic Zewnętrznych może okazać się opłacalne również dla niej.

3-335-421

**Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Poważne trudności finansowe, z jakimi zmagają się niektóre państwa członkowskie Unii Europejskiej, zmusiły je do skorzystania z mechanizmów wsparcia finansowego UE. Niemniej jednak nawarstwiający się problemy ekonomiczne w tym gronie były głównym powodem, dla którego wspomniana grupa państw nie mogła sprostać wymogom współfinansowania obowiązującym w ramach dostępnych funduszy. Mając to na uwadze, zgłosiowałem za przyjęciem sprawozdania pana posła Nilsa Torvaldsa dotyczącego zwiększenia poziomu współfinansowania w ramach Funduszu Granic Zewnętrznych dla państw przeżywających poważne trudności ekonomiczne. Wierzę, że przyczyni się to do odpowiedniej realizacji przez te państwa zadań związanych z zarządzaniem granicami oraz zwiększy poziom bezpieczeństwa na terenie UE.

3-335-437

**John Bufton (EFD)**, *in writing*. – The current spend on the External Borders Fund is EUR 1.882 billion. The Commission has proposed increasing co-financing rates by 70 %; this will see EU taxpayers having to increase their contribution by 40 %, the equivalent of around EUR 728 billion. I disagree with this proposal and, indeed, the existence of the fund altogether as I believe that the management of borders is an internal matter that should be dealt with by the Member States. In the UK, it is essential that the UK's borders are kept locked and it is the UK Government that should have control over this.

3-335-468

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Em alguns Estados-Membros, a crise económica e financeira tem-se repercutido severamente nas finanças públicas. Alguns países foram de tal modo afetados que tiveram de recorrer aos mecanismos de assistência financeira da UE. Na sequência das enormes dificuldades financeiras, estes Estados-Membros têm-se deparado com problemas em satisfazer as exigências de cofinanciamento associadas ao financiamento da União. Estas dificuldades são igualmente evidentes no que se refere aos fundos no quadro do programa geral "Solidariedade e gestão dos fluxos migratórios". É necessário apoiar as propostas que visam um aumento das taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros que beneficiam de assistência financeira. É fundamental que os Estados-Membros confrontados com grandes dificuldades económicas continuem capazes de se encarregar das tarefas relacionadas com a gestão dos fluxos migratórios.

3-335-500

**Carlos Coelho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Os sistemas de receção e proteção de vários Estados-Membros têm sido drasticamente postos à prova com a chegada às suas fronteiras de um enorme número de pessoas à procura de proteção internacional, tendo sido igualmente notória a existência de uma falta de solidariedade entre Estados-Membros para lidar com este tipo de situações. Daí a importância que reveste todo o conjunto de medidas aprovadas, com especial destaque para o programa geral de solidariedade e gestão dos fluxos migratórios, onde se incluem os quatro Fundos comunitários nesta área, de forma a assegurar uma repartição equilibrada do esforço assumido pelos Estados-Membros ao acolherem refugiados e pessoas deslocadas e para suportarem as consequências decorrentes desse acolhimento. Porém, a crise financeira e económica que se continua a prolongar tem vindo a aumentar a pressão sobre os recursos financeiros nacionais, que por sua vez têm sido alvo de restrições orçamentais, o que cria enormes dificuldades para alguns Estados-Membros conseguirem satisfazer as exigências de cofinanciamento no âmbito destes programas. Apoio esta proposta de aumento da taxa de cofinanciamento da União, de forma a reduzir o nível de financiamento que recai sobre o Estado-Membro (a beneficiar dum mecanismo de apoio financeiro), pois só assim se poderá assegurar uma execução adequada dos programas e uma gestão eficaz dos fluxos migratórios.

3-335-750

**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Criza economică și financiară a avut un impact sever asupra finanțelor publice în mai multe state membre. Consider de bun augur și susțin propunerile de majorare a ratei de cofinanțare pentru statele membre care fac obiectul sprijinului financiar.

3-335-875

**Rachida Dati (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Grâce à cette mesure, les États en difficulté pourront bénéficier d'un taux de cofinancement accru de l'Union européenne pour leurs dépenses de gestion des flux migratoires. Si un État n'est plus capable de gérer correctement ses flux migratoires, c'est l'ensemble de nos États qui risquent d'en souffrir. Grâce à ce vote, nous unissons nos forces pour garantir que la crise économique n'aura pas de conséquences néfastes sur nos objectifs migratoires.

3-336-000

**Ioan Enciu (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Am votat în favoarea acestui raport întrucât consider că buna gestionare a frontierelor și a fluxurilor migratorii sunt esențiale pentru Uniunea Europeană. Suplimentarea ratei de cofinanțare din partea Uniunii a Fondului european pentru frontiere până la 70%, respectiv 95%, este destinată acelor state membre care se confruntă cu dificultăți importante în ceea ce privește finanțele publice și bugetele naționale. Astfel, prin această măsură, statele membre vor putea să respecte în continuare standardele și acquis-ul comunitar în materie de gestionare a frontierelor și a fluxurilor migratorii, respectându-se totodată drepturile migrantilor. Această suplimentare a ratei de cofinanțare va rămâne însă una temporară și limitată și nu se va aplica în cadrul viitorului exercițiu financiar multianual 2014-2020.

3-336-500

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Concordo com a proposta da Comissão Europeia que visa o aumento das taxas de cofinanciamento para os Estados-Membros que beneficiam

de assistência financeira, para que estes mantenham o bom funcionamento dos fluxos migratórios, para a segurança de toda a UE. Na base destes fundos está o princípio da criação de um mecanismo de solidariedade entre os Estados-Membros relativamente à gestão dos fluxos migratórios. Esta tarefa não é distribuída de forma equitativa pelos Estados-Membros, pelo que se justifica uma reavaliação das exigências de cofinanciamento no contexto das atuais dificuldades económicas. Parece-me razoável a proposta da Comissão que sugere o aumento das taxas de cofinanciamento em 20 pontos percentuais para os países que beneficiam de um mecanismo de apoio financeiro.

3-336-750

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Alguns Estados-Membros (EM) mais afetados pela crise económica e financeira como a Grécia e Portugal, entre outros, viram-se obrigados a recorrer a ajudas externas, nomeadamente ao mecanismo europeu de estabilização financeira (MEEF), e a adotar medidas drásticas de contenção orçamental que tiveram um enorme impacto negativo nos investimentos, originando uma situação de recessão económica. O objetivo principal do Fundo para as Fronteiras Externas (FFE) da União Europeia (UE) é apoiar os Estados-Membros (EM) nos custos resultantes de uma gestão integrada das suas fronteiras externas para que todos possamos partilhar um espaço de liberdade, de segurança e de justiça. O relatório em apreço, elaborado por Nils Torvalds, debruça-se sobre a proposta de decisão do Parlamento Europeu (PE) e do Conselho que altera a Decisão n.º 574/2007/CE e visa aumentar a taxa de cofinanciamento do FFE, à semelhança do que aconteceu com os fundos estruturais no final do ano de 2011, a favor dos EM com graves dificuldades de estabilidade financeira. Saúdo mais esta manifestação de solidariedade e de apoio da União Europeia aos EM que se vêem confrontados com rigorosos e penosos programas de apoio financeiro.

3-337-000

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – A nossa votação neste relatório é indissociável da posição de princípio que temos relativamente ao Fundo em questão, para o qual se pretende agora aumentar o cofinanciamento da UE. Desde sempre, criticámos uma política de emigração que criminaliza e reprime os imigrantes, que restringe a sua admissão e facilita a sua expulsão, que os expõe às redes de tráfico de seres humanos e à exploração como mão-de-obra ilegal, impondo-lhes uma situação próxima da escravatura. Este Fundo é uma das peças integrantes desta política. Desde sempre, defendemos uma política de imigração mais justa, mais humana e mais democrática, que assegure o respeito pelos direitos de todos os trabalhadores, sem discriminação quanto à sua origem nacional e com respeito pela sua dignidade e pelas suas legítimas aspirações a uma vida melhor. Não podíamos por isso apoiar este relatório e daí o nosso voto contra. Saliente-se ainda que nenhum aumento do cofinanciamento da UE neste Fundo poderá compensar a destruição de direitos sociais e laborais, a destruição de serviços públicos impostos pelas troicas (estrangeira e nacional), cujas consequências afetarão não apenas os trabalhadores e o povo destes países, mas igualmente os imigrantes, tendo em conta a sua situação social e laboral frágil.

3-338-000

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Účinky hospodárskej a finančnej krízy na verejné financie boli vo viacerých členských štátoch tvrdé a znateľné. Väčšina členských štátov bola nútená prijať ďalekosiahle opatrenia na zníženie dlhových úrovní a rozpočtových deficitov s cieľom dostať verejné financie späť na udržateľnú cestu, ale niektoré krajiny boli krízou zasiahnuté do takej miery, že sa museli obrátiť so žiadosťou

o pomoc na mechanizmy finančnej podpory EÚ. Tieto členské štáty sa v dôsledku veľkých hospodárskych ťažkostí stretávali s problémami pri plnení požiadaviek spolufinancovania súvisiacich s financovaním EÚ. Komisia preto navrhla možnosť na zvýšenie sadzieb spolufinancovania pre členské štáty, ktoré majú ošoh z mechanizmu finančnej podpory. Zámerom návrhu je umožniť zvýšenie sadzby spolufinancovania Únie o dvadsať percentuálnych bodov, a tým zníženie potrieb spolufinancovania pre časť zmienených členských štátov. Fungujúce riadenie migračných tokov je veľmi dôležité pre Európsku úniu ako celok. Neschopnosť jedného členského štátu zabezpečiť efektívne riadenie migračných tokov nepôsobí len na príslušnú krajinu, ale ovplyvňuje aj mnohé ďalšie členské štáty. Preto je v záujme všetkých členských štátov, aby záväzky prijaté v súvislosti s migráciou nepocítovali dôsledky hospodárskych ťažkostí v niektorých členských štátoch. Považujem za veľmi dôležité, aby členské štáty s veľkými hospodárskymi problémami stále mohli zodpovedne plniť úlohy súvisiace s riadením migračných tokov.

3-338-500

**Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce rapport afin de montrer le nécessaire devoir de solidarité de toute l'Union européenne dans la question essentielle des flux migratoires, notamment à l'égard des États les plus durement touchés par la crise économique et financière, pour que ceux-ci puissent tenir leurs engagements aux frontières extérieures de l'Union. Il est inadmissible de laisser des pays en proie à l'austérité, comme la Grèce, seuls et sans moyens pour accueillir les candidats à l'asile ou à l'immigration décentement et dans le respect des conventions internationales. Ainsi, je soutiens sans réserve la proposition de la Commission d'augmenter, pour les États-membres qui bénéficient d'une assistance financière de l'Union, de 20 points les taux de cofinancement pour le Fonds pour les frontières extérieures.

3-338-750

**Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį dokumentą. Visoms valstybėms narėms svarbu, kad su migracija susiję prisiimti įsipareigojimai nenukentėtų dėl kai kurių valstybių narių patiriamų ekonominių sunkumų. Bendro finansavimo iš Išorės sienų fondo normos padidinimas tam tikroms valstybėms narėms, kurios turi didelių finansinio stabilumo sunkumų arba kurioms gresia tokie sunkumai, suteiktų galimybę jų išvengti arba juos sumažinti. Tad tai būtų naudinga visai Europai, kadangi vienos valstybės narės nesugebėjimas užtikrinti veiksmingo migracijos srautų valdymo paveikia ne tik atitinkamą šalį, bet ir daug kitų valstybių narių.

3-338-875

**Agnès Le Brun (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Ce texte prévoit la possibilité d'augmenter le taux de cofinancement de l'Union européenne pour certains programmes adoptés au titre du "Fonds pour les frontières extérieures" par les États membres connaissant ou risquant de connaître de graves difficultés en termes de stabilité financière. J'ai voté en faveur de ce texte, de la même manière que j'ai voté pour son équivalent concernant les programmes adoptés au titre du "Fonds européen pour les réfugiés", du "Fonds européen pour le retour" ou du "Fonds européen d'intégration des ressortissants de pays tiers". J'estime en effet qu'en cas de défaillance des États à cause de la crise économique, l'Union européenne se doit d'éviter que la protection des frontières extérieures ne soit affaiblie.

3-339-000

**Petru Constantin Luhan (PPE)**, *în scris* . – Într-o perioadă marcată de continuarea incertitudinilor economice și financiare, una dintre principalele consecințe a fost reducerea semnificativă a bugetelor statelor membre. Cu toate acestea, gestionarea fluxurilor migratorii reprezintă o problemă deosebit de importantă, care afectează întreaga Uniune și, tocmai de aceea, trebuie să ne asigurăm că statele membre care întâmpină dificultăți grave în ceea ce privește finanțarea vor face față viitoarelor provocări. Pentru că știu foarte bine situația în care se află aceste state membre, am susținut cu tărie majorarea ratelor de cofinanțare atunci când a fost vorba despre fondurile de coeziune și cele structurale și acum, în același mod, consider că aceste state ar trebui sprijinite prin cele patru fonduri instituite ca parte a programului general „Solidaritatea și gestionarea fluxurilor migratorii”. Numai așa ne putem asigura că aceste fonduri își vor atinge obiectivele scontate și că vom depăși toate problemele importante din domeniul migrației, azilului și frontierelor externe.

3-340-000

**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE)**, *în scris* . – Am votat pentru majorarea cu douăzeci de puncte procentuale a ratei de cofinanțare aplicate fondurilor în domeniul migrației și azilului. Multe state membre se confruntă cu dificultăți grave în ceea ce privește stabilitatea lor financiară, însă acest lucru nu trebuie să afecteze gestionarea fluxurilor migratorii. Regret, totuși, că în unele state membre utilizarea fondurilor este abuzivă și creează probleme pe termen lung. De aceea, solicit Comisiei implementarea unor sisteme riguroase de gestionare și control, urmate de verificări și monitorizări permanente și adecvate.

3-341-000

**David Martin (S&D)**, *in writing* . – Functioning management of migration flows is of great importance for the European Union as a whole. The inability of one Member State to ensure efficient management of migration flows does not only affect the country in question; it has also an impact on many other Member States. It is therefore in the interests of all Member States that the commitments made with regards to migration do not suffer from the economic difficulties in some Member States. There are a number of projects in the making that require increased co-financing rates in order to be implemented. This applies to, for example, the renovation of detention centres in poor condition and improvements in technical equipment needed for efficient border management. It is essential that Member States with significant economic challenges still can handle the tasks related to the management of migration flows.

3-341-500

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE)**, *par écrit* . – J’ai voté en faveur du rapport sur le Fonds européen pour les frontières extérieures afin d’augmenter le taux de cofinancement de l’Union européenne, et donc de permettre à certains États membres qui connaissent des difficultés financières à continuer de financer des projets dans ce domaine.

3-341-750

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito* . – A presente crise levou a que alguns Estados-Membros se vejam confrontados com dificuldades para fazer face às suas responsabilidades no que respeita aos fundos no quadro do programa geral “Solidariedade e gestão dos fluxos migratórios”. Esta situação sofre um agravamento no caso dos Estados-Membros intervencionados. Assim, a presente proposta visa permitir um aumento da taxa de

cofinanciamento da União de vinte pontos percentuais e, conseqüentemente, diminuir as necessidades de cofinanciamento por parte dos Estados-Membros em questão. A taxa de cofinanciamento ascenderá, deste modo, aos 70 %, e no caso de projetos destinados a prioridades específicas e dos Estados-Membros abrangidos pelo Fundo de Coesão, a taxa atingirá um máximo de 95 %. É o caso do Fundo para as Fronteiras Externas. Daí o meu parecer favorável.

3-342-000

**Alajos Mészáros (PPE)**, *írásban* . – A gazdasági és pénzügyi válság hatására a legtöbb tagállamnak jelentős intézkedéseket kellett hoznia az adósságsszintek és a költségvetési hiányok csökkentésére. Egyes országok az EU pénzügyi támogatási mechanizmusaihoz folyamodtak. E tagállamok problémákkal szembesültek a társfinanszírozási követelmények teljesítése során. Ez a helyzet fennáll a „Szolidaritás és a migrációs áramlások kezelése” elnevezésű általános programban szereplő alapok tekintetében is. Egyetérték a Bizottság javaslatával, hogy lehetővé tegye az Unió társfinanszírozási arányának emelkedését húsz százalékponttal, és ezáltal csökkenjen a szóban forgó tagállamok részére a társfinanszírozási igény. Ez a társfinanszírozási arányt 70%-ra módosítaná. Az alapokból az egyes országoknak az alap-jogiaktusok értelmében járó éves összeg nem fog változni, míg a nemzeti társfinanszírozás megfelelően csökkenni fog. Mivelhogy a társfinanszírozási követelményekben bekövetkező hasonló változásokat már jóváhagyták a Strukturális és az egyéb Alapokra, ésszerűnek tartom a hasonló változások bevezetését a migrációs áramlásokkal kapcsolatos alapoknál is. Fontosnak tartom, hogy a jelentős gazdasági kihívásokkal küzdő tagállamok továbbra is meg tudjanak birkózni a migrációs áramlásokkal kapcsolatos feladatokkal, ezért támogattam a jelentést.

3-342-500

**Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito* . – He votado en contra de este informe puesto que desde mi formación política estamos en contra de una Europa Fortaleza y de la financiación comunitaria con el objetivo de financiar una política migratoria de la Unión Europea que criminaliza y reprime a los inmigrantes, que restringe su admisión en territorio comunitario y que facilita su expulsión. Esta política represiva de la UE en materia de inmigración deja expuestos a miles de personas al tráfico de seres humanos y a la explotación como mano de obra ilegal, en condiciones cercanas a la esclavitud. Por ello, no he podido sino oponerme a este informe que, en tiempos de crisis sistémica, pretende blindar a la UE con un aumento de la financiación para la militarización de sus fronteras exteriores, en una flagrante violación del derecho de asilo de miles de personas. Por el contrario, con mi voto en contra quiero reclamar el respeto por el cumplimiento de los derechos de los migrantes y de los refugiados, y mostrar una vez más mi rechazo a la Europa Fortaleza y a su carácter persecutorio, represivo y explotador, y a sus instrumentos, como este Fondo para las Fronteras Exteriores.

3-342-750

**Alexander Mirsky (S&D)**, *in writing* . – The purpose of the proposal is to ensure that Member States receiving financial assistance under the European Financial Stabilisation Mechanism, the European Financial Stability Facility, the Balance of Payments Mechanism or from EU bilateral loans continue to implement the programmes established under the External Borders Funds and continue to disburse funds to projects. I am in favour.

3-343-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Im Zuge der Wirtschafts- und Finanzkrise hatten einige Mitgliedsstaaten Probleme, die Kofinanzierungsanforderungen für EU-Beihilfen zu erfüllen. Mit dem vorliegenden Vorschlag soll für die betreffenden Mitgliedsstaaten der Kofinanzierungssatz der EU in Zusammenhang mit den Migrationsströmen auf 70 % bzw. bei bestimmten Prioritäten auf 95 % erhöht werden. Sofern diese Änderung tatsächlich nicht zu einer Erhöhung der Gesamtbeträge für die betreffenden Fonds führen und an den zugrunde liegenden Problemen gearbeitet wird, stimme ich dem Bericht zu.

3-343-500

**Claudio Morganti (EFD)**, *per iscritto*. – Questa relazione si prefigge lo scopo di approvare una proposta della Commissione europea volta ad aumentare la possibilità di cofinanziamento da parte dell'UE per il Fondo per le frontiere esterne per gli Stati membri che si trovano in difficoltà finanziarie.

Mi sembra una misura giusta poiché, per quanto riguarda i nostri confini esterni, l'Unione europea dovrebbe intervenire in maniera più massiccia. Non si possono infatti lasciare pochi Stati membri da soli a farsi carico di affrontare e ricevere pesanti flussi migratori. Si parla spesso, a volte a sproposito, di solidarietà europea. Questo mi sembra un ambito di applicazione in cui questo principio dovrebbe realmente valere.

Le insurrezioni della cosiddetta Primavera araba del 2011, le cui conseguenze sono ancora lontane dall'essere pienamente comprese, hanno ad esempio portato migliaia di cittadini nordafricani a cercar rifugio in Italia. Dall'Europa non è giunto alcun sostegno concreto, ma piuttosto solamente critiche ingenerose per come è stata gestita la situazione. L'Unione europea deve quindi farsi carico di una migliore gestione delle frontiere esterne, non solo a parole, ma con azioni e iniziative concrete.

3-343-562

**Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už. 2007 m. priimtas sprendimas dėl Išorės sienų fondo modifikuojamas atsižvelgiant į būtinybę padaryti fondo lėšas prieinamas ES šalims, kovojantiems su ekonominės ir finansinės krizės padariniais, esant vis labiau ribotiems jų nacionaliniams resursams. Tai reikalinga, kad būtų užtikrintas bendras ES tikslas plėtoti išsamią ES migracijos politiką, kuri prisidėtų prie ES konkurencingumo, socialinės sanglaudos ir bendrosios ES prieglobsčio sistemos sukūrimo. Todėl laikinai Sąjungos bendrojo finansavimo dalis bus padidinta, o nacionalinė bendro finansavimo dalis sumažės valstybėms, patiriančioms didelius finansinio stabilumo sunkumus. Veiksminga ES išorės sienų apsauga yra vienas iš būsimos Lietuvos pirmininkavimo ES Tarybai prioritetų.

3-343-625

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Pritariu pateiktam pasiūlymui, kad valstybėms, susiduriančioms su itin dideliais finansiniais sunkumais, būtų padidinta bendro finansavimo norma ir kartu sumažėtų nacionalinė bendro finansavimo dalis. Kai kurių valstybių narių biudžeto suvaržymai užkerta kelią efektyviam programų įgyvendinimui bei projektų vykdymo tęstinumui. Be to, valstybės vienos yra nepajėgios spręsti svarbius uždavinius migracijos, prieglobsčio ir išorės sienų srityse. Joms reikalinga ES finansinė parama. Visų pirma, reikia palengvinti ES lėšų, skirtų valdymui migracijos, prieglobsčio ir išorės sienų

srityse, gavimą. Antra, valstybėms turėtų būti pagerintas lėšų prieinamumas, kad jos įgyvendintų savo metines programas pagal fondus.

3-343-750

**Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE)**, *γραφτιώς*. – Η παρούσα απόφαση στηρίζει τις μεγάλες προσπάθειες που καταβάλλει η Ελλάδα το τελευταίο χρονικό διάστημα για την καταπολέμηση της παράνομης μετανάστευσης. Και είναι σημαντικό ότι, σε συνεργασία με τους εισηγητές των άλλων πολιτικών ομάδων, την Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και το Συμβούλιο, προχωρήσαμε και ολοκληρώσαμε πολύ γρήγορα την διαδικασία ώστε η χώρα άμεσα να επωφεληθεί από τις νέες προβλέψεις. Με την αύξηση των ποσοστών κοινοτικής χρηματοδότησης, η Ελλάδα θα μπορέσει να υποστηρίξει έργα που μέχρι σήμερα απαιτούσαν μεγαλύτερη εθνική συμμετοχή και λόγω της οικονομικής κρίσης ήταν αδύνατον να χρηματοδοτηθεί από μόνη της, όπως για παράδειγμα ανακαίνιση κέντρων κράτησης και βελτίωση του τεχνικού εξοπλισμού που είναι απαραίτητος για την αποτελεσματική εποπτεία των συνόρων. Είναι αισιόδοξο το γεγονός ότι οι εταίροι μας αναγνωρίζουν ολοένα και περισσότερο την ανάγκη για επίδειξη αλληλεγγύης σε κράτη μέλη, όπως η χώρα μας, που σηκώνουν αρκετές φορές για λογαριασμό ολόκληρης της Ε.Ε. δυσανάλογο βάρος στον τομέα αντιμετώπισης των παράνομων μεταναστευτικών ροών. Και βεβαίως προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση είχαν μεγάλη σημασία η αποτελεσματικότητα, η αποφασιστικότητα και τα σημαντικά αποτελέσματα που έχει επιδείξει σε σύντομο χρονικό διάστημα η ελληνική κυβέρνηση και το αρμόδιο Υπουργείο.

3-343-875

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – O presente relatório sobre a proposta de decisão do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho que altera a Decisão n.º 573/2007/CE, a Decisão n.º 575/2007/CE e a Decisão 2007/435/CE do Conselho, com vista a aumentar a taxa de cofinanciamento do Fundo Europeu para os Refugiados, do Fundo Europeu de Regresso e do Fundo Europeu para a Integração de Nacionais de Países Terceiros, no que diz respeito a determinadas disposições relacionadas com a gestão financeira, a favor de certos Estados-Membros confrontados ou ameaçados com dificuldades graves de estabilidade financeira tem por base as mesmas razões que aduzi na minha intervenção no âmbito do processo A7-0433/2012, pelo que votei aqui também a proposta de aumento do cofinanciamento por parte da UE de 50 para 70%.

3-344-000

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – In favour. It is in the interests of all Member States that the commitments made with regard to migration do not suffer from the economic difficulties in some Member States. As the participants to the recent Committee on Civil Liberties mission to Greece have born witness, there are a number of projects in the making that require increased co-financing rates in order to be implemented. This applies to, for example, the renovation of detention centres in poor condition and improvements in technical equipment needed for efficient border management. It is essential that Member States with significant economic challenges still can handle the tasks related to the management of migration flows.

3-344-500

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Ho espresso parere positivo sulla proposta di decisione del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica la decisione n. 574/2007/CE al fine di aumentare il tasso di cofinanziamento del Fondo per le frontiere



esterne per alcuni Stati membri che si trovano o rischiano di trovarsi in gravi difficoltà di stabilità finanziaria. Oggi, a causa della grave situazione economica, alcuni Stati membri hanno riscontrato difficoltà nel soddisfare i requisiti di cofinanziamento connessi ai fondi dell'UE, che sono risultati evidenti anche per quanto concerne i fondi relativi al quadro del programma generale "Solidarietà e gestione dei flussi migratori". L'obiettivo della proposta è di aumentare il tasso di cofinanziamento dell'Unione di 20 punti percentuali, diminuendo così le esigenze di cofinanziamento da parte dello Stato membro interessato. Ciò porterebbe il tasso di cofinanziamento al 70%, che potrebbe essere aumentato fino al 95% per i progetti concernenti le priorità specifiche e gli Stati membri che beneficiano del Fondo di coesione. Una gestione efficace dei flussi migratori è molto importante per tutta l'Unione europea. L'incapacità di uno Stato membro di assicurare una gestione efficiente dei flussi migratori non solo si ripercuote sul Paese in questione, ma anche su molti altri Stati membri

3-344-750

**Catherine Stihler (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour as this proposal is here to assist in the smooth implementation of programmes adopted under Funds established as part of the General Programme on 'Solidarity and Management of Migration Flows' and is of particular importance as a means of injecting funds into the economy.

3-345-000

**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – Je suis, d'une manière générale, favorable aux propositions visant à majorer le taux de cofinancement pour les États membres bénéficiaires d'une aide financière. La raison d'être du Fonds en question est de créer un mécanisme de solidarité entre les États membres pour la gestion des flux migratoires. Cette tâche n'est pas également partagée entre les États membres; il est donc justifié de réévaluer les exigences de cofinancement compte tenu des défis économiques actuels. Une bonne gestion des flux migratoires revêt une grande importance pour l'ensemble de l'Union européenne. L'incapacité d'un seul État membre à assurer une gestion efficace de ces flux a des incidences non seulement sur celui-ci mais aussi sur bon nombre d'autres États membres.

3-345-500

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A solidariedade europeia reveste-se no apoio e na entajuda dos Estados-Membros, mesmo que não expostos a certos problemas. É o caso do fluxo e gestão das migrações, a que certos países como a Grécia, a Itália e Malta se encontram mais expostos. A crise económica e financeira que afeta a União diminui a capacidade de cofinanciamento dos Estados-Membros. Por estas razões, e de forma a não criar mais desequilíbrios nos próprios países, a Comissão Europeia apresenta um plano de aumento do cofinanciamento para o Fundo para as Fronteiras Externas, para o Fundo Europeu para os Refugiados, para o Fundo Europeu de Regresso e para o Fundo Europeu para a Integração de Nacionais de Países Terceiros. Não podemos deixar que as dificuldades financeiras ponham em causa a nossa política de migração e que diminuam a proteção das inúmeras pessoas que procuram a Europa.

3-346-000

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Kryzys gospodarczy ostro dał się we znaki finansom publicznym w krajach UE. Niektóre kraje same zdołały przywrócić poziom finansów publicznych na właściwy tor, jednakże niektóre kraje musiały zwrócić się z prośbą o wsparcie finansowe. Komisja zaproponowała możliwość podniesienia poziomu

współfinansowania dla państw członkowskich korzystających z mechanizmu wsparcia finansowego. Propozycja ma na celu umożliwienie podniesienia poziomu współfinansowania przez Unię o 20 punktów procentowych. Może to skutkować większą solidarnością między państwami członkowskimi w dziedzinie zarządzania przepływami migracyjnymi. Może to wpłynąć na usprawnienie zarządzania w UE.

W interesie wszystkich państw członkowskich leży zatem, aby zobowiązania podjęte w związku z migracją nie ucierpiały z powodu trudności gospodarczych w danym państwie członkowskim. Jak mogą zaświadczyć członkowie niedawnej delegacji komisji LIBE do Grecji, wiele zaplanowanych przedsięwzięć wymaga zwiększonych poziomów współfinansowania, aby można było je zrealizować. Mowa tu np. o remontach ośrodków detencyjnych w złym stanie czy o poprawie wyposażenia technicznego niezbędnego do skutecznego zarządzania granicami.

3-346-500

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL),** *por escrito.* – Este relatório é perverso na sua fundamentação: utiliza a política de restrição orçamental e de destruição de direitos e conquistas sociais que está a ser imposta a países como Portugal para justificar o aumento da taxa de cofinanciamento da UE nestes fundos. Nada existe de solidariedade nesta decisão. Em primeiro lugar, porque ela mantém intocável uma política de emigração que criminaliza e reprime os imigrantes, que restringe a sua admissão e facilita a sua expulsão, que os expõe às redes de tráfico de seres humanos e à exploração como mão-de-obra ilegal, impondo-lhes uma situação próxima da escravatura. Em segundo lugar, nenhum aumento do cofinanciamento da UE nestes fundos poderá compensar a destruição de direitos sociais e laborais, a destruição de serviços públicos impostos pelas troikas (estrangeira e nacional), cujas consequências afetarão não apenas os trabalhadores e o povo destes países, mas igualmente os imigrantes, tendo em conta a sua situação social e laboral frágil. Pela nossa parte, consideramos fundamental uma política de imigração mais justa, mais humana e mais democrática, que assegure o respeito pelos direitos de todos os trabalhadores, sem discriminação quanto à sua origem nacional e com respeito pela sua dignidade e pelas suas legítimas aspirações a uma vida melhor.

### **8.8. Διατήρηση των αλιευτικών πόρων (A7-0342/2012 - Pat the Cope Gallagher)**

3-348-000

#### **Oral explanations of vote**

3-349-000

**Andrea Zanoni (ALDE).** - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la sovraccapacità di pesca sta distruggendo non solo la biodiversità dei nostri mari ma sta riducendo fortemente ogni possibilità di futuro per i pescatori dell'Unione. Il regolamento per la protezione del novellame rappresenta sicuramente uno strumento efficace se vogliamo veramente permettere agli stock ittici di ricostituirsi. Attraverso l'adozione di specifiche misure volte a stabilire il tipo di attrezzi utilizzati, la maglia delle reti, il rispetto delle quote di cattura autorizzate e i tempi durante i quali la pesca è consentita, possiamo e dobbiamo impedire che si continuino a pescare i piccoli dei pesci che devono poter crescere per ripopolare i nostri mari. Senza queste misure e senza severi controlli, il nostro mare non ha futuro. Purtroppo in molti paesi membri, e in particolare in Italia, non passa giorno senza che la

guardia costiera registri violazioni gravi del regolamento sulla protezione del novellame. La pesca europea potrà sopravvivere solo e soltanto se diventerà realmente sostenibile.

3-350-000

**Diane Dodds (NI).** - Madam President, I was happy to vote for Mr Gallagher's report on technical conservation measures, since aspects of this report are very important for sustainable fish stocks and for the measures which the industry might use to ensure this goal. However, it is deeply regrettable that despite delaying this report as a negotiating tool on the issue of long-term management plans, there has still not even begun to be an end to a resolution on the issue.

We have just voted on Parliament's position on the reform of the common fisheries policy. Central to that reform is the issue of long-term management plans. These plans are essential to preserving fish stocks and the future sustainability of the industry, yet we find ourselves in a dispute between three European institutions over the issue of competence. The most frustrating aspect of this is that all sides seem content for this to go to court, potentially delaying reform and its implementation, and consigning the industry to further years of haggling over yearly quotas in December. Madam President, this is an abject failure. Mr Cameron should make fisheries policy a key subject of British negotiation.

3-351-000

**Seán Kelly (PPE).** - Madam President, today's vote is a triumph in some respects for the power of Parliament when it stands up to the Council when necessary. The rapporteur, Mr Gallagher, made that point when he came before us some months ago and we decided to postpone the final vote because there was not proper cooperation from the Council. Since then, as a result of negotiations, there has been a promise that this cooperation would be forthcoming.

Hopefully that will ensue, because long-term fishing plans are absolutely vital. When you are talking about a resource like fish in the sea, long-term planning is essential, particularly to preserve stocks and to allow them to grow into the future. It makes absolute sense.

What is needed here is a meeting of minds, taking a broad view of what is good for the environment, what is good for fishing and what is good for citizens generally. But at the end of the day, it all comes down to discussion and cooperation. The Council have to cooperate. Mr Gallagher has made his point clearly and we support him fully in that.

3-352-000

### Γραπτές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

3-352-031

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D),** *por escrito.* – Aprovo o presente relatório, tendo em conta que as medidas técnicas de conservação de recursos haliêuticos são elementos centrais de uma abordagem regionalizada da gestão das pescas e vêm juntar-se às decisões anuais e bianuais tomadas em relação às possibilidades de captura. As medidas técnicas fixam as regras relativas às zonas de pesca e às artes de pesca, ao contrário das quantidades (esforço de pesca) e/ou capturas (TAC e quotas) autorizadas. A presente proposta da Comissão tenciona alargar as disposições relativas às medidas técnicas para ainda mais um período de transição até que seja adotado um enquadramento regional para as medidas técnicas, em conformidade com a PCP. Como a PCP não entrará em vigor antes de 1 de janeiro de 2013,

quando as medidas técnicas transitórias expirarão, a Comissão propõe uma vez mais uma solução intermediária, modificando o ato jurídico de base, com termo incerto. No entanto, saliento que é de lamentar que se apresente de novo outra proposta ao Parlamento relativa às medidas técnicas transitórias; teria sido preferível encontrar uma solução permanente no devido tempo. Os pescadores europeus precisam de segurança jurídica e o termo "temporalidade" não deve ser utilizado em vão.

3-352-046

**Sophie Auconie (PPE)**, *par écrit* . – J'ai soutenu ce texte qui maintient des mesures techniques de conservation. Il s'agit de règles à observer chaque jour par les pêcheurs lorsqu'ils partent en mer pour garantir que la manière et le lieu de l'activité de pêche respectent le développement durable. Ces mesures concernent les tailles minimales de débarquement, les tailles minimales des maillages des filets tout comme les zones de pêche. Le but est ici d'inciter à utiliser des engins de pêche plus sélectifs afin de protéger l'environnement marin.

3-352-054

**Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D)**, *raštu* . – Balsavau už šį siūlymą dėl techninių priemonių jūrų gyvūnų jaunikliams apsaugoti taikymo pratęsimo. Šiuo siūlymu siekiama užtikrinti ES žuvininkystės išteklių apsaugą. Komisijos teigimu apie 75 % Europos Sąjungos žuvų išteklių yra pereikvoti, o dėl netausios žuvininkystės Sąjunga kasmet praranda apie 1,8 mlrd. EUR. Techninės žuvininkystės išteklių išsaugojimo priemonės yra taisyklės, kurių privalo laikytis žvejai ES vykdydami žvejybą, siekiant, kad ji būtų tausi. Šios priemonės atlieka pagrindinį vaidmenį priimant sprendimus dėl galimo leistino žvejybos laimikio dydžio. Jomis nustatomos taisyklės dėl žvejybos zonų, draudžiamų laikotarpių įrankių ir kt. Pritariu išdėstytiems siūlymams, kad šios priemonės negali būti suvokiamos kaip bendro pobūdžio taisyklės, vienodai taikomos visoms valstybėms narėms. Būtina parengti konkretiems atvejams ir zonoms skirtas technines priemones. Viena iš problemų, kurias reikėtų spręsti – neatsižvelgimas į mokslininkų rekomendacijas, todėl pritariu raginimui suformuluojant ir rengiant šias priemones atsižvelgti į žuvininkystės valdymo kintamumą ir mokslines rekomendacijas.

3-352-062

**Francesca Barracciu (S&D)**, *per iscritto* . – L'approvazione di queste misure in concomitanza con il voto sul nuovo Regolamento relativo alla politica comune della pesca dà il senso di un approccio integrato, e ampiamente condiviso in Parlamento, ad un tema fondamentale per la sostenibilità futura delle risorse ittiche dell'Unione. In attesa che si adotti un quadro regionalizzato di misure tecniche in conformità della politica comune della pesca, questo Regolamento potrà sicuramente contribuire ad un soddisfacente raggiungimento degli obiettivi della PCP.

3-352-125

**Nora Berra (PPE)**, *par écrit* . – Les mesures techniques de conservation sont des règles à observer chaque jour par les pêcheurs, dans toute l'Union européenne, afin de garantir que la manière et le lieu de l'activité de pêche répondent aux critères du développement durable. J'accorde donc ma voix au rapporteur Pat the Cope Gallagher, qui reconnaît la nécessité de ces mesures, tout en révélant qu'elles doivent être formulées et conçues en harmonie avec la nature évolutive de la gestion de la pêche et en accord avec les avis scientifiques. En

effet, le rapporteur fait observer que des mesures techniques mal conçues ou inappropriées peuvent avoir pour résultat des pratiques de pêche non durables.

3-352-250

**Mara Bizzotto (EFD)**, *per iscritto*. – Ho sostenuto col mio voto la relazione Gallagher sulla modifica del regolamento (CE) n. 850/98 del Consiglio per la conservazione delle risorse della pesca attraverso misure tecniche per la protezione del novellame e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1288/2009 del Consiglio. Le misure tecniche fissano le norme relative alle zone di pesca, agli attrezzi utilizzati rispetto alle quantità consentite, le dimensioni minime delle maglie delle reti, le zone e i periodi di divieto. Il testo propone una proroga transitoria delle norme su tali misure, che resteranno valide fino a quando non sarà adottato un quadro di misure tecniche conforme alla nuova Politica comune della pesca, oltre a un loro aggiornamento in seguito al parere elaborato dal Comitato scientifico tecnico ed economico per la pesca.

3-352-500

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį pranešimą, kadangi norint išsaugoti žuvų išteklius ir apsaugoti jų ekosistemą yra būtina nustatyti konkrečias taisykles dėl žvejybos zonų ir įrankių. Žuvų išteklių išsaugojimo sąlygas būtina parengti atsižvelgiant į žuvininkystės valdymo kintamumą ir mokslines rekomendacijas. Svarbu pažymėti, jog Tarybos reglamentas dėl žuvininkystės buvo parengtas, siekiant vėliau jį iš dalies pakeisti, kad būtų sukurta nuolatinė techninių priemonių sistema, vadovaujantis Sutartimi dėl Europos Sąjungos veikimo, tačiau nebuvo pasiektas politinis susitarimas. Europos žvejams reikalingas teisinis aiškumas, o žodis „laikiniai“ neduoda jokių garantijų šioje srityje. Prastai parengus arba nustatčius netinkamas technines priemones, gali susiformuoti netausios žvejybos praktika, o tam tikrais atvejais gali kilti pavojus žvejų gyvybei ir saugai, o tai būtų visiškai nepriimtina. Taigi tinkamai išnagrinėti pasiūlymai turi būti priimami kuo skubiau.

3-353-000

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Pentru conservarea și buna administrare a resurselor de pescuit au fost adoptate măsuri tehnice de conservare aplicabile, între altele, dimensiunilor năvoadelor, mărimilor autorizate pentru peștii ce pot fi pescuiți, precum și restricțiilor privind capturile din anumite zone, din anumite perioade, ori efectuate cu anumite tipuri de ambarcațiuni. Cu toate acestea, consider că Uniunea Europeană va trebui să accepte în viitorii ani provocarea de a stabili și menține un echilibru susținut și economic viabil între conservarea resurselor și exploatarea lor. Acest lucru este fundamental pentru supraviețuirea industriei piscicole și, totodată, pentru menținerea slujbelor și pentru viitorul sectorului în ansamblul său.

3-353-250

**Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – W głosowaniu poparłem sprawozdanie dotyczące zachowania zasobów połowowych. W dokumencie znajdują się szczegółowe opisy technicznych środków ochrony zasobów połowowych, określających m.in. zasady dotyczące stref połowów, sezonów zakazu połowów, narzędzi połowowych, a także minimalnych rozmiarów konkretnych gatunków wylawianych ryb. Niezwykle ważne jest, by w tym zagadnieniu zastosowano podejście regionalne, które przy określaniu technicznych środków ochrony zasobów połowowych bierze pod uwagę specyfikę poszczególnych akwenów. Mam nadzieję, iż proponowane rozwiązania przyczynią się

do zrównoważonego zarządzania zasobami połowowymi oraz lepszej ochrony środowiska morskiego.

3-353-500

**John Bufton (EFD)**, *in writing*. – The UK should be in charge of its own waters and fishing stocks and, if this were the case, I firmly believe that a British national conservation plan would be implemented to ensure that no overfishing took place.

3-353-531

**Cristian Silviu Buşoi (ALDE)**, *în scris*. – Resursele halieutice trebuie conservate pentru a putea avea un mediu marin sustenabil și pentru a menține stocurile de pește. Raportul domnului Gallagher stabilește niște măsuri tehnice care vor crea un plan de management pe termen lung în industria pescuitului. Un bun exemplu în acest sens îl reprezintă reglementarea dimensiunii plaselor de pescuit în Marea Neagră, fapt neacoperit până acum de nicio legislație și care va duce la protejarea puietului de pește și la dezvoltarea faunei marine din aceste ape. În același timp, disputa interinstituțională trebuie să înceteze pentru că altfel va duce la întârzierea adoptării politicilor necesare, lucru care poate avea consecințe destul de grave asupra întregii industrii.

3-353-562

**Alain Cadec (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté pour le rapport Gallagher relatif aux mesures techniques de conservation des ressources de pêche. J'estime en effet que la mise à jour des mesures existantes selon les derniers avis scientifiques était nécessaire. Ce rapport permettra de garantir que les stocks halieutiques soient pêchés de manière durable, et que les écosystèmes soient maintenus et protégés. Je me réjouis donc de l'adoption de ce texte, d'autant que des mesures techniques inappropriées peuvent avoir pour résultat non seulement des pratiques de pêche non durables, mais aussi, dans certaines circonstances, la mise en danger de la vie et de la sécurité des pêcheurs.

3-353-593

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente este relatório por acreditar que é necessário assegurar a sustentabilidade dos recursos da pesca e também assegurar que unidades populacionais de peixe são pescadas de forma sustentável e que os ecossistemas onde vivem são preservados. Medidas técnicas mal concebidas ou inapropriadas podem levar a práticas de pesca insustentáveis e, em certas circunstâncias, podem colocar em risco as vidas e a segurança dos pescadores.

3-353-609

**Corina Crețu (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Susțin acest proiect pentru că este necesară o abordare regionalizată în gestionarea pescuitului. Măsurile tehnice de conservare trebuie să fie respectate de toți pescarii în vederea protejării ecosistemului și pentru a permite dezvoltarea unei activități sustenabile.

3-353-625

**Tadeusz Cymański (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Przyjęliśmy dziś ważne sprawozdanie dotyczące przyszłości wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa. Zmiany w tym obszarze miałyby wejść w życie od początku 2014 roku. Głównym celem rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady jest stworzenie warunków dla odnowienia się zasobów ryb do 2020 roku, tak aby

rybołówstwo w Europie stało się zrównoważonym sektorem. Przyjęte rozwiązania zakładają większą ochronę zasobów morskich. Odnowione zasoby ryb będą generować większy połów, więc w dalszej perspektywie oczekiwana tendencja powinna prowadzić do tworzenia nowych miejsc pracy w sektorze.

3-353-750

**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Consider că pentru asigurarea conservării și gestionării corespunzătoare a resurselor biologice marine în Marea Neagră ar trebui să se stabilească dimensiunea minimă pentru debarcare și dimensiunea minimă a ochiurilor de plasă pentru pescuitul de calcan.

3-353-875

**Edite Estrela (S&D)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente o relatório sobre "Conservação dos recursos da pesca", pois permitirá alargar as disposições relativas às medidas técnicas transitórias até que seja adotado um enquadramento regional, em conformidade com a PCP, tendo em vista garantir a sustentabilidade das atividades da pesca.

3-354-000

**Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I am delighted that the vote on the Gallagher report has finally taken place. The Council's refusal to engage fully with Parliament has been regrettable and it is time for them to accept that the Lisbon Treaty has given this House legislative competence. Nevertheless, whilst interinstitutional issues may seem important to us, we should never lose sight of the people we have been elected to represent. My job is to represent the fishing industry in Wales and the vital role it plays in the economy. The ministers in the Council must accept this too – and in future must work to protect the jobs which are so vital to our coastal communities.

3-354-500

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Concordo com o relator quanto a ser preferível dar aos pescadores e às empresas do setor um quadro jurídico estável no tocante às medidas técnicas que lhes são aplicáveis. A manutenção da transitoriedade em questões desta natureza não contribui para a segurança jurídica daqueles atores e constitui, por isso, fator de instabilidade. A matéria sobre que versam estas medidas técnicas é particularmente delicada. A conservação dos recursos haliêuticos é essencial para a sustentabilidade, não apenas da biodiversidade marinha, mas da pesca enquanto atividade humana geradora de receitas e produtora de sociedades e culturas particulares que urge proteger. Sem o recurso natural que lhe subjaz, estas estariam necessariamente condenadas ao desaparecimento. Desejo que a conservação dos recursos piscatórios se faça com rigor bastante e flexibilidade suficiente para permitir responder atempadamente e com atenção aos interesses dos principais atores concretos e às suas circunstâncias específicas, sempre que tal seja possível sem que seja posta em causa a preservação dos ecossistemas e a renovação das espécies.

3-354-750

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Todos sabemos que a sobrepesca destrói a diversidade marinha e reduz as perspetivas de futuro para os nossos pescadores ao impedirem a reposição de estoques. Para evitar que tal aconteça, temos de garantir uma gestão sustentável dos recursos haliêuticos. O relatório que acabámos de votar, elaborado pelo colega Pat the Cope Gallagher, assenta numa proposta de regulamento do Parlamento

Europeu (PE) e do Conselho que altera o Regulamento (CE) n.º 850/1998 do Conselho sobre a conservação dos recursos da pesca através de determinadas medidas técnicas de proteção dos juvenis de organismos marinhos e revoga o Regulamento (CE) n.º 1288/2009 do Conselho. Porque a União Europeia deve ser um exemplo a nível mundial, votei favoravelmente este relatório e entendo que a pesca só tem futuro se for autenticamente sustentável. Para tal, são necessários planos de gestão que evitem a captura de juvenis e preservem o seu crescimento até à fase adulta. Com este regulamento, serão definidas as malhas das redes a utilizar, bem como os períodos de defeso, de modo a não afetar a normal reposição de estoques.

3-355-000

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – As medidas técnicas estabelecem as regras sobre as zonas e artes de pesca utilizadas em oposição a quantidades (esforço de pesca) e/ou capturas (TAC e quotas) autorizados. Esta proposta da Comissão pretende ampliar as regras sobre as medidas técnicas de proteção dos juvenis de organismos marinhos para mais um período de transição, até que, num quadro de regionalização para as medidas técnicas, de acordo com a futura Política Comum das Pescas, seja aprovado um novo enquadramento. O anterior regulamento integrava uma medida de interdição à pesca com redes de tresmalho em profundidades abaixo dos 200 metros, que era muito gravosa e discriminatória para a frota portuguesa que pescava tamboril até, aproximadamente, aos 400m de profundidade – medidas que careciam de base científica. Saudamos a disponibilidade do relator para acolher a proposta de alteração que apresentámos, relativa à utilização de redes de tresmalho na subzona CIEM IX, com determinadas condições, visando pôr fim à referida discriminação. Votámos a favor do relatório.

3-355-500

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Technické ochranné opatrenia pre zdroje rybolovu patria k najdôležitejším prvkom regionalizovaného prístupu k rybnému hospodárstvu a dostávajú sa do popredia rozhodnutí o lovných možnostiach. Stanovujú pravidlá na rybolovné zóny a používaný rybársky výstroj v protiklade s povolenými množstvami (rybolovné úsilie) alebo úlovkami (TAC a kvóty). Technické ochranné opatrenia sú pravidlá, ktorých sa rybári v celej Európskej únii musia každodenne pridržiavať, keď sa vydávajú na rybársku expedíciu, aby sa zabezpečilo, že spôsob a miesto lovu rýb sa uskutočňujú udržateľne. Opatrenia súvisia s minimálnymi veľkosťami vykladaných úlovkov, minimálnymi veľkosťami ôk, zónami a uzavretými sezónami, obmedzovaním vedľajšieho výlovu, kritériami na používanie selektívnejšieho rybárskeho výstroja a opatreniami určenými na ochranu morského prostredia, a preto majú značný vplyv na dosiahnutie cieľov spoločnej politiky v oblasti rybného hospodárstva. Domnievam sa, že v záujme zabezpečenia kontinuity náležitej ochrany a riadenia morských biologických zdrojov je potrebné predmetné nariadenie zodpovedajúcim spôsobom aktualizovať a tiež vynaložiť úsilie na dosiahnutie politickej dohody v danej problematike.

3-355-625

**Jim Higgins (PPE)**, *in writing*. – I believe that it is very important to make sure that fish stocks are fished in a manner which is not only sustainable but also in a manner which does not destroy the ecosystems of the fish and that is the reason why I have voted in favour of this report. As the technical measures under the CFP will not be coming into force before 1 January 2014, we must support the extension of the technical rules in place for a transitional period. These measures relating to the rules on fishing gear, such as the net



mesh used by fishermen, are essential in order to ensure sustainability, protect ecosystems and also protect the safety of fishermen throughout Europe. On this basis, I am glad to support this report and the measures proposed within it.

3-355-875

**Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį pasiūlymą. Pritariu tam, kad reikalingos tokios priemonės, kurios būtų sukurtos užtikrinti, kad žuvų išteklių būtų žvejojami tausiai ir kad būtų išsaugotos ekosistemos, kuriose žuvis gyvena. Be to, šias priemones reikia suformuluoti ir parengti atsižvelgiant į žuvininkystės valdymo kintamumą ir mokslines rekomendacijas.

3-355-750

**David Martin (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The technical conservation measures for fishery resources are among the key elements of a regionalised approach to fisheries management and come on top of the annual/ biannual decisions on catch possibilities. Technical measures lay down the rules on fishing zones and fishing gear used as opposed to quantities (fishing effort) and/or catches (TACs and quotas) authorised. Technical conservation measures are rules, which our fishermen throughout the European Union must follow on a daily basis when undertaking a fishing expedition in order to ensure that how and where fishing activity is carried out it is done so in a sustainable manner. The measures relate to minimum landing sizes, minimum net mesh sizes, zones and closed seasons, limiting by-catch, the criteria to use more selective fishing gears and measures designed to protect the marine environment and have thus a considerable impact in achieving the objectives of the Common fisheries policy (CFP).

3-355-812

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A conservação dos recursos da pesca é essencial para a manutenção das espécies e para a atividade pesqueira. Para o meu país, Portugal, com grande tradição no setor das pescas, é essencial manter a pesca como uma atividade económica viável e sustentável. A manutenção dos recursos da pesca em bom nível é importante para se conseguir os efetivos necessários para consumo e para que as espécies mantenham intactas as suas capacidades de reprodução e a sua integridade genética. Daí o meu voto favorável.

3-356-000

**Louis Michel (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Si l'on veut faire de la pêche un secteur durable, il est impératif de tenir compte de ses ressources et par conséquent éviter d'épuiser les stocks halieutiques. Pour ce faire, parallèlement à la politique commune de pêche réformée, certaines mesures techniques doivent être prises.

Pour assurer un développement durable de ce secteur, tout pêcheur doit respecter les normes relatives au matériel utilisé. Il doit également pêcher en fonction des zones et des périodes de fermeture. Dernier élément, et non des moindres, une attention toute particulière doit être accordée à la protection de la faune marine; quoi de plus normal si l'on veut permettre aux stocks halieutiques de se reconstituer.

C'est en respectant l'environnement marin et les règles relatives à la pêche que l'on arrivera à un résultat optimal. La prise en compte de cette réglementation et sa mise en œuvre est à cet effet un élément-clé.

3-356-500

**Alexander Mirsky (S&D)**, *in writing*. – Technical conservation measures are rules, which our fishermen throughout the European Union must follow on a daily basis when undertaking a fishing expedition in order to ensure that how and where fishing activity is carried out, it is done so in a sustainable manner. The measures relate to minimum landing sizes, minimum net mesh sizes, zones and closed seasons, limiting by-catch, the criteria to use more selective fishing gears and measures designed to protect the marine environment and have thus a considerable impact in achieving the objectives of the common fisheries policy. I would add also river and lake environment. I am in favour.

3-357-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Ein regionalisierter Ansatz für die Bestandsbewirtschaftung, basierend auf technischen Maßnahmen zur Erhaltung der Fischereiresourcen, in deren Rahmen die Vorschriften über Fanggebiete und Fanggeräte festgelegt, nicht jedoch die Fangquoten festgelegt werden, mag wichtiger Teil der Schutzbestimmungen sein. Das Problem liegt wie immer in der praktischen Umsetzung. Diese Überlegungen habe ich in mein Abstimmungsverhalten einfließen lassen.

3-358-000

**Rareş-Lucian Niculescu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Salut aprobarea, prin vot final, a raportului Gallagher, după mai multe luni de amânare, pe fondul lipsei unui acord cu Consiliul în ceea ce priveşte competenţele. În cadrul acestui raport au fost adoptate două amendamente importante, care reglementează pescuitul în Marea Neagră, domeniu în care există un veritabil vid legislativ. Măsurile aprobate reglementează dimensiunea plaselor de pescuit utilizate, iar prin aceasta contribuie semnificativ la protecţia puietului de peşte din apele acestei mări.

3-358-062

**Siiri Oviir (ALDE)**, *kirjalikult*. – Arvestades Euroopa praegust läbikukkunud kalanduspoliitikat, kus statistika kohaselt toimub kalavarude suur ülepüük (näiteks 80% Vahemere ning 27% Atlandi kalavarudest on ülepüütud), toetasin antud raportit, et tagada Euroopa kalavarude jätkusuutlikkus. Viimase tagamist silmas pidades on mul hea meel tõdeda, et parlamendi heakskiidu leidsid muudatusettepanekud nr 5, 7 ja 60, mille kohaselt peavad kalurid arvestama alates 2015. aastast jätkusuutliku saagikuse tagamise nõudega, mille kohaselt ei tohi kindlat kalaliiki püüda rohkem, kui on selle liigi reprodutseerimisvõime ühe aasta kohta. Hääletamisel olin päri oma fraktsiooni – ALDE – enamike seisukohtadega antud küsimuses, kuid mõnes jäin ka eriarvamusele. Need olid küsimused, mis puudutasid teatud lisapiiranguid kalapüügilaevadele (nt muudatusettepanek nr 274) ja muid lisatäpsustusi (nt muudatusettepanekud nr 116, 94 jne). Loodan, et seekordne ELi kalanduspoliitika reform annab soovitud tulemuse, st saavutatakse Euroopa kalavarude taastumine 2020. aastaks tasemel, mis on jätkusuutlik ka tulevikus. Selleks tuleb aga reformi rakendamisel tugineda mitmeaastasele põhjalikule kalavarude planeerimisele ning piisavale järelvalvele.

3-358-125

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Pritariu šio reglamento pakeitimams, kuriais numatoma pratęsti taisyklių dėl techninių priemonių galiojimą dar vienam pereinamajam laikotarpiui. Tokiu būdu bus užtikrintas teisinis tikrumas ir jūrų išteklių apsauga. Pažymėtina, kad norint

užtikrinti tausią žvejybą labai svarbu užtikrinti tinkamą žuvų išteklių apsaugą. Techninės žuvininkystės išteklių išsaugojimo priemonės padės užkirsti kelią išteklių išsekimui taip pat išlaikyti gerą jūros ekosistemų aplinkos būklę. Ypatingą dėmesį reikia skirti į jūrą išmetamų žuvų kiekio sumažinimui, taip pat būtina nustatyti tokias priemones, kurios padėtų efektyviai kovoti su aplinkai kenksminga žvejyba. Tam, kad jūrų ištekliai būtų toliau tinkamai saugomi ir valdomi, manau, kad komisijai turėtų būti suteikti įgaliojimai jei prireikia nedelsiant imtis veiksmų dėl jūros organizmų išteklių apsaugos.

3-358-250

**Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D)**, *in writing*. – The main issues at hand for the conservation of fishery resources are the multi-annual plan of the salmon sector in the Baltic, shark fining in southern Europe and small-scale fisheries. All of these issues at hand require a precise amount of regulation to ensure the success of each of these programmes under the amendments to the conservation of fishery resources. While this will be difficult to carry out, if we collectively join forces in a manner that is unified this can result in great achievements across many sectors of our Union. I voted in favour of this report, because the multi-annual plan for the Baltic salmon stock will manage to increase stock to ensure maximum sustainability, as well as yield. The eradication of shark fining will both improve the ecosystems for sharks and help small-scale fisheries. Because of this, the economy will also be improved because three out of every four small-scale vessels are generating jobs and increasing incomes, boosting the economy within their local communities, as well as nationally. All in all sustainability will be the principal outcome from this proposal. The socio-economic sector as well as the environmental sector will all profit generously from these amendments.

3-358-500

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – As medidas técnicas de conservação de recursos haliêuticos definem as regras relativas às zonas de pesca e artes de pesca, constituindo elementos fulcrais para uma abordagem regionalizada da gestão pesqueira. Este tipo de medidas destina-se a assegurar a sustentabilidade da atividade piscatória e é fundamental para atingir os objetivos preconizados na Política Comum das Pescas (PCP). As medidas técnicas de conservação incluem o estabelecimento de zonas e períodos de defeso, limitação de capturas acessórias, definição da malhagem mínima das redes e de tamanhos mínimos de desembarque das espécies, contemplando ainda critérios para a utilização de artes de pesca mais seletivas e adoção de medidas de proteção ambiental. Neste contexto, o presente relatório propôs uma atualização das medidas técnicas existentes e a adoção de medidas específicas destinadas à redução das rejeições. O relatório consagrou ainda uma alteração resultante de uma pretensão portuguesa, destinada a permitir à frota nacional que opera com redes de tresmalho voltar a capturar tamboril entre 200 e 600 metros de profundidade. Votei favoravelmente o presente relatório por concordar com a importância destas medidas técnicas para a conservação dos recursos pesqueiros, bem como com a salvaguarda dos legítimos interesses do setor da pesca nacional.

3-359-250

**Robert Rochefort (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Selon la Commission européenne, 80% des stocks de poissons en Méditerranée et 47% dans l'Atlantique sont affectés par la surpêche. Une réforme majeure de la politique commune de la pêche est donc urgente, et j'ai apporté mon soutien à ce texte, tout en ayant le souci de préserver la pêche artisanale et récréative de restrictions excessives. Les points principaux sont les suivants : - Respect du rendement

maximal durable : à partir de 2015, interdiction de pêcher plus que ce qu'un stock donné peut produire en une année déterminée - les stocks devraient ainsi être reconstitués d'ici 2020. - Fin des rejets en mer en raison de l'espèce ou de la taille des poissons - un quart des captures totales de l'UE : débarquement obligatoire de toutes les captures conformément à un calendrier fixant des dates spécifiques pour les différentes pêches, qui débiterait en 2014. - Planification à long terme : plans pluriannuels de gestion de stocks de poissons, afin d'améliorer la prévisibilité du marché, et d'aider le secteur à mieux investir et à faire des plans pour l'avenir. Les négociations avec les États membres vont débiter, et j'espère que nous parviendrons à un accord au plus vite.

3-359-000

**Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – In favour. The technical conservation measures for fishery resources are among the key elements of a regionalised approach to fisheries management and come on top of the annual/biannual decisions on catch possibilities. Technical measures lay down the rules on fishing zones and fishing gear used, as opposed to quantities (fishing effort) and/or catches (TACs and quotas) authorised. Technical conservation measures are rules, which our fishermen throughout the European Union must follow on a daily basis when undertaking a fishing expedition in order to ensure that however and wherever fishing activity is carried out, it is done so in a sustainable manner. The measures relate to minimum landing sizes, minimum net mesh sizes, zones and closed seasons, limiting by-catch, the criteria to use more selective fishing gears and measures designed to protect the marine environment and have thus a considerable impact in achieving the objectives of the common fisheries policy (CFP).

3-359-500

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Sono favorevole alla proposta di regolamento del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio che modifica il regolamento (CE) n. 850/98 del Consiglio per la conservazione delle risorse della pesca attraverso misure tecniche per la protezione del novellame e che abroga il regolamento (CE) n. 1288/2009 del Consiglio, in quanto le misure tecniche di conservazione sono norme che i pescatori di tutta l'Unione europea sono tenuti a rispettare quotidianamente nelle proprie spedizioni di pesca per assicurare che l'attività alieutica sia sempre sostenibile, indipendentemente dalle modalità con cui è condotta e dal luogo in cui si esplica. Tali misure riguardano tra l'altro le taglie minime di sbarco, le dimensioni minime delle maglie delle reti, le zone e i periodi di divieto, la limitazione delle catture accessorie, i criteri per l'utilizzo di attrezzi da pesca più selettivi e i provvedimenti intesi a proteggere l'ambiente marino, incidendo dunque in modo significativo sul raggiungimento degli obiettivi della politica comune della pesca (PCP). Riconosco pertanto pienamente la necessità delle misure tecniche, che consentono di assicurare lo sfruttamento sostenibile degli stock ittici e la conservazione degli ecosistemi. Credo che i pescatori europei abbiano bisogno di maggiore chiarezza giuridica. .

3-359-750

**Catherine Stihler (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour as fisheries should be conserved in order to maintain sustainable fish stocks and a sustainable marine environment.

3-360-000

**Marc Tarabella (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – Non seulement la surpêche est un fléau qui détruit le milieu marin, mais elle risque aussi de faire disparaître près de 100 000 emplois européens et de précariser des communautés entières qui dépendent directement de la mer. À force de puiser dans les stocks de poissons, on diminue leur taille et le volume des captures. Les 4 millions de tonnes de poissons capturés n'arrivent pas à satisfaire la demande toujours plus grande des Européens, qui consomment 23,1 kilos de poisson par an et par personne. 90 % des stocks de Méditerranée font l'objet d'une surpêche. Il n'est pas trop tard pour agir, mais il est temps, sans quoi le mal de mer sera permanent!

3-360-500

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – As medidas técnicas de conservação de recursos haliêuticos são elementos centrais de uma abordagem regionalizada da gestão das pescas. As medidas técnicas fixam as regras relativas às zonas de pesca e às artes de pesca, ao contrário das quantidades (esforço de pesca) e/ou capturas (TAC e quotas) autorizadas. A presente proposta da Comissão tenciona alargar as disposições relativas às medidas técnicas para ainda mais um período de transição, até que seja adotado um enquadramento regional para as medidas técnicas, em conformidade com a Política Comum das Pescas. Como esta não entrará em vigor antes de 1 de janeiro de 2013, quando as medidas técnicas transitórias expirarão, a Comissão propõe uma vez mais uma solução intermédia. Para além da extensão da validade das medidas técnicas atuais, o texto proposto contém uma atualização das medidas existentes, assim como medidas para reduzir as devoluções no Atlântico Nordeste, mas que ainda não foram transpostas para o Direito da União. Pelos motivos descritos, votei a favor do documento.

3-360-750

**Isabelle Thomas (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du règlement mesures techniques sur lequel j'étais rapporteure pour mon groupe. Alors que le vote de ce texte ne visait qu'à proroger des mesures transitoires jusqu'en janvier 2014, dans l'attente de l'adoption de la réforme de la Politique commune de la pêche (PCP), nos débats ont permis d'anticiper la complexité de la refonte technique à venir. Tandis que le règlement de base de la PCP a pour vocation de définir les grandes orientations de la pêche pour les dix années à venir, la réglementation technique définit quant à elle les règles applicables par zone géographique, métier, stock ciblé, période de l'année, etc... Un véritable travail d'orfèvre permettant de mettre en pratique, au plus près des réalités territoriales, une politique pensée de manière globale. Les travaux sur ce texte transitoire ont donc permis de mettre les débats sur la PCP en perspective avec les réalités, et poser la question de la mise en œuvre de nombreuses mesures proposées dans la réforme, belles sur papier, mais dont la faisabilité au quotidien pose question, telles que le débarquement obligatoire des rejets par exemple. La suite en 2014...

3-360-875

**Rafał Trzaskowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Przyjęte sprawozdanie to gwarancja lepszej przyszłości tak dla europejskiego, jak i polskiego rybołówstwa. Reforma wspólnej polityki rybołówstwa Unii ma na celu zapobieganie zjawisku przełowienia zasobów rybnych poprzez wprowadzenie zrównoważonych połowów oraz stworzenie warunków, w których zasoby ryb odnowią się do roku 2020. Niezwykle ważnym aspektem reformy jest regionalizacja zarządzania rybołówstwem. W praktyce będzie to oznaczać, iż tylko główne

ramy i zasady prawne będą określone na szczeblu UE, natomiast faktyczne decyzje wykonawcze będą podejmowane na poziomie regionalnym, co pozwoli uwzględnić specyfikę i potrzeby poszczególnych akwenów. Takie zmiany pozwolą na dobre funkcjonowanie, a nawet utworzenie dodatkowych miejsc pracy w sektorze. Oczywiście dokument, jakim dysponujemy, wymaga jeszcze ulepszeń, ale jest to dobry punkt wyjścia do dalszych rozmów trójstronnych z Komisją Europejską i Radą.

3-361-000

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Techniczne środki ochrony to zasady, które nasi rybacy w całej Unii Europejskiej muszą stosować każdego dnia, wpływając na połów, aby dopilnować, że miejsce i sposób dokonywania połowów gwarantują ich trwałość. Uwzględniają one m.in. minimalny rozmiar wyładowywanych osobników, minimalną wielkość oczek w sieciach. Obecny wniosek komisji ma na celu przedłużenie środków technicznych na kolejny okres przejściowy do momentu przyjęcia zregionalizowanych ram środków technicznych zgodnie z WPRyb. W związku z niemożnością wprowadzenia WPRyb przed 1 stycznia 2013 r. zaproponowano rozwiązanie tymczasowe. Polega ono na zmianie podstawowego aktu prawnego bez podania konkretnych terminów wygaśnięcia, a tym samym anuluje się rozporządzenia z lat 2009 i 2011. Akt uwzględnia również środki na rzecz redukcji odrzutów na wodach północno-wschodniego Atlantyku, które uzgodniono z krajami partnerskimi. Wniosek ten jest niestety tymczasowy i nie gwarantuje rybakom jasnej sytuacji prawnej, jednakże zapewnia prowadzenie zrównoważonego połowu i umożliwia reprodukcję w ekosystemach.

3-361-500

**Iva Zanicchi (PPE)**, *per iscritto*. – Il testo approvato oggi in Aula prevede, a garanzia di una maggiore sostenibilità ambientale, uno stop alla pratica dei "rigetti", cioè quella parte di pescato che viene scaricata in mare perché costituita da esemplari troppo piccoli o indesiderati. Pur riconoscendo fortemente la necessità di rispettare l'ambiente marino, credo fosse più opportuno portare la percentuale di rigetti dal 3% proposto nella relazione al 10% proposto dal gruppo PPE, a tutela degli operatori del settore che, in taluni casi, rischiano di non vedere salvaguardati i propri interessi.

3-361-750

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Esta proposta da Comissão pretende ampliar as regras sobre as medidas técnicas de proteção dos juvenis de organismos marinhos para mais um período de transição, até que, num quadro de regionalização para as medidas técnicas, de acordo com a futura Política Comum das Pescas, seja aprovado um novo enquadramento. O anterior regulamento integrava uma medida de interdição à pesca com redes de tresmalho em profundidades abaixo dos 200 metros, que era muito gravosa e discriminatória para a frota portuguesa que pescava tamboril até, aproximadamente, aos 400m de profundidade – medidas que careciam de base científica. Votámos favoravelmente.

## **8.9. Εξάλειψη και πρόληψη όλων των μορφών βίας κατά των γυναικών και των κοριτσιών (B7-0049/2013)**

3-363-000

**Προφορικές αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου**

3-364-000

**Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR).** - Madam President, I make this explanation on behalf of my Group, the ECR Group. This motion for a resolution addresses the issue of violence against women and includes a wide range of actions which constitute violent actions against women: sexual abuse, rape, domestic violence, trafficking of women and girls, violence against women in conflict situations, genital mutilation and forced marriages.

The motion for a resolution strongly condemns all violence against women and girls and strongly states that Member States and the EU as a whole must do more in this area. To these ends, the resolution calls for a directive laying down minimum standards.

The ECR Group opposes the development of any further legal instruments in this area. We were also reassured by Commissioner Reding's comments regarding the adopted victims package. We already have legislation in place and now Member States must implement that directive. The Commissioner does not plan to include any more legislation in this area. The ECR believes, therefore, that the issues raised in the resolution are of value and importance to all women across the European Union and hence supports the resolution overall. Our message must be zero tolerance in this area.

3-366-000

**Petri Sarvamaa (PPE).** - Arvoisa puhemies, kaikenlaisen naisiin ja tyttöihin kohdistuvan väkivallan lopettaminen ja ehkäiseminen on ytimessä oleva asia. Kun keskustelemme siitä täällä Euroopan parlamentissa, emme saa unohtaa, millainen tilanne vallitsee omassa lähipiirissämme.

EU:n tilastojen mukaan joka viides nainen Euroopan unionissa on kohdannut fyysistä väkivaltaa ja joka kymmenes on ollut elämänsä aikana seksuaalisen väkivallan kohteena. Euroopan neuvosto arvioi, että jopa 45 prosenttia, siis lähes puolet naisista kärsii jonkinlaisesta väkivallasta vähintään kerran elämässään. Yleisin väkivallan aiheuttaja löytyy siitä vierestä, naisen lähin kumppani on useimmiten kärsimyksen aiheuttaja. Tässä siis totisesti riittää työtä meillä Euroopassakin, vaikka tilanne onkin parempi kuin eräissä muissa osissa maailmaa.

Pöyristyttävää on, että maailmanlaajuisesti jopa puolet seksuaalisesta väkivallasta kohdistuu alle 16-vuotiaisiin tyttöihin. Näiden lukujen valossa ihmiskunta on vielä kovin kaukana sivistyksestä. Siksi EU:n on lausuttava ja tehtävä kaikki voitava tämän järkyttävän tilanteen muuttamiseksi, ja siksi äänestin tämän mietinnön puolesta.

3-367-000

**Norica Nicolai (ALDE).** - Am votat, desigur, pentru acest raport, de fapt este vorba de o rezoluție a Parlamentului European dedicată, ca de obicei, unei reuniuni a Națiunilor Unite pe tema femeilor. Pare a avea un caracter ușor formal și, deși toți suntem convinși că acest fenomen cu costuri sociale, cu costuri economice grave, trebuie eradicat, pașii pe care i-am făcut ca societate pentru eradicarea lui sunt adesea formali și de foarte multe ori ne semnificativi.

Două lucruri mi se par importante în acest raport: faptul că se cere o susținere mai mare financiară din partea statelor membre pentru a finanța programele ONU pentru femei și faptul că Uniunea Europeană este motivată să susțină acel plan global de implementare pentru eradicarea violenței împotriva femeilor din 2015 de către Națiunile Unite. Deși

există legislație relevantă, nu există părghii care să determine statele să exercite presiune pentru implementarea în mod real a legislației adecvate.

3-368-000

**Mitro Repo (S&D).** - Arvoisa puhemies, olemme jo vuosia yrittäneet löytää keinoja edistää miesten ja naisten tasa-arvoa maailmassa, mutta valitettavasti eriarvoisuus jatkuu. Etenkin naisiin ja tyttöihin kohdistuvan väkivallan jatkumisella on erittäin vakavia yhteiskunnallisia vaikutuksia. Tuon väkivallan ennaltaehkäisyyn ja poistamiseen tulee koko yhteiskunnan osallistua. Henkilöön kohdistuva väkivalta on vakava ihmisoikeusloukkaus. Se jättää syvät arvet ihmisen persoonaan.

Euroopan unioni on vaikutusvaltainen ja varteenotettava globaali toimija. Onkin tärkeää, että unioni pyrkii vakavissaan torjumaan kaikkea naisiin ja lapsiin kohdistuvaa väkivaltaa missä tahansa ikinä sitä tapahtuukin.

3-369-000

**Andrea Češková (ECR).** - Paní předsedající, hlasovala jsem pro tento návrh usnesení o odstraňování a prevenci všech forem násilí páchaného na ženách a dívkách.

Jen v minulém roce otrásly společností 3 otrěsné případy, které dokonce vedly ke smrti mladých žen. V Pákistánu byla 15letá dívka střelena do hlavy jenom proto, že se chtěla vzdělávat. V Irsku, v naší demokratické Evropě, jak si všichni myslíme, zemřela mladá žena na následky těhotenství jen proto, že ji lékaři odmítli potrat. V Indii byla mladá dívka brutálně znásilněna v autobuse 6 muži tak, že zemřela.

Tyto případy bohužel nejsou ojedinělé, velkým problémem je také domácí násilí, kde jsou pachatelé rodinní příslušníci. Musíme si uvědomit, že všechno je to otázka dodržování základních lidských práv a svobod.

Ženy a dívky musí mít právo rozhodovat se o svém těle, právo na tělesnou integritu, právo na své reprodukční a sexuální zdraví, které zahrnuje nejen právo na antikoncepci, zdravotní péči, ale i právo na bezpečný potrat.

Jsem proto velmi ráda, že tento Parlament velkou většinou hlasů podpořil všechna tato práva.

3-370-000

**Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE).** - Madam President, nine out of ten victims of intimate partner violence are women and around 25% of all women have experienced physical violence at least once. The Union's efforts to reduce domestic violence through legislative measures have failed. Poor implementation of criminal laws and poor imposition of sanctions are major reasons for impunity. This is why a solution could be for Member States to recognise domestic violence as a form of gender-based violence in their criminal codes and implement protection orders and impose sanctions.

Non-criminal measures, such as shelters and real and long-term protection for victims, including putting distance between those aggressing and their victims, could be more efficient than any punishment. Also we need to focus and think that the objective is protecting the victims and reducing domestic violence; I therefore insist on, and lobby for, these non-criminal measures.



3-371-000

**Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE).** - Señora Presidenta, apoyo esta propuesta sobre la violencia contra las mujeres, siempre oportuna, pero particularmente en unos días en los que la opinión pública vive con consternación las agresiones sexuales que han afectado en Acapulco a siete ciudadanas europeas.

Comparto las consideraciones que se realizan en esta Resolución y apuesto por que se establezcan unos estándares mínimos europeos para poder combatir esta lacra, que debería generar un nivel de debate y alarma social más acorde con el número de víctimas que causa y los costes de todo orden que origina.

Animo además a que, si la Comisión no toma pronto la iniciativa, sean mujeres y hombres en complicidad, a través de la iniciativa ciudadana europea, los que propongan esta regulación; ello animará un debate social sobre la materia a nivel europeo, que es muy conveniente como herramienta de concienciación y prevención del problema.

Sugiero, por último, que la regulación obligue a los Estados a plantear políticas integrales, multidisciplinarias y coordinadas para hacer frente a la violencia machista, con protocolos que integren prevención, reacción y atención a las víctimas, recogiendo las buenas prácticas que, a nivel regional y estatal en Europa, han acreditado eficacia para combatir este problema.

3-372-000

**Monika Smolková (S&D).** - Na zasadnutí Komisie OSN pre postavenie žien v marci tohto roku musí byť jednoznačne prezentované úsilie Európskej únie na odstránení všetkých foriem násilia páchaného na ženách a dievčatách. Preto som podporila návrh uznesenia, lebo iba koordinované opatrenia na všetkých národných a nadnárodných úrovniach a globálna kampaň môžu prispieť k dodržiavaniu ľudských práv žien a dievčat na celom svete. Jednou z kľúčových priorít pri riešení násilia na ženách a dievčatách musí byť odstránenie diskriminačných sociálno-ekonomických a kultúrnych postojov, ktoré určujú ženy do podradného postavenia v spoločnosti a vedú k tolerancii násilia páchaného na ženách a dievčatách tak v súkromnej, ako aj vo verejnej sfére, doma i na pracoviskách. Veľkú zásluhu v presadzovaní prevencie násilia páchaného na ženách a dievčatách majú miestne a medzinárodné mimovládne organizácie, preto ich podpora z pozície Európskej únie musí byť jednoznačná.

3-373-000

**Diane Dodds (NI).** - Madam President, in the United Kingdom today, one in four women will experience domestic abuse from the age of 16 years, often with years of psychological abuse. Over 300 000 women were sexually assaulted in the last year alone.

In response to these alarming figures, the UK Government has launched its own action plan to tackle all aspects of violence against women and children. The plan contains one hundred actions in the area of prevention, provision of services and partnership working, as well as justice outcomes and reducing the risk to victims. This plan should not be limited to the United Kingdom, but we should all recognise that violence against women and girls occurs in all countries and is an issue which crosses all borders. It is therefore vital that, in order to achieve our collective goals, we are able to implement effective and coordinated action. The message from this House should be clear: no level of violence against women

and girls is acceptable in today's society, here in the European Union or anywhere else in the world.

3-374-000

**Charles Tannock (ECR).** - Madam President, I doubt there is a single decent-minded politician who would not welcome efforts to combat the scourge of violence against women and girls. Despite the progress of the last fifty years it is shocking that violence against women continues to be perpetrated in every country in the world, including even children, such as the recent case in Pakistan.

The statistics are sobering. Up to 70% of women worldwide are thought to experience domestic violence in their lifetime. Even in the United Kingdom an estimated nine women are raped every hour.

I therefore wholeheartedly endorse the UN's efforts to tackle this problem everywhere. The only problem is one of EU universality. While the EU must do all it can, the specific causes, cultures and circumstances of violence against women and girls differ greatly across the Union. An over-prescriptive EU directive I would oppose, as it would be a blunt instrument to tackle a problem which is best dealt with by the individual Member States in cooperation with the European Union. But deal with this issue we must.

3-375-000

**Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE).** - Každý člověk má právo, aby rozhodoval o svojom živote slobodne pri rešpektovaní slobody toho druhého. Násilie páchané na ženách je v rozpore s týmto právom, pretože ženám, ktoré sú obmedzované fyzicky, psychicky, sociálne alebo ekonomicky, nie je umožnené rozhodovať podľa svojej vôle. Ide o etický a morálny problém, a to preto, že sú ním porušované základné ľudské práva a ľudská dôstojnosť. Chcem povedať, že pri hlasovaní moje hlasovacie zariadenie vykazovalo nejakú poruchovosť a na záver som chcel hlasovať však proti tomuto uzneseniu, pretože obsahuje aj paušálnu odvolávku na stereotypy ako sexuálne a reprodukčné práva, ktoré zakladajú akési právo na potrat. Ako lekár s tým nemôžem vôbec súhlasiť, tam už sú dve ľudské bytosti. Čiže hlasoval som nakoniec proti, aj proti Recital D, v časti 3 som hlasoval proti.

3-376-000

### Written explanations of vote

3-376-250

**Luís Paulo Alves (S&D),** *por escrito.* – Considerando que, ao mesmo tempo que a desigualdade de género e a discriminação aumentam o risco de violência, outras formas de discriminação – em razão de fatores como a deficiência ou a pertença a um grupo minoritário – podem aumentar os riscos incorridos pelas mulheres de exposição a violência e exploração, e que as atuais respostas à violência contra mulheres e raparigas e as estratégias de prevenção não incluem suficientemente as mulheres e raparigas vítimas de múltiplas formas de discriminação, são as razões pelas quais aprovo esta proposta. Considerando que, se pretende que o trabalho destinado a pôr termo à violência contra as mulheres seja eficaz, é necessário acautelar a cooperação e ação internacionais, o firme empenho dos dirigentes políticos a todos os níveis e níveis de financiamento mais substanciais. Deste modo, penso importante exortar a Comissão e os Estados-Membros a reverem as suas políticas, programas e recursos disponíveis para fazer face à violência dentro e fora da UE,

bem como a reforçarem as suas estratégias com instrumentos melhorados e metas ambiciosas.

3-376-375

**Laima Liucija Andrikienė (PPE)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šią svarbią rezoliuciją dėl visų formų smurto prieš moteris ir mergaites panaikinimo ir prevencijos. Smurtas prieš moteris vis dar išlieka visą pasaulį užvaldžiusia epidemija. Viena iš trijų moterų kažkuriuo gyvenimo tarpsniu buvo mušama, prievartaujama, parduota ar kitaip išnaudota. Smurtas veikia moteris ir mergaites visame pasaulyje nepriklausomai nuo tokių veiksnių, kaip amžius ar ekonominės sąlygos, jis taip pat daro žalą šeimoms ir bendruomenėms, lemia dideles ekonomines ir socialines išlaidas ir riboja bei stabdo ekonomikos augimą ir vystimąsi. Deja, smurtas prieš moteris yra aktuali problema ir Europos Sąjungos šalyse. ES, siekdama būti lydere ginant žmogaus teises pasaulyje, privalo dėti daugiau pastangų savo teritorijoje, kad būtų panaikintas smurtas prieš moteris ir smurtas dėl lyties. Todėl pritariu rezoliucijoje įtvirtintam raginimui ES ir valstybėms narėms skirti daugiau išteklių siekiant sustabdyti smurtą prieš moteris ir mergaites, įskaitant išteklius vietos, nacionaliniu, Europos ir viso pasaulio lygmenimis, ir suteikti paramą toms organizacijoms ir asmenims, kurie dirba siekdami sustabdyti smurtą prieš moteris ir smurtą dėl lyties, ypač šioje srityje veikiančioms nevyriausybinėms organizacijoms.

3-376-500

**Pino Arlacchi (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I voted for this resolution because violence against women remains one of the most serious human rights violations present in every country of the world. Many societies where women and men are not ensured equal rights perpetuate a structural form of violence against women. We need to bear in mind that all forms of gender-based violence, physical, sexual or psychological, need to be tackled. To put an end to the violence against women requires international cooperation and action, firm commitment from political leaders at all levels, as well as more substantial levels of financing. For these reasons, with this resolution we urge the Commission to propose an EU strategy against violence against women, including a directive laying down minimum standards of protection. In addition we ask the EU External Action Service to ensure that the human rights of women and girls are protected and advanced in all actions and dialogues in which the service is involved.

3-376-750

**Sophie Auconie (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Les violences faites aux femmes sont encore trop nombreuses, y compris dans les pays européens. Mon engagement en faveur de cette cause est total, et c'est pourquoi j'ai soutenu ce texte. J'ai voté en faveur de cette résolution, qui rappelle l'implication européenne dans la lutte contre ces violences, et notamment le soutien au lancement d'une campagne mondiale de sensibilisation pour la prévention des violences contre les femmes et les filles et les violences liées au genre.

3-377-000

**Zoltán Bagó (PPE)**, *írásban*. – Szavazatommal maradéktalanul támogatom a nők és lányok elleni erőszak valamennyi formájának felszámolását és megelőzését. A nők és lányok elleni erőszak világméretű, számos formát öltő és minden tagállamban egyaránt jelentkező jelenség. Egyetértek azzal, hogy a nők elleni erőszak minden formáját kezelni kell, mivel akadályozza, hogy a nők teljes mértékben gyakorolhassák emberi jogukat és

alapvető szabadságaikat. A jelenség felszámolása létfontosságú kérdés, többek között azért, mert maga az erőszak nem csak a lányok és a nők milliót érinti, hanem közvetve és közvetlenül gyengíti a családokat, a közösségeket és a nemzetet is. Álláspontom szerint a nők és lányok elleni erőszak kiküszöbölésének és megelőzésének érdekében hatékony nemzetközi összefogásra van szükség, ezért is támogatom az indítvány elfogadását, hiszen ezáltal közös erővel léphetünk fel a nők és a lányok testi és lelki épségének védelme érdekében.

3-377-062

**Francesca Barracciu (S&D)**, *per iscritto*. – La violenza contro le donne resta una delle piaghe più gravi nelle società europee e nel mondo. Essa colpisce bambine, ragazze e donne in maniera drammatica e trasversale alle culture, alle religioni, alle classi sociali, alle situazioni economiche ed alle nazionalità. Le responsabilità politiche che emergono da un fenomeno che non accenna a diminuire, sono pesanti e chiamano in causa ogni livello istituzionale. Le risposte finora date e le iniziative assunte si dimostrano del tutto insufficienti. È necessario che l'Unione e gli Stati membri si adoperino, al più presto, per dare una sterzata alla loro condotta politica, all'interno dell'Unione, e nei rapporti verso gli Stati terzi. Abbiamo bisogno di maggiore sostegno alle ONG sia locali che internazionali ed a tutte le associazioni che operano in favore delle donne a rischio o vittime di violenza. All'Unione e agli Stati Membri spetta inoltre il compito di definire politiche stringenti e stanziare maggiori risorse per programmi, progetti e iniziative di sostegno ad ogni utile intervento in questo ambito. È non più rinviabile la ratifica della Convenzione del Consiglio d'Europa sulla prevenzione e la lotta contro la violenza nei confronti delle donne. All'Unione spetta il compito di sollecitare in tal senso gli Stati membri.

3-377-125

**Regina Bastos (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A violência contra as mulheres e as raparigas é uma das mais graves violações dos direitos humanos. Este fenómeno é universal e afeta todas as culturas e meios sociais, com consequências desastrosas para as vítimas, as famílias e para a sociedade. No meu país, Portugal, morreram 36 mulheres de violência doméstica no ano passado. A violência contra as mulheres e as raparigas não pode ser tolerada, de nenhuma forma e em nenhum contexto. A União Europeia deve reforçar a sua ação neste domínio com a colaboração das Nações Unidas, nomeadamente através da Plataforma de Ação de Pequim. Por isso, votei favoravelmente esta resolução que sublinha a importância da União Europeia apoiar os esforços das Nações Unidas para se atingirem conclusões consensuais durante a próxima sessão da Comissão das Nações Unidas sobre o Estatuto da Mulher que terá como tema "Prevenir e erradicar todas as formas de violência contra mulheres e raparigas". Será um momento crucial para a União Europeia associar-se às Nações Unidas no desenvolvimento de programas e mecanismos institucionais e para assegurar que as estratégias de prevenção da violência contra mulheres e raparigas estejam no centro de todas as atenções a nível mundial.

3-377-250

**Jean-Luc Bennahmias (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Les violences à l'encontre des femmes et des filles demeurent l'une des violations des droits de l'homme les plus répandue au monde, quels que soient le pays ou la classe, et ce aussi bien dans la sphère privée que publique. C'est la raison pour laquelle je me suis déclaré favorable à ce qu'il soit exigé : 1) au niveau de l'Union, que la Commission présente une stratégie contre la violence à l'égard des femmes comprenant une directive établissant des normes minimales; 2) au niveau du Conseil de

l'Europe, que l'UE et les Etats membres adhèrent à la convention sur la prévention et la lutte contre les violences à l'égard des femmes et la violence domestique; 3) au niveau des Nations unies, que l'Union souscrive, lors de la session de 2013, à la recommandation du groupe d'experts recommandant à la commission des Nations Unies d'élaborer un plan d'action global d'élimination de telles violences et discriminations qui devrait être adopté par tous les Etats membres et lancée en 2015.

3-377-500

**Nora Berra (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de cette résolution, qui rappelle que les efforts à mettre en œuvre pour mettre fin aux violences faites aux femmes et aux filles exigent une approche coordonnée et multisectorielle. Cette résolution rappelle également qu'une des priorités majeures de la lutte contre cette violence devrait être l'élimination des comportements socioculturels discriminatoires qui accentuent la place subalterne des femmes dans la société. Il est donc nécessaire, à cet égard, d'accélérer les progrès dans l'élaboration de normes juridiques et de normes et politiques internationales.

3-379-000

**Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau dėl šios rezoliucijos, kadangi turime kuo daugiau dėmesio skirti kovai su smurtu prieš moteris ir mergaites tiek ES, tiek visame pasaulyje. Nors smurto prieš moteris klausimas aptariamas jau kelis dešimtmečius, tačiau skaudu matyti, kad mums vis dar nepavyksta apsaugoti moterų nuo smurto.

Deja, bet viena iš dešimties moterų Europoje yra patyrusi smurtą, ir tai viena dažniausių moterų smurtinės mirties priežasčių. Smurtas prieš moteris ir mergaites išlieka vienas didžiausių žmogaus teisių pažeidimų, kuriam nėra jokių geografinių, ekonominių, kultūrinių ar socialinių ribų. Visų formų smurtiniai nusikaltimai daro didelę įtaką ir neatstatomą žalą moterų ir mergaičių fizinei bei psichinei sveikatai. Taigi siekiant panaikinti smurtą prieš moteris, taip pat smurtą dėl lyties, būtina dėti pastangas visais lygmenimis. Jungtinės Tautos tarptautiniu lygmeniu ėmėsi svarbiausių veiksmų kovojant su tokio smurto, įgyvendindamos Pekino veiksmų programą. Europos Sąjunga taip pat įtraukė minėtą klausimą tiek į vidaus politiką ir teisės aktus, tiek į užsienio politikos veiksmus.

Džiugu, kad ši opi problema yra diskutuojama ir ieškoma jos sprendimų pasauliniu lygiu. Smurto prieš moteris ir mergaites panaikinimas bus Jungtinių Tautų Moterų padėties komisijos 57-osios sesijos, vyksiančios 2013 m. kovo 4–15 d., pagrindinė tema.

3-378-000

**Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE)**, *în scris*. – Violența împotriva femeilor este un fenomen prezent la nivel mondial. Potrivit Organizației Mondiale a Sănătății, între 15% și 71% dintre femeile cu vârste cuprinse între 15 și 49 de ani au fost bătute, forțate să facă sex sau abuzate pe perioada vieții de partenerii lor. În ciuda adoptării mai multor strategii pentru protejarea femeilor, problema violenței împotriva femeilor rămâne acută – în fiecare zi una din cinci femei din cele 47 de țări ale Consiliului Europei este supusă violenței.

Pe lângă toate, violența împotriva femeilor are și un impact negativ asupra economiei europene. Costurile violenței împotriva femeilor în Europa constituie estimativ 34 de miliarde de euro anual, sau 555 de euro din partea fiecărui locuitor al Europei. În ceea ce privește elementele menționate mai sus, consider că se impune o strategie a UE de combatere a violenței împotriva femeilor, inclusiv o directivă care să stabilească o serie de standarde minime pentru statele membre ale Uniunii Europene.

3-378-500

**Arkadiusz Tomasz Bratkowski (PPE)**, *na piśmie*. – Poparłem projekt niniejszej rezolucji. Uważam za konieczne podjęcie konkretnych działań zwalczających karygodne praktyki, jakimi są dyskryminacja, nierówne traktowanie oraz przemoc wobec kobiet. Szczególnie bulwersujące jest stosowanie przemocy wobec kobiet. Fakt ten wymaga potępienia oraz podjęcia kroków w celu eliminacji tego zjawiska. Kobiety zasługują na wielki szacunek i uznanie za swoją często niedocenianą pracę i wysiłki, troskę o rodzinę i gospodarstwo domowe, a także wykonywaną przy tym jednocześnie pracę zawodową. Sprostanie tak wielu obowiązkom wymaga wielkich wysiłków i wyrzeczeń. Kobiety wnoszą do społeczeństwa nieocenione dobra i wartości.

Mając to na uwadze, należy stworzyć odpowiednie programy wsparcia dla kobiet, które stały się ofiarami przemocy, a także zapewnić im warunki do godnego życia. Potrzebne jest również organizowanie kampanii informacyjnych zwalczających stereotypy i nieuprawnione opinie dotyczące kobiet. Jednocześnie podkreślam, iż konieczność walki z przemocą wobec kobiet nie może być utożsamiana z bezwarunkowym promowaniem praw seksualnych i reprodukcyjnych kobiet, czy też praw grup LGBT.

3-379-500

**John Bufton (EFD)**, *in writing*. – I am absolutely against violence, especially against women and girls, and staunchly advocate the view that it is completely unnecessary and unacceptable. Unfortunately, I have to abstain from voting as I do not agree that there is a need for a new EU law on this and cannot accept this level of interference into the foreign affairs of Member States which, in line with the Vienna Convention, should be exempt from external pressures.

3-379-750

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente este relatório porque a violência contra as mulheres e raparigas continua a ser uma das mais graves violações dos direitos humanos a nível mundial e estrutural e é um fenómeno que envolve vítimas e autores de todas as idades, antecedentes educativos, rendimento e posição social, sendo tanto causa como consequência da desigualdade entre homens e mulheres. A desigualdade de género e a discriminação aumenta o risco de violência, É preciso pôr termo à violência contra mulheres e raparigas. A UE e os seus Estados-Membros devem intensificar os esforços desenvolvidos a nível interno para eliminar a violência contra mulheres e raparigas.

3-380-000

**Minodora Cliveti (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Violența împotriva femeilor și a fetelor are consecințe grave asupra sănătății fizice și psihice a victimelor și asupra dezvoltării sociale în general. Principalele cauze ale fenomenului sunt sărăcia, tradițiile, valorile religioase, instabilitatea politică, conflictele armate, mass-media. Consecințele violenței pe scară largă se extind dincolo de vătămările corporale sau pierderile materiale imediate. Deseori, există efecte grave și de lungă durată asupra sănătății, precum și urmări sociale și psihologice care afectează victimele violenței, copiii și familiile acestora. În ciuda evoluției societății, a creșterii nivelului de educație, se constată nu numai menținerea unor forme „tradiționale” (lovirea, insulta, violul), ci și resuscitarea unor forme speciale ale violenței: blocarea accesului femeilor la venituri, mutilarea genitală, sclavia, munca forțată, prostituția. De aceea, UE trebuie să dea o definiție exhaustivă a violenței împotriva femeilor, să identifice factorii

care contribuie la proliferarea acesteia și să continue la nivel internațional prevenirea și controlul acestui flagel social.

3-381-000

**Carlos Coelho (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A violența contra as mulheres e raparigas continua a ser uma das mais graves violações dos direitos humanos a nível mundial, envolvendo vítimas e autores de todas as idades e estratos sociais. Não pode existir qualquer tolerância para este tipo de situações, pelo que a União Europeia está firmemente empenhada em combater toda e qualquer forma de violência. As mulheres têm sido, assim, as principais vítimas da violência em razão do sexo, o que constitui uma violação dos direitos fundamentais à vida, segurança, liberdade, dignidade e integridade física e emocional.

Deverá, assim, ser feito um investimento especial em termos de prevenção, a qual deverá incidir sobre domínios como a educação, o conhecimento, o desenvolvimento de redes e parcerias, bem como o intercâmbio de boas práticas. É fundamental erradicar toda e qualquer forma de violência contra as mulheres e raparigas, o que requer uma abordagem coordenada e multisetorial, nomeadamente através da criação de uma estratégia europeia. É, igualmente importante reforçar a cooperação internacional e fomentar uma intervenção urgente no sentido de eliminar atitudes, práticas e costumes tradicionais nefastos, incluindo a mutilação genital feminina, os casamentos precoces e forçados e os crimes em nome da honra.

3-381-250

**Emer Costello (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I welcome the adoption of the resolution on the forthcoming session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women: elimination and prevention of all forms of violence against women and girls. The EU must play its part in ensuring that ambitious conclusions are agreed at this session. In 2010, the Commission committed itself to presenting – by the end of 2012 – a strategy to combat violence against women, domestic violence and female genital mutilation, to be followed up by an EU action plan. It is very disappointing that the Commission has yet to live up to this commitment. I urge it to do so without any further delay. An EU strategy should cover in particular the signing and ratification by the EU and the Member States of the Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence, as well as the stepping up of efforts to end FGM worldwide, which affects 8 000 girls daily. Over 500 000 girls and women in Europe are living with the consequences of FGM.

3-381-500

**Corina Crețu (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Am votat în favoarea propunerii de rezoluție referitoare la a 57-a Sesiune a CSF a ONU: eliminarea și prevenirea tuturor formelor de violență împotriva femeilor și fetelor, pentru a evidenția necesitatea implicării UE în eforturi coordonate în scopul reducerii multiplelor forme de violență împotriva fetelor și femeilor. Abuzul fizic, sexual, emoțional sau financiar, hărțuirea, mutilarea organelor genitale ale femeilor, căsătoriile forțate și crimele de onoare sunt încălcări extrem de grave și sistematice ale demnității umane, care continuă în toate statele lumii și pentru care nu există justificări. Condamn cu tărie orice formă de discriminare și de violență împotriva femeilor și fetelor și pledez pentru regândirea priorităților politice în favoarea respectării drepturilor femeilor și, de asemenea, pentru susținerea ONG-urilor, coordonarea și monitorizarea strategiilor și programelor existente și nou create.

3-381-750

**Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D)**, *în scris*. – Violența împotriva femeilor și a fetelor tinere este cea mai răspândită formă de încălcare a drepturilor omului. Există studii care arată că principalele cauze ale fenomenului sunt inegalitățile economice și cele de putere dintre sexe, obiceiurile, tradițiile, valorile religioase, instabilitatea politică și conflictul armat. Deși Uniunea Europeană a fost și este un promotor al promovării egalității de gen, strategia UE 2020 conține puțini indicatori care menționează egalitatea de gen ca și prioritate la nivel european. Începând din acest an, în cadrul celei de-a 57-a sesiuni a Comisiei pentru Statutul Femeii a Organizației Națiunilor Unite, eradicarea și prevenirea tuturor formelor de violență împotriva femeilor și a fetelor va fi una dintre temele prioritare. Consider de asemenea de o importanță majoră faptul ca ajutoarele pentru dezvoltare să fie corelate cu o luptă continuă împotriva oricărui fel de violență asupra femeilor în țările în curs de dezvoltare.

3-381-812

**Rachida Dati (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Aujourd'hui, le Parlement européen fait clairement entendre sa voix : l'Europe doit être un leader contre les violences faites aux femmes. Dans ce texte, nous appelons à la mise en place d'une véritable stratégie européenne pour mettre fin à la violence contre les femmes. Il nous faut des mesures contraignantes. La 57<sup>e</sup> session de la commission des Nations Unies sur la condition de la femme, qui aura lieu en mars 2013, devra être une étape importante dans la réalisation de cet objectif. Avec ce rapport, le Parlement trace des ambitions claires, celles de la fin des violences, toutes les violences, et contre toutes les femmes, quelles que soient leur condition ou leur situation géographique.

3-381-875

**Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – En dépit de nombreuses campagnes de sensibilisation et de prévention, les violences faites aux femmes, qui sont la forme la plus répandue de violation des droits de l'homme, demeurent un fléau, dans l'Union européenne et dans le monde entier, toutes classes sociales confondues. Aujourd'hui, une femme européenne sur cinq est victime de harcèlement moral ou de violences physiques et sexuelles. Cette réalité insupportable, contraire aux droits humains les plus essentiels, doit être constamment combattue, a fortiori en Europe, dont la vocation est d'être exemplaire en matière de droits de l'homme et de la femme. L'Union européenne doit consacrer davantage de ressources à la sauvegarde des droits des femmes et des filles, tant dans son action extérieure via la coopération internationale, notamment lors des crises humanitaires, que dans la mise en œuvre de ses politiques internes.

3-382-000

**Jill Evans (Verts/ALE)**, *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this report on an issue on which I have campaigned for many years. The European External Action Service must ensure that the human rights of all women are respected and that all Member States have signed the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing Violence Against Women. The UK is one of the Member States that have so far failed to do so, despite a huge campaign by the Soroptimists, Women's Aid and others. I spoke at a highly successful conference in the Temple of Peace in Cardiff on this very issue several years ago. Assembly members there pledged their support for the campaign. I hope that this vote will encourage the Welsh Government to put pressure on the UK to sign as soon as possible.



3-382-500

**Diogo Feio (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – Como já várias vezes o escrevi, condeno toda a violência, mas em especial aquela que é exercida sobre quem se encontra em situação de maior fragilidade – social, económica ou emocional – como é o caso das crianças, e muitas vezes, das mulheres. Este não é um problema local, mas uma questão de dimensão global que merece uma resposta internacional adequada e firme. Por isso mesmo, os Estados devem procurar eliminar todas as formas de violência contra mulheres e crianças, nomeadamente o tráfico para exploração sexual, as violações da sua auto-determinação sexual e a violência doméstica, e a UE deve servir de exemplo nesta matéria, implementando políticas firmes de prevenção da violência, de punição dos agressores e de apoio às vítimas. O respeito pela vida e dignidade humanas não se coadunam com os crimes de que são vítimas muitas mulheres e crianças.

3-382-750

**José Manuel Fernandes (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A presente proposta, apresentada nos termos do n.º 5 do artigo 115.º do Regimento, surge na sequência de uma pergunta com pedido de resposta oral formulada por Mikael Gustafsson, em nome da Comissão dos Direitos da Mulher e da Igualdade dos Géneros, e visa prevenir e erradicar todas as formas de violência contra as mulheres e as raparigas. Todos sabemos que esta violência existe, mesmo na Europa. Uma em cada 5 mulheres é vítima de violência. Uma em cada dez mulheres é vítima de violência sexual. Na Índia, em cada 25 minutos, há uma mulher a ser violada. São números que não nos podem deixar indiferentes e que colocam esta questão no centro da agenda europeia. Votei favoravelmente esta proposta de resolução porque não nos podemos limitar a falar. Temos de agir rapidamente. Está em causa a violação de direitos humanos. Não se compreende que apenas 17 Estados-Membros tenham assinado a Convenção do Conselho da Europa sobre a prevenção e o combate à violência contra as mulheres. Congratulo-me com o facto de o meu país, Portugal, ter sido o primeiro – e único, para já – Estado-Membro a ratificar esta Convenção, o que aconteceu, precisamente, ontem, dia 5 de fevereiro, aqui em Estrasburgo.

3-383-000

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Votámos favoravelmente esta resolução sobre a necessidade de prevenir e erradicar todas as formas de violência contra mulheres e raparigas. Salientamos que o problema da violência contra mulheres e raparigas não pode ser isolado do conjunto de políticas e orientações hoje dominantes na UE. Erradicar todas as formas de violência contra mulheres implica combater o empobrecimento, o desemprego, o aumento de fenómenos de marginalidade e dependência que arrastam consigo a prostituição e outras formas intoleráveis de violência sobre as mulheres. Combater a violência implica combater a violência doméstica e, para tal, é necessário o reforço das políticas sociais, ou seja, o investimento público que vem sendo esmagado pela UE e governos nacionais. Erradicar a violência contra as mulheres implica erradicar, no trabalho, a imposição de extenuantes ritmos de trabalho, os salários baixos que mantêm as mulheres em ciclos de pobreza e dependência económica, implica terminar com as desigualdades salariais. Ora, os ataques aos direitos dos trabalhadores, e em particular a discriminação das mulheres no local de trabalho, não contribuem para que as mulheres consigam romper com os ciclos de violência a que estão sujeitas. Não vale a pena pregar igualdade e aplicar, na prática, a desigualdade que é hoje crescente, e tem responsáveis políticos.

3-384-000

**Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Násilie páchané na ženách a dievčatách je aj naďalej jednou z najzávažnejších foriem porušovania ľudských práv celosvetového a štrukturálneho rozmeru, pričom je zároveň aj javom, ktorý sa týka tak obetí, ako aj agresorov bez ohľadu na ich vek, vzdelanie, príjem a spoločenské postavenie. Táto forma násilia pretrváva vo všetkých krajinách na svete, predstavuje závažné porušovanie ľudských práv a je naďalej hlavnou prekážkou v dosiahnutí rodovej rovnosti a posilnení postavenia žien. Obťažovanie žien a násilie na ženách zahŕňa množstvo foriem porušovania ľudských práv vrátane sexuálneho zneužívania, znásilnenia, domáceho násilia, sexuálneho napadnutia a obťažovania, prostitúcie či obchodovania so ženami a dievčatami. Považujem za nevyhnutné, aby Komisia pre postavenie žien 2013 súhlasila s vypracovaním všeobecného realizačného plánu na ukončenie násilia páchaného na ženách a dievčatách s osobitným dôrazom na prevenciu násilia a zabezpečenie monitorovania a praktického poradenstva v súvislosti s existujúcimi medzinárodnými záväzkami (CEDAW a Pekinská akčná platforma), ktorý má byť schválený všetkými členskými štátmi OSN a ktorý sa má začať plniť v roku 2015.

3-385-000

**Ashley Fox (ECR)**, *in writing*. – I was pleased to support this resolution. I think that violence against women, of any kind, is an abomination that all Member States should work to eliminate. I did vote against the paragraph calling for an EU directive. Implementation should remain in the hands of the member states. We must resist the temptation to believe that 'more Europe' is the answer to every problem. A directive would do nothing to tackle the ongoing scourge of gender-based violence. Of course, resolutions such as this are no substitute for concrete action to tackle the underlying problems that give rise to acts such as genital mutilation, 'honour' crimes, and forced marriage. Member States should be encouraged to address those important issues.

3-385-500

**Sylvie Guillaume (S&D)**, *par écrit*. – En tant que membre de la commission des Droits de la femme et de l'égalité des genres, et en tant que militante féministe, j'ai voté en faveur de ce texte, qui rappelle la priorité donnée à la lutte contre toutes les formes de violence à l'égard des femmes et des filles. Les violences contre les femmes constituent l'une des plus grandes violations des droits fondamentaux, et demeurent la plus grande des inégalités fondées sur le sexe. A travers ce texte, le Parlement interpelle une nouvelle fois la Commission et les États membres sur la nécessité de définir une stratégie commune au sein de l'Union. Il faut renforcer et poursuivre les efforts pour éliminer et mieux prévenir des violences contre les femmes, comme le viol ou les violences conjugales. A l'échelle internationale, mes collègues et moi-même confirmons l'engagement et le soutien de l'Union européenne en faveur du programme d'action de Pékin. Et nous espérons vivement que la 57ème session de la commission des Nations unies sur la condition de la femme aboutira à un accord global au mois de mars prochain.

3-385-625

**Juozas Imbrasas (EFD)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį pasiūlymą. Smurtas prieš moteris egzistuoja visose pasaulio šalyse kaip viską persmelkiantis žmogaus teisių pažeidimas ir didžiausia kliūtis, trukdanti siekti lyčių lygybės ir moterų įgalinimo. Smurtas veikia moteris ir mergaites visame pasaulyje nepriklausomai nuo tokių veiksnių, kaip amžius, klasė ar

ekonominės sąlygos, ir jis taip pat daro žalą šeimoms ir bendruomenėms, lemia dideles ekonomines ir socialines išlaidas ir riboja bei stabdo ekonomikos augimą ir vystimąsi. Tad būtina kovoti su visų formų smurtu prieš moteris, t. y., fiziniu, seksualiniu ir psichologiniu smurtu, kaip nurodyta Pekino veiksmų programoje, nes visos šios smurto rūšys riboja moterų galimybę naudotis visomis žmogaus teisėmis ir pagrindinėmis laisvėmis. Raginama tarptautiniu ir regioniniu lygmenimis sukurti programas ir institucinius mechanizmus, siekiant užtikrinti, kad smurto prieš moteris ir mergaites prevencijos strategijos būtų svarbiausia visų tarptautinių veiksmų, kurių imamasi reaguojant į su situacijomis konfliktų metu ir po jų ar gaivalinėmis nelaimėmis susijusias humanitarines krizes, dalis. Turi būti sukurtas visuotinis įgyvendinimo planas siekiant sustabdyti smurtą prieš moteris ir mergaites, ypatingą dėmesį skiriant smurto prevencijai.

3-385-750

**Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE)**, *schriftlich*. – Noch immer ist Gewalt gegen Frauen und Mädchen ein weltweites Problem, das in allen sozialen Schichten auftritt. Daher muss diesem Problem auf nationalen, europäischen und internationalen Ebenen entgegengewirkt werden. Die 57. Tagung der UN-Kommission für die Rechtsstellung der Frau wird eine entscheidende Chance darstellen, Fortschritte im Bereich der Menschenrechte für Frauen zu erzielen und weltweit Aktionspläne durchzusetzen, um Gewalt gegen Frauen und Mädchen zu beseitigen. Die EU muss dabei eine gewichtige Rolle einnehmen und alle notwendigen Maßnahmen ergreifen, um ein positives Ergebnis sicherzustellen und die Ungleichheit zwischen Männern und Frauen zu beseitigen. Ich stimme daher für den Antrag und setze mich für die Rechte der Frauen zur sexuellen und reproduktiven Gesundheit ein.

3-385-812

**Agnès Le Brun (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Dans le monde et au sein même de l'Union européenne, les femmes et les filles sont encore malheureusement victimes de violences en tout genre (violences domestiques, agressions et harcèlements sexuels, prostitution et trafic humain, etc), violences qui les privent souvent de leurs pleins droits civils et politiques. Je me suis donc prononcée en faveur de cette résolution, qui rappelle notre soutien aux programmes et organismes de lutte contre la violence faite aux femmes, et invite les États membres et l'Union européenne à accroître le soutien financier qu'ils leur accordent. Nous invitons également l'Union européenne à mettre en place une stratégie ambitieuse en matière de lutte contre la violence faite aux femmes, notamment à travers le lancement d'une campagne mondiale de sensibilisation et de prévention, ainsi qu'une plus grande intransigeance envers les pays tiers avec lesquels nous avons des relations politiques ou commerciales, en termes de respect des droits des femmes.

3-385-875

**Constance Le Grip (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Nous avons voté une résolution sur l'élimination et la prévention de toutes les formes de violence à l'égard des femmes et des filles, en vue de la 57ème réunion de la commission de la condition de la femme de l'ONU. En tant que membre de la commission des Droits de la femme et de l'égalité des genres du Parlement européen, je ne peux que me réjouir du fait que les députés aient exprimé un soutien et un engagement forts pour cette démarche, en appelant de leurs vœux des conclusions tournées vers l'avenir, qui contribueront à faire cesser ces violences inacceptables.

3-386-000

**David Martin (S&D)**, *in writing*. – I welcome this resolution which calls on the EU to support the launch of a Global Advocacy Campaign for the prevention of violence against women and girls and gender-based violence, in order to take further steps to make our communities and countries safe and fully respect the human rights of women and girls worldwide. Parliament believes this campaign should build on existing partnerships between states and other relevant actors, including civil society and women's organisations.

3-386-125

**Nuno Melo (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A violência contra as mulheres e raparigas continua a ser uma das mais graves violações dos direitos humanos a nível mundial, e é um fenómeno que envolve vítimas de todas as idades, antecedentes educativos, rendimento e posição social. São, por isso, necessárias políticas que levem à prevenção e erradicação de qualquer forma de violência contra as mulheres e raparigas. Daí o meu voto favorável.

3-386-250

**Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – He votado a favor de esta resolución ya que subraya la necesidad de prevenir y erradicar todas las formas de violencia contra las mujeres y las niñas, tema prioritario de la 57ª sesión de la Comisión de la Condición Jurídica y Social de la Mujer de las Naciones Unidas, que se celebrará del 4 al 15 de marzo de 2013. La UE debe desempeñar un papel importante en la misma y realizar todos los esfuerzos posibles para garantizar un resultado positivo. Además, he apoyado esta resolución que insta a la Comisión a evaluar la política de la UE en los ámbitos de la prevención y la lucha contra la violencia en el contexto de la ayuda humanitaria y la ayuda internacional al desarrollo. Ahora bien, la lucha contra la violencia de género es indisociable de la lucha contra el empobrecimiento, la brecha salarial o el paro femenino, que provocan un aumento de la marginalidad y de la dependencia de las mujeres. Por ello, resultan imprescindibles políticas sociales de inversión pública que proporcionen herramientas reales a las mujeres para salir de los ciclos de violencia a los que se ven sometidas.

3-386-500

**Louis Michel (ALDE)**, *par écrit*. – Les violences faites aux femmes et aux filles partout dans le monde, notamment en cas de conflits armés, nécessitent la création d'un véritable "projet d'humanité". A l'heure de la mondialisation, il ne nous est plus permis de laisser tant d'êtres humains en marge de nos consciences. La mondialisation a un besoin criant d'universalisme. L'histoire nous jugera sur nos actes et sur nos silences. Nul ne pourra dire qu'il ne savait pas. La démocratie n'est jamais acquise. Il faut la préserver. Personne n'est à l'abri de dérapages au Nord comme au Sud. Ce n'est pas une question de développement ou de richesse économique. C'est une question de valeurs, de libertés publiques et de respect des autres. Nous devons lutter contre toutes formes d'impunité, de corruption, de banalisation, et de criminalité.

3-386-750

**Alexander Mirsky (S&D)**, *in writing*. – To contribute to the ending of violence against women and girls, and to gender balance, the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality has decided to table an oral question with a resolution to demonstrate the EU's support for the international process. I am in favour.

3-387-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**, *schriftlich*. – Gewalt gegen Frauen ist weltweit nach wie vor ein bestehendes Problem. Zudem ist sie ein Phänomen, das sich in jeder Gesellschaftsschicht und jedem Kulturkreis findet. Allerdings gibt es einige Staaten auf der Welt, in denen Gewalt, die Frauen angetan wird, immer noch rechtlich gedeckt ist und sogar anerkannt wird. Vor allem in islamistischen Staaten haben Männer immer noch das Recht, ihre Frauen zu schlagen oder ihnen gar Ärgeres anzutun – ein Umstand, der durch die Zuwanderung nach Europa mittlerweile auch in unseren Breiten immer häufiger vorkommt, jedoch untragbar ist. Ich habe mich meiner Stimme enthalten, denn ich bin der Ansicht, solange es in einigen Religionen immer noch Usus ist, Frauen zu schlagen und zu misshandeln, und diese Gewaltakte in dieser Gesellschaft auch noch anerkannt werden, werden Kampagnen nicht reichen, um ein Umdenken zu bewirken. Da es immer mehr Zuwanderer in die EU gibt, die muslimischen Glaubens sind, in dem die Züchtigung der Frau anerkannt ist, sieht sich die EU mit einem Problem konfrontiert, für dessen Lösung sie die Wurzel des Übels packen muss.

3-388-000

**Claudio Morganti (EFD)**, *per iscritto*. – Ho voluto sostenere questa risoluzione, affinché anche dall'Unione europea giunga un segnale forte per cercare di prevenire ed eliminare ogni forma di violenza contro le donne, anche in vista della 57<sup>a</sup> sessione della Commissione sullo status delle donne delle Nazioni Unite che si dovrà tenere all'inizio di marzo. Ancora oggi, infatti, sono milioni le donne e le ragazze vittime di violenza ogni giorno e ad ogni latitudine. Si passa, ad esempio, dalle mutilazioni genitali in Africa agli stupri in India, senza dimenticare tutte le nefandezze che avvengono anche in Italia e in Europa.

Sono soddisfatto che nel testo si faccia riferimento alla necessità che nelle azioni esterne dell'UE la condizione della donna debba essere considerata come uno dei valori imprescindibili, verso cui il Servizio europeo per l'azione esterna deve mostrare la massima attenzione. Ovviamente, anche all'interno dell'Unione si deve agire, e in fretta, e gli Stati membri devono adoperarsi per cercare di prevenire ogni possibile manifestazione di violenza nei confronti delle donne. Non è sicuramente semplice, considerando anche il fatto che moltissime violenze avvengono all'interno delle mura domestiche, ma l'azione deve essere continua e incessante, per porre fine a questi odiosi crimini.

3-388-500

**Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE)**, *raštu*. – Balsavau už rezoliuciją dėl smurto prieš moteris ir mergaites prevencijos ir panaikinimo. Ši problema – vis dar opi daugelyje pasaulio šalių. Smurtas prieš moteris ir mergaites – struktūrinė problema. Tenka apgailestauti, kad vis dar egzistuoja daug smurto prieš moteris formų: pasirinkimo teisės, teisės į savo kūną ir kūno neliečiamybę, teisės į švietimą ir apsisprendimo teisės ribojimai. Šios diskriminacijos ir smurto formos neleidžia moterims visiškai laisvai naudotis pilietinėmis ir politinėmis teisėmis. Todėl kovo mėnesį posėdžiausianti Jungtinių Tautų Moterų teisių komisija privalo dirbti bet kokios formos diskriminacijos mažinimo linkme. Būtinas politinių lyderių bendradarbiavimas ir įsipareigojimas tarptautinėms institucijoms, ypač didele moterų diskriminaciją patiriančiose valstybėse, bei didesnis prevencijos programų finansavimas – tai priemonės, kurių reikia imtis jau šiandien visais lygiais. Antra vertus, neišvengiamai pačios įvairių valstybių moterų teisėms atstovaujanti, įvairiapusę pagalbą moterims teikiančios nevyriausybinės organizacijos turėtų įsitraukti į smurto prieš moteris ir mergaites mažinimo programas. Politinė valia, finansavimo mechanizmas

švietimo, mokymo programoms ir stiprus NVO sektorius bei jų tarpusavio bendradarbiavimas, mano manymu, gali prisidėti prie šios problemos spartesnio ir efektyvesnio sprendimo ne tik visame pasaulyje, o ypatingai besivystančiame, bet ir ES valstybėse narėse, kuriose vis dar pasitaiko smurto prieš moteris atvejų.

3-389-000

**Cristiana Muscardini (ECR)**, *per iscritto* . – Non è facile trovare l'accordo sulla coniugazione della violenza contro le donne. C'è una violenza fisica che va condannata sempre e comunque. C'è una violenza sociale: salario inferiore rispetto a quello degli uomini, oppure una condanna alla prostituzione, anche per minorenni, a causa dell'estrema povertà. E c'è una violenza che nasce da certe culture tribali che impongono alle bambine le orrende mutilazioni genitali.

Credo che non possiamo fare distinzioni e selezionare la forma di violenza che più ci conviene. Ogni forma è violenza e come tale va condannata senza appello né sconti, senza giustificazioni né false remore. Lo stupro è una violenza inaudita, l'avvio alla prostituzione è un delitto imperdonabile, la mutilazione è una brutalità barbarica, un salario inferiore è un sopruso non più accettabile, coprirsi contro la propria volontà è una coercizione non rispettosa della dignità della donna, impedire l'istruzione è una prepotenza delittuosa. E interrompere la nascita di figlie femmina contro la volontà della madre, quale forma di violenza si configura? È lecito parlare di violenza, di violenza estrema, in questi casi? Sono a favore della risoluzione nella speranza che la commissione delle Nazioni Unite tenga conto di tutte le violenze contro "la metà del cielo".

3-389-500

**Siiri Oviir (ALDE)**, *kirjalikult* . – Hääletasin selle resolutsiooni ettepaneku poolt, sest olen veendunud naiste diskrimineerimise vastane ja naiste õiguste eest seisja. Naiste- ja tütarlastevastane vägivald on endiselt üks kõige raskemaid maailmas levinud inimõiguste struktuursete rikkumisi, mis hõlmab vägivalda kõiki vorme. Me peame seisma vastu nii füüsilisele, seksuaalsele kui ka psühholoogilisele vägivaldale. Siinjuures on oluline põhjus just meeste ja naiste võrdõiguslikkuse puudumine ning sooline diskrimineerimine. Naiste- ja tütarlastevastase vägivalda likvideerimiseks peavad koostööd tegema eri sektorid ja sidusrühmad. Oluline on, et käesoleva aasta märtsis peetav ÜRO naiste olukorra komisjoni istungjärk annaks ka reaalseid tulemusi, mis aitaksid kaasa naistevastase vägivalda kaotamisele. Riikide ja kodanikuühiskonna ning naisorganisatsioonide partnerlusele põhinev ülemaailmne toetuskampaania oleks kindlasti samm edasi diskrimineerimise ja vägivalda likvideerimisel.

3-389-750

**Rolandas Paksas (EFD)**, *raštu* . – Pritariu šiai rezoliucijai. Tam, kad būtų tinkamai įgyvendinti smurto prieš moteris ir mergaites stabdymo veiksmai ir užkertamas kelias smurtą sukeliančioms priežastims atsirasti, būtinas koordinuotas, įvairius sektorius apimantis požiūris. Pažymėtina, kad smurtui negalioja geografinės, kultūrinės, socialinės, ekonominės ar išsilavinimo ribos. Nuo smurto ir prievartos nukenčia įvairiausias padėties moterys. Atkreiptinas dėmesys į tai, kad priekabiavimas prie moterų ir smurtas prieš jas apima įvairius žmogaus teisių pažeidimus. Turime ne tik padėti užkirsti kelią smurtui, bet ir operatyviai suteikti specializuotas paramos paslaugas nuo smurto nukentėjusioms aukoms. Nacionaliniu ir visais kitais atitinkamais lygiais ir vadovaujantis visapusišku požiūriu būtina spręsti prevencijos ir kitus su smurto panaikinimu susijusius klausimus.

3-389-875

**Justas Vincas Paleckis (S&D),** *raštu* . – Nuolat vis išgirstame apie moterų ir mergaičių teisių pažeidimus: smurtas, prievarta, prekyba, sekso vergija. Statistika rodo, kad kas penkta moteris yra patyrusi smurtą, o kas dešimta – prievartą. Dažnai moterų judėjimo laisvė yra apribota dėl smurto. Šie sisteminiai moterų teisių pažeidimai kai kuriose pasaulio dalyse negali būti pateisinami remiantis kultūrinėmis arba religinėmis nuostatomis. Balsavau už šią moterų komiteto parengtą rezoliuciją. Ji turėtų tapti šauksmu ES valstybėms narėms bei valstybėms esančioms už ES ribų – kovokime kartu dėl moterų ir mergaičių apsaugos. Turime parodyti, kad turime priemonių kovai su visomis smurto prieš moteris apraiškomis. ES lygmeniu nuveikta daug – priimtose direktyvose dėl kovos su prekyba žmonėmis, dėl moterų ir mergaičių seksualinio išnaudojimo, dėl nusikaltimų aukų teisių apsaugos. Tad ši rezoliucija – dar vienas pavyzdys, kad ES neapsiriboja pareiškimais ir imasi teisiškai įpareigojančių moterų teisių apsaugą įtvirtinančių veiksmų. Tokiu būdu ES rodo pažangios praktikos pavyzdį ne tik savo kaimynėms, bet ir visam pasauliui.

3-390-000

**Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D),** *per iscritto* . – Esprimo voto favorevole riguardo alla risoluzione del Parlamento europeo sulla 57<sup>a</sup> sessione della commissione sullo status delle donne (CSW) delle Nazioni Unite: prevenzione ed eliminazione di ogni forma di violenza contro le donne e le ragazze. La violenza contro le donne e le ragazze è una delle forme più gravi e diffuse di violazione strutturale dei diritti umani a livello mondiale. È un fenomeno che coinvolge vittime e aggressori di ogni età, livello d'istruzione, reddito e posizione sociale e che rappresenta sia una conseguenza sia una causa della disuguaglianza tra donne e uomini. Per sradicare tale piaga sono necessari una maggiore cooperazione ed interventi internazionali, un impegno forte da parte dei responsabili politici a tutti i livelli, nonché finanziamenti più congrui. Per queste ragioni auspico che tale proposta esorti l'UE e i suoi Stati membri a rivedere le politiche, i programmi e le risorse disponibili per affrontare il problema della violenza all'interno e all'esterno dell'UE e a rafforzare la loro strategia con strumenti aggiornati e obiettivi ambiziosi.

3-390-500

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE),** *por escrito* . – Votei favoravelmente a presente resolução em que o Parlamento Europeu exorta a UE a apoiar o lançamento de uma campanha de sensibilização mundial relativa à prevenção da violência contra mulheres e raparigas e da violência em razão do género, visando a adoção de medidas que contribuam para que os nossos países e comunidades sejam seguros e respeitem plenamente os direitos humanos de mulheres e raparigas em todo o mundo. Esta campanha deve basear-se nas actuais parcerias entre Estados e outros atores relevantes, incluindo a sociedade civil e as organizações de mulheres.

3-391-000

**Evelyn Regner (S&D),** *schriftlich* . – Die Bekämpfung von Gewalt gegen Frauen und Mädchen ist eine zentrale Herausforderung in unserer Gesellschaft. Dieser Kampf muss aber auch den Arbeitsplätzen von Frauen geführt werden. Gerade in der Krise hat die Gewalt gegen Frauen zugenommen, speziell im Arbeitsumfeld. Deshalb unterstütze ich diesen Entschließungsantrag sehr und habe auch dafür abgestimmt.

3-391-500

**Tokia Saïfi (PPE),** *par écrit* . – Les chiffres publiés par les Nations unies sont alarmants: une femme sur trois dans le monde subit des violences infligées par son partenaire; entre 40% et 50% des femmes de l'Union européenne ont fait état de harcèlement sexuel sur le lieu de travail; et en France, une femme meurt tous les trois jours sous les coups de son conjoint. J'ai voté en faveur de cette résolution, car l'élimination et la prévention de toutes les formes de violence à l'égard des femmes et des filles sont aujourd'hui une priorité mondiale. En vue de la 57ème session de la commission de la condition de la femme des Nations unies, l'Union européenne doit plus que jamais s'impliquer dans la protection des femmes. En ce sens, elle doit encourager la coopération entre les États membres et harmoniser les plans nationaux pour mettre en place une stratégie européenne effective. En parallèle, l'Union et ses États membres doivent soutenir l'ensemble des acteurs qui prennent part à cette lutte, et notamment les acteurs de la société civile telle que les ONG et les associations.

3-391-625

**Olga Sehnalová (S&D),** *písemně* . – Podpořila jsem návrh usnesení k 57. zasedání Komise OSN pro postavení žen předložený původně M. Gustafssonem, který požaduje dosažení pokroku a přijetí opatření k odstraňování a prevenci násilí páchaného na ženách a dívkách. Citlivou otázku připomněly nedávné události v Indii. Že se stále jedná i o evropský problém pak dokazuje fakt, že v Evropě umírá na následky domácího násilí každý den sedm žen.

3-391-750

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE),** *per iscritto* . – La proposta di prevenzione ed eliminazione di ogni forma di violenza contro le donne e le ragazze mi trova pienamente d'accordo nella sua intenzione. La violenza contro le donne persiste in tutti i paesi del mondo come la violazione più diffusa dei diritti umani a livello mondiale. È un fenomeno che coinvolge vittime e aggressori di ogni età, livello d'istruzione, reddito e posizione sociale, e che costituisce sia una conseguenza che una causa della disuguaglianza tra donne e uomini con notevoli costi economici e sociali, limitando e compromettendo la crescita economica e lo sviluppo dei paesi interessati. L'UE e i suoi Stati membri sono tenuti pertanto ad aumentare gli stanziamenti destinati all'eradicazione della violenza contro donne e ragazze a livello globale. L'UE deve pertanto continuare a perseguire e sostenere una campagna di sensibilizzazione a livello globale per la prevenzione della violenza contro le donne e le ragazze al fine di adottare ulteriori misure per rendere le nostre comunità e i nostri Paesi sicuri, garantendo il rispetto pienamente dei diritti umani delle donne e delle ragazze in tutto il mondo.

3-391-875

**Catherine Stihler (S&D),** *in writing* . – I voted in favour as I strongly believe that women and girls should live lives without fear of being abused by anyone, be it a family member or a complete stranger.

3-392-000

**Marc Tarabella (S&D),** *par écrit* . – L'opinion réproche l'usage du viol comme arme de guerre au Congo, la lapidation des femmes adultères en Iran, l'agression de fillettes qui revendiquent leur scolarisation en Afghanistan ou au Pakistan. Ces violences extrêmes doivent être dénoncées, combattues et condamnées. Mais, même si tout cela est très loin



de l'Europe, on ne peut mesurer l'état de l'égalité des droits à l'aune des pires situations. Il suffit de connaître le quotidien de la police, de la justice et des associations concernées pour voir qu'il n'en est rien. Les chiffres sont connus, mais sont très inférieurs à la réalité: par exemple, les soixante-quinze mille viols recensés chaque année ne représenteraient que 10 % du chiffre réel, la majorité des femmes victimes craignant de porter plainte. Mais la presse et l'opinion ne s'émeuvent que dans les cas outranciers. Il est de la responsabilité de l'Europe d'enrayer cette machine infernale de la violence et de la discrimination.

3-392-500

**Nuno Teixeira (PPE)**, *por escrito*. – A Convenção das Nações Unidas de 1979 sobre a Eliminação de Todas as Formas de Discriminação contra as Mulheres (CEDAW) veio reforçar a liberdade cívica e política de todas as mulheres à escala global. Voto favoravelmente o presente relatório que visa eliminar todas as formas de violência contra as mulheres e as raparigas e se acabam por repercutir numa violação dos direitos humanos, em desigualdade de género e no aumento do risco de conflitos sociais. Entendo ainda que é fundamental que seja realizado um trabalho contínuo com vista a pôr termo à violência contra as mulheres, devendo ser acautelada uma superior cooperação e adotadas ações concretas à escala internacional.

3-393-000

**Frank Vanhecke (EFD)**, *schriftelijk*. – Ik heb me bij de eindstemming over deze resolutie onthouden omdat dit parlement eens te meer niet de moed of de politieke wil heeft om man en paard te noemen. Hoe kan een resolutie over vrouwenrechten stemmen zonder het te hebben over de opmars van de onverdraagzame islam, waar meisjes en vrouwen heel dikwijls rechtenloos zijn? Geweld tegen vrouwen zit heel dikwijls in bepaalde culturen ingebakken. Wie dat feit ontkent, kan ook niet aan oplossingen werken.

3-394-000

**Justina Vitkauskaitė (ALDE)**, *raštu*. – Smurtas prieš moteris yra šio amžiaus ryškė. Smurto statistika liūdina: viena iš penkių moterų ES yra patyrusi smurtą, o viena iš dešimties yra nukentėjusi nuo seksualinio priekabiavimo. Vyrų smurtas prieš moteris yra socialinis reiškiny, kuris būdingas visoms socialinėms grupėms. Šiai dienai 16 milijardų eurų ES yra investuojama į smurto prieš moteris aukų rehabilitaciją, apsaugą. Svarbu, kad smurto prieš moteris panaikinimas taptų prioritetiniu EP ir ES klausimu. Pritariu Europos Komisijai, kad visos valstybės narės turėtų pasirašyti ES konvenciją dėl smurto prieš moteris ir smurto artimoje aplinkoje prevencijos ir šalinimo tam, kad ES priemonių paketas prieš smurtą būtų įgyvendintas visose šalyse narėse.

Raginu Lietuvą pasirašyti šią konvenciją, kuria siekiama kovoti su smurtu prieš moteris kaip rimtu žmogaus teisių pažeidimu. Pagrindinės šios pažangios konvencijos sritys yra smurto prevencija, jo aukų apsauga bei smurtautojų baudžiamasis persekiojimas. Konvencija pateikia išsamią ir tvarią smurto aukų apsaugos ir prevencijos sistemą, kuri puikiai papildytų Lietuvos Respublikos teisyną. XXI amžiuje neturime toleruoti tokio žmogaus teisių pažeidinėjimo kaip smurtas prieš moteris. Moteris turi jaustis saugiai tiek namuose, tiek darbe, tiek viešojoje aplinkoje. Sveikinu ES ir Jungtinių Tautų bendrą programą, kurios tikslas – smurto prieš moteris išgyvendinimas.

3-395-000

**Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE)**, *in writing*. – I have given my support to the motion for a resolution on the elimination and prevention of all forms of violence against women and girls. This resolution provides an outline for future steps to protect women and girls from acts of violence. It is my view that we must not become complacent when it comes to human rights. Everyone has the right to live freely and without fear of violence. We must be diligent in our efforts to maintain equality for all citizens. In many cases the women who are victims of violence also have a lower level of education and are prevented from voting. This in itself is outrageous; we must continue to work with the UN in addressing and stopping these horrific situations. Women must have the right to pursue their goals and retain control of their physical and mental wellbeing. Gender-based equality is, and will continue to be, a focus for the EU and this resolution is but another step toward solidifying that end.

3-396-000

**Josef Weidenholzer (S&D)**, *schriftlich*. – Ich habe für die Entschließung „Beseitigung und Verhütung aller Arten von Gewalt gegen Frauen und Mädchen“ gestimmt, da Frauen noch immer täglich verschiedenen Formen von Gewalt ausgesetzt sind. Fast jede vierte Frau in der EU ist mindestens einmal in ihrem Leben Opfer von Gewalt. Die Entschließung fordert, dass die EU und alle Mitgliedstaaten ihre politischen Anstrengungen zur Bekämpfung der Gewalt gegen Frauen und Mädchen sowie von geschlechtsbezogener Gewalt deutlich verstärken. Die Kommission wird aufgefordert, eine europaweite Strategie gegen Gewalt an Frauen und einen legislativen Vorschlag für Mindestnormen in diesem Bereich vorzulegen. Dafür ist es höchste Zeit. Gewalt gegen Frauen passiert auf verschiedenen Ebenen: auf psychischer, sexueller, ökonomischer oder sozialer. Sie ist sowohl Ursache als auch Folge der ungleichen Machtverteilung zwischen Männern und Frauen. Die Bekämpfung von Gewalt gegen Frauen als auch der Ungleichheit zwischen den Geschlechtern sollte daher eine der Prioritäten auf der europäischen Agenda sein.

3-397-000

**Jacek Włosowicz (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Niższa pozycja społeczna kobiet jest wynikiem wielowiekowej dyskryminacji i negatywnych stereotypów. Jest to jeden z głównych powodów, dla których przemoc wobec kobiet jest nadal tak szeroko występującym zjawiskiem społecznym. Polityka Unii Europejskiej jest temu przeciwna i stanowczo potępia wszelkie dyskryminacyjne postawy oraz przemoc wobec kobiet i dzieci. Tradycja, honor, kultura, prywatność czy religia nie mogą być usprawiedliwieniem dla państw członkowskich, zwalniającym je z zapobiegania przemocy i jej eliminowania.

Walka z wszelkimi formami przemocy wobec kobiet i dzieci wymaga skoordynowanych strategii. Należy zacząć działać od najniższych szczebli krajowych. Podejście do sprawy powinno być złożone i nakierowane na kluczowe kwestie, takie jak zapobieganie, ochrona, wsparcie dla ofiar, a także ściganie sprawców. Dlatego należy popierać inicjatywy, które sprzeciwiają się wszelkiego rodzaju agresji wobec kobiet.

3-397-250

**Zbigniew Ziobro (EFD)**, *na piśmie*. – Jest rzeczą zawstydzającą, że nadal w Europie występuje tak wiele przypadków przemocy wobec kobiet. Szczególne zaniepokojenie musi budzić fakt, że znaczna część przypadków przemocy nie jest zgłaszana policji, tym bardziej że dotyczy to przypadków tak ciężkich przestępstw jak przestępstwo zgwałcenia.

Żadna strategia zwalczania przemocy wobec kobiet nie może odnieść skutku, jeżeli pokrzywdzone nie będą zgłaszać faktu przemocy odpowiednim organom. Prawo musi zapewniać w tym zakresie zdecydowaną reakcję, tak aby ofiary odzyskały poczucie sprawiedliwości, a jednocześnie zarówno one, jak i całe społeczeństwo były chronione przed podobnymi przypadkami w przyszłości.

Zaniepokojenie musi budzić fakt, że w kilku krajach Unii, w tym w Polsce, kary orzekane za przestępstwa o charakterze seksualnym są bardzo niskie, a na dodatek ich wykonanie jest często warunkowo zawieszane. Tytułem przykładu można wskazać, że 40% orzekanych w Polsce kar za przestępstwo zgwałcenia to kary pozbawienia wolności z warunkowym zawieszeniem ich wykonania. Wymierzanie tak łagodnych kar stanowi w istocie policzek wymierzany pokrzywdzonym przez sądy, które lekceważąco podchodzą do wyrządzonej krzywdy. Poważne traktowanie zjawiska przemocy wobec kobiet musi oznaczać konieczność surowego traktowania sprawców tej przemocy, tak aby zapewnić sprawiedliwą odpłatę za wyrządzone zło i jednocześnie zabezpieczyć społeczeństwo na przyszłość.

3-397-500

**Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL)**, *por escrito*. – Não podemos isolar o problema da violência contra mulheres e raparigas do conjunto das políticas transversais que são aplicadas pela UE nos 27 EM. Erradicar todas as formas de violência contra mulheres implica combater o empobrecimento, o desemprego, o aumento de fenómenos de marginalidade e dependência que arrastam consigo o aumento das causas da prostituição, que vítima hoje cada vez mais mulheres. Combater a violência implica combater a violência doméstica e para tal é necessário o reforço das políticas sociais, ou seja, o investimento público que é bloqueado pelas políticas fiscais da UE. Erradicar a violência contra as mulheres implica erradicar, no trabalho, a imposição de extenuantes ritmos de trabalho, os salários baixos que mantêm as mulheres em ciclos de pobreza e as impossibilitam de realizar a sua independência económica, e implica terminar com as desigualdades salariais. Ora, as medidas de flexibilização laboral que tanto animam o conceito de competitividade das "instituições europeias" só contribuem para impossibilitar que as mulheres consigam romper com os ciclos de violência a que estão sujeitas. Fazer uma rutura com as atuais políticas económicas e sociais seria o maior contributo que a UE poderia dar para a luta contra a violência contra as mulheres.

3-486-000

**President.** – That concludes the vote.

## 9. Διαρθρώσεις και προθέσεις ψήφου: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά

3-488-000

**PRESIDE: ALEJO VIDAL-QUADRAS**

*Vicepresidente*

## 10. Aprobación del Acta de la sesión anterior: véase el Acta

## 11. Suplicatorio de suspensión de la inmunidad parlamentaria : véase el Acta

## 12. Diálogo para una solución pacífica de la cuestión kurda en Turquía (debate)

3-492-000

**El Presidente.** – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate a partir de las Declaraciones del Consejo y de la Comisión sobre una solución pacífica de la cuestión kurda en Turquía.

3-493-000

**Lucinda Creighton,** *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, honourable Members, this afternoon's debate on the Kurdish issue takes place only a few weeks after the terrible and brutal killings of three PKK activists in Paris last month. We share Parliament's profound shock at those killings but they serve to underline to all of us the importance of settling the Kurdish issue; that is in the interests of all concerned. A settlement would play a vital role in helping ensure the security and the stability of the region.

The Kurdish issue also has important implications for EU enlargement, which is a key policy of the European Union and a particular priority for the Irish Presidency. It is important for Turkey's accession process, and is raised regularly in the context of the accession negotiations.

As a candidate country, Turkey has to meet the Copenhagen political criteria, including the stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities. The Kurdish issue has implications in all of these areas, but also extends to related areas, such as cultural rights and socio-economic considerations.

The EU's accession partnership with Turkey includes a number of priorities which particularly relate to the situation in the East and South-East of the country. These highlight the need for Turkey to develop a comprehensive approach to reducing regional disparities. This means improving the situation in the region so as to enhance the economic, social and cultural opportunities for all Turkish citizens including those of Kurdish origin.

Clearly, the Kurdish issue constitutes a major and longstanding challenge for Turkey. Continuing terrorist attacks make it harder to reach a solution. I wish to reiterate here that the EU and its Member States strongly condemn terrorism in all forms and are working closely with Turkey to combat the terrorist threat. The PKK is listed by the EU as a terrorist organisation. Within the EU, the PKK is involved mainly in fund-raising, including through criminal activity. This has led to arrests in a number of European countries. The EU and its Member States are also active in cooperating with Turkey in combating terrorism and associated criminal activities via counter-terrorism training and information exchange.

Whilst much of these activities are devoted specifically to addressing the PKK, we are also working closely with Turkey in tackling all forms of terrorism, including in the Global Counter-Terrorism Forum in which the EU and Turkey co-chair the working group on the Horn of Africa region.

Whilst the EU has consistently condemned PKK terrorism, it is clear that the wider Kurdish issue can only be addressed through a peaceful, comprehensive and sustainable solution. It is a conflict which has claimed far too many victims over the course of three decades and which has created a climate of instability and profound mistrust.

Against this background, the EU is fully supportive of the ongoing talks between the Turkish Government and the PKK aimed at ending the conflict. This is a significant new initiative which offers a positive perspective for the future. We welcome these moves, and we call on both sides to use this opportunity to make real progress. We also welcome the fact that there is cross-party support, and backing from civil society, for this initiative.

There is a clear indication that there is a real desire for peace. We will continue to encourage an approach which is inclusive and broad-based. This is essential if it is to have a chance of success.

A successful outcome would also play a crucial role in Turkey's own reform process. It would help encourage further political and constitutional reform which is important for Turkey's EU accession.

Mr President, honourable Members, this is a courageous initiative and we need to recognise it as such. We are at the start of what is likely to be a lengthy process. Not everybody is committed to it succeeding. Indeed there will always be some who attempt to derail such a process for their own misguided ends.

The killings in Paris remind us tragically that there is strong opposition to any negotiations from some quarters. But such events cannot be allowed to derail negotiations. Our own experience closer to home shows that any peace process requires both courage and commitment. We should therefore give our full and unequivocal support to this initiative. I am sure that Members here will join me in offering their own support.

3-494-000

**Štefan Füle**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, throughout the years we have consistently underlined that finding a solution to the Kurdish issue and to all the problems in the South-East of Turkey requires the widest possible contribution of all democratic forces and an open and frank public discussion that should be conducted in full respect of the basic fundamental freedoms.

That is why the ongoing discussions are of such historic importance for Turkey. They constitute a great window of opportunity for the ending of terrorism that would hopefully pave the way for an overall solution to the Kurdish issue. The fact that the process has met the support of all stakeholders, notably the opposition, and has been welcomed by important parts of Turkish society gives us more reasons to be optimistic and to believe that the process is truly result-oriented.

A successful outcome would not only put an end to a conflict that has claimed tens of thousands of lives over the past three decades: it would solve many outstanding problems in Turkey and play a crucial role in fostering political and constitutional reforms; it would be a strong incentive for the adoption of the Fourth Judicial Reform Package, actually addressing the key problems related to freedom of expression and other fundamental rights; and it would facilitate the redrafting of the constitution with respect to the rights of citizenship.

In this regard, a solution of this issue would have a strong impact on the accession process of Turkey as such, as it would further consolidate the role of the European Union as a benchmark for reforms in Turkey. In turn, putting the accession negotiations back on the right track would be a strong incentive for supporting a solution for this issue and the reform process in general.

In the meantime, I welcome steps such as the recent adoption of the law allowing for the defence of Kurds in Kurdish as an important confidence-building measure in the context of the ongoing talks.

Regarding the redrafting of the constitution, we have understood that it has entered a critical stage. While all parties are to be congratulated for the constructive attitude so far, now is the time for results in the spirit of compromise, and I cannot underline enough the importance of keeping up the participatory process.

Finally, a few words on the tragic events which occurred in Paris last month. We are aware of the distress this triple murder has provoked. We are confident that ongoing investigations by the French authorities will shed full light on this crime. We encourage all parties involved not to let this horrible incident or other possible provocations in the future distract them from their goal to achieve peace.

It is crucial that the European Union as a whole conveys its strong and clear support for these ongoing efforts. It remains equally important that we coordinate our messages of support to Turkey. The Commission stands ready to assist where it can, including in using our financial assistance under our instrument for pre-accession support to support a post-conflict and reconciliation strategy and to expand further the socio-economic development and the political and cultural rights of citizens of Kurdish origin.

3-495-000

**Ria Oomen-Ruijten**, *namens de PPE-Fractie* . – Het verleden heeft ons geleerd dat vredesgesprekken alleen maar gebaat zijn bij rust en discretie en niet bij publieke opwindning. Om die reden vond de PPE-Fractie een debat daarover nu niet nodig, omdat wij straks ook de resolutie over Turkije bespreken. Ook president Gül heeft het gezegd, minder praten en meer doen, meer werken, dat zou het motto moeten zijn.

De aanleiding voor dit debat zijn de afschuwelijke provocaties die er zijn geweest, in Akari, maar ook in Parijs. Want niet iedereen wil dat er vrede komt. Er is een gewapende strijd sinds 1984. Dat heeft tienduizenden mensen het leven gekost. Wij hebben altijd onze afschuw uitgesproken over het terrorisme van de PKK. In 2009 zagen wij dat er een democratische opening zou moeten komen. Die is niet volledig tot stand gekomen. Eind 2011 en 2012 zijn er dan ineens die gesprekken tussen de overheid en Abdullah Öcalan. Wij hopen dat er een duurzame oplossing komt, maar dat kan alleen maar als er een breed draagvlak is. In dit opzicht complimenteer ik, net zoals de commissaris, de oppositiepartijen die het ook mogelijk maken en het maatschappelijk middenveld dat er nu zo positief tegenover staat.

Onderhandelen vergt moed, je moet ook over je eigen schaduw heen springen. Alleen dan kan er een historisch akkoord komen dat goed is voor alle Turkse burgers. Als dat vervolgens ook nog gestalte krijgt in de nieuwe grondwet, dan zou elke Turkse inwoner tevreden moeten zijn. Ik ben ervan overtuigd dat wanneer die rust en ook die vrede er komt, dat ook het begin zal zijn van meer welvaart in het zuidoosten van Turkije.

3-496-000

**Raimon Obiols**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D* . – Señor Presidente, quiero expresar el apoyo de nuestro Grupo parlamentario al proceso de diálogo que se ha abierto en Turquía para una solución pacífica de la cuestión kurda.

Es probablemente el reto más difícil y más complejo que se presenta en el proceso de modernización y democratización de Turquía. Tiene adversarios muy poderosos y decididos, tanto dentro como fuera de Turquía. Y hemos visto, con el asesinato de las tres militantes kurdas en París, hace unos días, hasta qué punto pueden llegar estos adversarios.

Sin embargo, todos los problemas turcos, en el fondo, tienen una dimensión kurda, y es muy difícil imaginar una situación de estabilidad democrática en Turquía sin que la cuestión kurda sea resuelta o se encauce en una vía de solución.

Por eso saludamos el inicio de estas conversaciones. Creemos que el primer objetivo debería ser poner fin a la violencia, al terrorismo y a las hostilidades. Escuchamos lo que el líder del PKK, Abdullah Öcalan, dijo a los parlamentarios y representantes kurdos que lo visitaron en la cárcel, el pasado 3 de enero: «La era de la violencia ha quedado atrás». ¡Ojalá sea así! Pero hay que tomar medidas concretas de confianza, y la primera de ellas es, sin duda, el fin de la violencia.

Luego está un camino, que será complejo y difícil, de reformas políticas, para hacer frente a la cuestión kurda en Turquía. Yo leí una vez un artículo de un historiador que decía que, suponiendo que alguna vez se resolvieran en el mundo los problemas nacionalitarios, el último en resolverse sería el problema kurdo. ¡Ojalá no sea así! Pero en todo caso es un problema de una gran complejidad.

Pero hay cosas por hacer. Hay la oportunidad de una nueva Constitución que reconozca y ampare los derechos lingüísticos de los kurdos en los medios de comunicación, en la escuela y en los tribunales; hay la posibilidad de una interpretación más justa de las leyes antiterroristas en Turquía, para que no signifiquen un amparo represivo frente a la afirmación de la identidad cultural de los kurdos; y hay una reforma electoral pendiente que pueda permitir que la expresión de su posición en las instituciones democráticas.

3-497-000

**Alexander Graf Lambsdorff**, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich bin anderer Auffassung als die von mir sehr geschätzte Kollegin von der EVP. Das ist keine Sache, die man hinter verschlossenen Türen und in aller Stille bearbeiten kann, sondern ich glaube, es haben sich in den letzten Monaten und Jahren so viele Entwicklungen ergeben, was die Frage der Kurden in der Türkei angeht, die es nötig und richtig machen, dass wir heute hier darüber reden und auch öffentlich debattieren, wie es weitergehen kann. Man braucht nur daran zu denken: Wer von uns hätte sich vorstellen können, dass die Regierung in Ankara in einen Dialog mit einem Menschen tritt, der über viele Jahre als Unperson bezeichnet worden ist?

Wir müssen uns vergegenwärtigen, dass im Südosten der Türkei jeden Tag türkische Soldaten unter Beschuss von PKK-Aktivisten aus den Bergen geraten. Wir haben die regionale Dimension – die weder von Rat noch Kommission hier erwähnt worden ist – mit dem Nordirak und der Situation in Syrien. Das heißt, wir haben insgesamt eine Lage, die zusammen mit den Morden von Paris uns alle vor ein großes Fragezeichen stellt: Wie geht es weiter mit der Situation der Kurden?

Eines ist ja auch klar – wie Kollege Obiols gerade gesagt hat: Ja, die Situation, was Sprache, Schulen, Gerichte angeht, hat sich für die Kurden verbessert. Wir sehen gleichzeitig aber eine massive Repressionskampagne gegen die KCK, also gegen Leute, die im Südosten der Türkei hauptsächlich kommunalpolitisch aktiv sind. Ich glaube, dass deswegen die öffentliche Debatte mit dieser Debatte heute hier im Europäischen Parlament vielleicht

beginnen kann, dass sie Fahrt aufnehmen kann, dass das Kurdenproblem nicht mehr im Windschatten unserer Aufmerksamkeit liegt, sondern dass wir es öffentlich debattieren.

Wir müssen einige Botschaften ganz klar transportieren. Zum einen an die türkische Regierung: Wir verurteilen Terror, und wir verstehen, dass es für keine Regierung dieser Welt hinnehmbar ist, wenn jeden Tag ihre eigenen Soldaten und Polizisten unter Beschuss geraten und dabei ums Leben kommen. Wir ermutigen die türkische Regierung, den Dialog auf der Insel İmralı fortzusetzen. Diesen Faden sollte man nicht abreißen lassen.

Aber die KCK-Verhaftungswelle muss gestoppt werden, die Repression muss enden, und die türkische Regierung muss sich der regionalen Dimension des Problems klar werden: Der Südosten der Türkei ist nicht mehr isoliert. An die Kurden ganz klar: Distanzierung vom Terror – das gilt für die BDP, das gilt aber auch für die KCK –, eine klare Distanzierung von Terror und Gewalt. Und die PKK muss ihre Kämpfer in den Bergen stoppen, sonst ist der Dialog, sonst ist die friedliche Lösung nicht absehbar.

3-498-000

**Hélène Flautre**, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, je crois, tout comme mes collègues, que le processus qui s'est ouvert en Turquie est de première importance, voire historique et que, en cela, il ne ressemble pas aux anciennes tentatives – qui, d'ailleurs, ont toutes échoué jusqu'à ce jour – de négociation pour la paix entre l'État turc et son gouvernement et les Kurdes.

Il s'agit de mettre fin à un cycle de violences de plusieurs décennies, un cycle de répressions et rébellions, qui a causé la mort de dizaines de milliers de personnes, et je dois dire que, pour les familles, qu'il s'agisse des mères, filles ou sœurs de policiers, de soldats, de guérilleros ou de civils, la douleur est la même. Il importe donc de mettre fin à cette douleur pour relancer une nouvelle étape de la démocratie en Turquie puisque la question kurde est la question taboue qui, aujourd'hui – on le voit dans les débats à l'assemblée nationale turque – est en train de révéler et de clarifier le paysage politique. Elle fait le départ entre ceux qui sont favorables à une avancée sur la citoyenneté, l'égalité des droits, la gouvernance locale et régionale et une position politique répressive qui relève du passé nationaliste.

Il y a aussi – cela a été dit et c'est très important – des enjeux régionaux considérables qui, à la fois, motivent la détermination du gouvernement à avancer résolument vers la paix et la négociation et qui, en même temps, auront des effets majeurs de stabilisation à l'échelle régionale.

Évidemment, après des dizaines d'années de méfiance, de violence, voire de haine, ce n'est pas simple de faire confiance. Ce n'est pas simple d'être positif et ce n'est pas facile de trouver le langage de la réconciliation, de la paix et de la démocratie. Ce n'est pas simple mais ne pas le faire serait une erreur historique aux conséquences dramatiques. La population elle-même l'a montré très simplement, quand elle a accueilli à Diyarbakir, le corps des trois militantes kurdes dans le recueillement, sans aucune provocation d'aucune part. La population a dit sa détermination pour la paix et elle s'est fait respecter dans cette aspiration à la paix. Je crois que ce message très fort, envoyé par la population, doit être aujourd'hui l'énergie positive qui permet aux acteurs de transcender leurs querelles et, parfois, leur haine du passé.

Ce sera compliqué, chacun le sait, il y a beaucoup de dimensions. C'est un processus qui va se jouer à l'assemblée nationale, par la Constitution, et qui va nécessiter des discussions directes, avec la partie armée du PKK, avec les militants qui sont nombreux, ici en Europe,



avec la population et avec le représentant politique BDP de la population kurde. Tous ces acteurs doivent, aujourd'hui, converger d'un même élan dans leurs différents champs d'action pour concourir à la paix et à la démocratie.

Puisque M. Öcalan est reconnu comme le leader de l'ensemble de ces composantes, que le gouvernement a accédé, en quelque sorte, à cette vaste campagne de la population pour prendre M. Öcalan comme interlocuteur et négociateur, il faut que ce leader reconnu ait les moyens de mener à bien cette tâche historique. Il faut renforcer les conditions de travail de M. Öcalan, il faut qu'il puisse dialoguer avec les différentes composantes du mouvement pour trouver la meilleure synthèse, celle qui va permettre que toutes les parties soient gagnantes à l'aune de cet intérêt commun, en Turquie, qui est celui de la paix et de la démocratie.

3-499-000

**Charles Tannock**, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, the Kurdish-Turkish conflict is now the only major insurgency taking place within a member or candidate state of the European Union. After almost 30 years of tragic bloodshed, the deaths of many thousands of civilians as well as combatants and the displacement of an estimated three million Kurds, actions must now be taken to ensure that no more lives are lost and that all the people in Turkey, regardless of their culture or ethnicity, are accorded full human rights enshrined in law.

Although I support Turkey's development and welcome it as an economic and social partner, we cannot deny that the country's human rights record has been questionable over the years, particularly with regard to minorities. The Kurdish population of Turkey has been culturally and institutionally alienated. Although the Turkish state has introduced some positive measures in recent years, the Kurdish language remains subject to restrictions as a language of instruction in schools, and organisations promoting the Kurdish minority have also been heavily discouraged. There are also worrying allegations that Turkey has relocated Kurds to different parts of the country in order to dilute the culture and the perceived military threat.

As a modern democracy, Turkey must now permit the Kurds to exercise their full cultural and linguistic identity within the existing borders of the Turkish state. Certainly my group accepts that encouraging a separate Kurdish state would pose a very real risk of destabilising the region further, drawing in Iraq, Syria and Iran and fermenting further conflict.

The Kurdish population also has a part to play. The Kurdish paramilitary organisation, PKK, must now fully renounce all violence and engage in meaningful, peaceful talks with Turkey without preconditions. In this I welcome the moves to involve Abdullah Öcalan. Even from prison as a convicted criminal, his influence cannot be underestimated. As with so many other conflicts, then, it is often necessary to negotiate with one's worst enemy – we have experience in the United Kingdom in Northern Ireland with the IRA, the Spanish with the Basque terrorists and so on – in order to achieve a shared goal of peace.

Finally, I too utterly condemn the brutal murder of the three PKK activists in their Paris office last month. The perpetrators must be brought to justice and not be permitted to derail the fragile peace negotiations between the Kurdish population and the Turkish Government.

3-500-000

**Bastiaan Belder**, *namens de EFD-Fractie*. – De ontmanteling van de kemalistische staat in Turkije door de AKP wekte grote hoop onder de Koerden. Hoop op de uiteindelijke officiële erkenning van hun eigen etnische nationale identiteit.

Na ruim 10 jaar van AKP-bewind is dit vurige Koerdische verlangen nog lang niet ingewilligd. Daaraan lag zeker een zeer verwarrende inconsistentie van de zijde van AKP-regeringen ten grondslag. Premier Erdogan ging daar recent in voor. Afwisselend sprak hij over de supra-etnische identiteit van het Turkse burgerschap, waarin Turken, Koerden en andere gelijkberechtigd zijn. Tegelijk sprak hij over één staat, één vlag, één vaderland, één natie.

Deze tegenstrijdige opstelling van de AKP manifesteerde zich ook in de jaren na de zogenoemde Koerdische opening of de democratische opening van 2009. Geheime besprekingen met de AKP, de Oslo-besprekingen, culturele concessies op taalgebied versus - en het is al door collega Lambsdorff gezegd - een ware arrestatiegolf onder Koerdische prominenten. Geen wonder dat de Koerden deze AKP-politiek opvatten als één stap vooruit en twee achteruit.

Ondertussen bouwden de Koerden met volharding verder aan een parallelstaat in Turkije, een realiteit die premier Erdogan ook openlijk erkent en militant verwerpt. Daarmee lost hij evenwel de Koerdische kwestie allerminst op. Een uitweg biedt wellicht een multi-etnisch staatsmodel voor Turkije. In het andere geval dreigt de wedren tussen de Turkse Republiek en de Koerdische parallelstaat uit te lopen op de scheidingseis van die parallelstaat. Daarover gaan niet alleen al Koerdische, maar ook Turkse, zij het anonieme, stemmen op. Geen irreële geluiden, nu Ankara zich geplaatst ziet voor autonome Koerdische scenario's aan de landsgrenzen.

*[De spreker stemt ermee in een "blauwe kaart"-vraag te beantwoorden (artikel 149, lid 8, van het Reglement)]*

3-501-000

**Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE)**, *"blauwe kaart"-vraag*. – Als rapporteur ben ik mij er terdege van bewust dat het goed is dat wij hier in het Parlement ook altijd de waarheid spreken over een politieke ontwikkeling in een land.

En daarom zou ik de heer Belder willen vragen of het hem wellicht ontgaat is dat de grootste hervormingen die zijn doorgevoerd ten behoeve van de Koerden, in de laatste jaren hebben plaatsgevonden? Kan hij dat beamen?

3-502-000

**Bastiaan Belder (EFD)**, *"blauwe kaart"-antwoord*. – Ik heb het in mijn speech duidelijk gezegd: de Koerden zien het als één stap vooruit en twee stappen achteruit. En op grond van de feiten wil ik er u ook op wijzen, rapporteur, dat in 2005 de AKP zich veel minder nationalistisch opstelde dan enkele jaren later, toen het zelfs ook nog eens de islampolitiek instrumentaliseerde in de Koerdische kwestie.

Ik heb nog aardige literatuur voor u ter kennisneming.

3-503-000

**Jürgen Klute**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Ich kann zwar jetzt meine Frage an Herrn Tannock nicht mehr stellen, vielleicht darf ich aber eine Sekunde länger reden und zuvor anmerken, dass die BDP – zumindest mittlerweile, also seit 10 Jahren etwa – keine Separierung mehr von der Türkei verlangt. Ich finde, das ist wichtig und das sollten wir in der Debatte berücksichtigen, dass es nicht mehr um eine Separierung und eine Zerstörung der Türkei geht.

Ansonsten möchte ich beisteuern, dass auch meine Fraktion, die GUE, den mutigen Anlauf zum Dialog mit Abdullah Öcalan und der PKK, den die türkische Regierung Ende Dezember unternommen hat, begrüßt. Beide Konfliktparteien haben sich in einen Prozess begeben, der große Hoffnungen geweckt hat bei den internationalen Partnern, aber vor allen Dingen auch bei den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern der Türkei, die nun schon mehr als 30 Jahre unter Krieg und Gewalt leiden müssen.

Die Gespräche zwischen der türkischen Regierung und Öcalan sind ein wichtiger Schritt, aber das ist nur ein erster Schritt auf dem Weg zu einer politischen und friedlichen Lösung. Der Weg zu Frieden und Versöhnung ist noch weit. Er kann nur gegangen werden, wenn es gelingt, Vertrauen aufzubauen. Friedensverhandlungen sind keine Machtspiele. Friedensverhandlungen kann man nur gemeinsam gewinnen oder gemeinsam verlieren. Die Initiative ist von der türkischen Regierung ausgegangen. Sie hat damit auf jahrelange Forderungen weiter Teile der kurdischen Bewegung reagiert. Premierminister Erdoğan hält allerdings die Zügel in der Hand – die Zügel für einen erfolgreichen Friedensprozess müssen aber von allen Seiten gehalten werden.

Die Verhandlungen brauchen Verlässlichkeit. Die Beteiligung an den Gesprächen darf nicht zu einem Lotteriespiel werden. Die nächsten Schritte müssen deshalb darin bestehen, dass die Konfliktparteien gemeinsam den weiteren Ablauf der Verhandlungen abstimmen und sich gemeinsam darauf verständigen, wer notwendigerweise an den Verhandlungen teilnehmen soll. Die drei Morde in Paris an Sakine Cansiz, Fidan Doğan und Leyla Söylemez am 9. Januar dieses Jahres haben den begonnenen Prozess offensichtlich unterbrochen. Ich glaube, ich spreche im Namen aller Abgeordneten hier, wenn ich an beide Konfliktparteien appelliere, sich durch die drei Morde nicht vom eingeschlagenen Verhandlungsweg abbringen zu lassen.

3-504-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI)**. - Herr Präsident! Viel zu lange wurde meines Erachtens die Kurdenfrage als reines Terrorproblem gesehen. Ganz unabhängig davon, wie realistisch Szenarien sind, die einen unabhängigen Kurdenstaat sehen, muss man jedenfalls sagen, dass das Recht der türkischen Staatsbürger mit kurdischen Wurzeln auf Gewährleistung von Grund- und Minderheitenrechten nicht ignoriert werden darf. Wenn man davon ausgeht, dass der Iran tatsächlich im syrischen Bürgerkrieg seine Finger im Spiel hat, muss man auch sagen, dass auch die Türkei durch die Unterstützung der syrischen Opposition tief im Konflikt steckt. Das hohe Ansehen, welches die PKK bei den syrischen Kurden genießt, wird damit also immer mehr zum Problem. Dass nun öffentlich eingeräumt wurde, dass es Gespräche mit der PKK gibt, liegt wohl vor allem daran, dass auch Ankara angesichts des anhaltenden syrischen Bürgerkriegs und der realen Gefahr eines Überschwappens des Konflikts auf die Türkei unter starkem Druck steht.

Die aktuellen Entwicklungen zeigen meines Erachtens einmal mehr das hohe, enorme Sicherheitsrisiko einer türkischen EU-Mitgliedschaft. Die EU und ihre Mitgliedstaaten

können kein Interesse daran haben, selbst zu Frontstaaten in einem Nahostkonflikt zu werden.

3-505-000

**Eduard Kukan (PPE).** - Mr President, I would like to welcome and appreciate this opportunity to discuss the Kurdish issue today. It is important to support fully all the initiatives which lead to the reopening of dialogue and a possible road to a peaceful solution for the Kurds in the region.

The latest steps taken by the Turkish ruling party aiming to resume talks with Öcalan in promoting peace dialogue could be a good start on this road. It is true that the Kurdish issue has been misunderstood in Turkey. Therefore, I hope that it will be possible to sustain a general consensus among leading parties on the dialogue and possibly get other political forces involved.

There is a very similar challenge for the other side as well. In order to build trust in the process, the Kurdish parties and groups should come on board and lay down arms. Moreover, with the latest developments in Syria and escalating political tensions in Arbil province in Northern Iraq, it is vital that Turkey seeks a political solution. It is important to stop any violence, especially against civilians; this is our most important goal at the moment.

Syria and Iran in particular may not be comfortable with a stronger Turkey in the region. These two countries have in the past used the PKK to destabilise Turkey. I believe a peaceful solution to the Kurdish issue could make Turkey only more powerful in the region; this is in the interest of the European Union too.

3-506-000

**Μαρία-Ελένη Κοππά (S&D).** - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, για να εξετάσουμε το κουρδικό πρόβλημα, πρέπει να δούμε συνολικά την κατάσταση των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων στην Τουρκία, γιατί είναι ένα αναπόσπαστο κομμάτι της. Μετά από τόσα χρόνια είναι αναμφισβήτητο ότι πρέπει να δοθεί τέλος σε αυτήν την σύγκρουση ανάμεσα στον κουρδικό λαό και την τουρκική κυβέρνηση.

Η πρωτοβουλία Ερντογάν για απευθείας συνομιλίες σημαίνει ότι έχει γίνει πια κατανοητό ότι η επίλυση αυτού του προβλήματος μπορεί να γίνει μόνο μέσα από πολιτικό διάλογο και όχι με τη βία. Η κατάσταση όμως που υπάρχει στην Τουρκία δεν καλλιεργεί αισιοδοξία σε αυτήν την κατεύθυνση. Και αυτό γιατί πολλοί Κούρδοι κρατούμενοι εξακολουθούν να παραμένουν στις φυλακές για μακρύ χρονικό διάστημα και χωρίς δίκη. Συνεχιζόμενες συλλήψεις τις οποίες παρακολουθούμε κάθε μέρα δεν βοηθούν καθόλου στη δημιουργία εδάφους συνεννόησης.

Από την άλλη μεριά οι δολοφονίες των τριών ακτιβιστριών της οργάνωσης ΡΚΚ στο Παρίσι μπορεί να δυναμιτίσουν το ήδη εύθραυστο κλίμα. Η ουσία είναι ότι οι συνομιλίες πρέπει να προχωρήσουν και οι λύσεις που θα προταθούν πρέπει να λαμβάνουν υπόψη και το κοινό συμφέρον αλλά και την αξιοπρέπεια και το μέλλον του κουρδικού λαού. Τα βασικά δικαιώματα των Κούρδων πρέπει να γίνουν σεβαστά.

Η Τουρκία βρίσκεται σε μια διαδικασία βαθιών αλλαγών, σε ένα μεγάλο σταυροδρόμι. Εναπόκειται στην ίδια να αποφασίσει εάν επιθυμεί να γίνει μια σύγχρονη δημοκρατική κοινωνία με σεβασμό στα θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα και τις ελευθερίες των πολιτών της. Είναι στο χέρι της να λύσει αυτό το χρονίζον ζήτημα που έχει μεγάλη σημασία όχι μόνο για την ίδια, αλλά και για τη σταθερότητα και την ειρήνη στην ευρύτερη περιοχή.

3-507-000

**Andrew Duff (ALDE).** - Mr President, both sides appear finally to have realised that their previous antagonistic positions have comprehensively failed, so while we can strongly welcome Turkish rapprochement with the Kurds and the pacification – if it comes – of the PKK, I think we also have the right to ask from Turkey moral, political and perhaps military support for the fight to combat the jihadists in the Sahel and the Middle East. The JPC will be in Ankara next week and we shall be seeking clarification from Turkey about reciprocal support to fight terrorism.

*(The President told the speaker that the Earl of Dartmouth wished to ask him a blue card question)*

Yes, I suspected he might.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-508-000

**William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD),** *blue-card question.* – Mr Duff, your suspicion was spot on. Do you regard Turkey's treatment of the Kurds, that has been eloquently outlined by our colleagues in this Chamber, as being a qualification for Turkey's membership of the European Union, or not?

3-509-000

**Andrew Duff (ALDE),** *blue-card answer.* – I certainly see a serious and genuine attempt to reconcile what was previously an intractable and painful problem to be precisely an expression of European values that will certainly make Turkey a credible partner and possible member of our family.

3-510-000

**Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE).** - Herr Präsident! Im Dezember habe ich an einer Türkeireise des Unterausschusses Menschenrechte teilgenommen, und wir haben uns über verschiedene Menschenrechtsverletzungen in der Türkei informiert. Es ging auch um die Degradierung, Verunglimpfung, Verfolgung und Inhaftierung von Menschenrechtsverteidigern im ganzen Land, besonders oft wurde aber die Region Mersin genannt. Hier hatte die kurdenfreundliche Partei BDP besonders gute Wahlergebnisse.

In der Vergangenheit und heute gibt es viele Prozesse gegen Journalisten, Professoren, Intellektuelle, die sich für die Rechte der Kurden einsetzen, die von ihrem Recht auf Meinungsfreiheit Gebrauch machen und deshalb als Terroristensympathisanten abgestempelt und kriminalisiert werden. Hunderte von Menschenrechtsaktivisten, denen die Unterstützung der KCK vorgeworfen wird, sitzen ohne konkrete Anklagepunkte in Haft oder werden bedroht. Auch kurdische Abgeordnete der BDP-Partei auf Landes- und Kommunalebene sitzen in Haft oder warten auf ihren Prozess.

Das sind alles keine guten Voraussetzungen, um zu einer politischen Lösung zu kommen. Der Prozess zur Ausarbeitung der Verfassung, die den ethnischen Minderheiten mehr Rechte geben soll, scheint auch ins Stocken geraten zu sein. Es ist schwierig, Einigkeit über die Frage der Staatsbürgerschaft zu erzielen. Auch das Antiterrorgesetz, die Erziehung in kurdischer Sprache und eine Absenkung der Zehnprozenthürde bei nationalen Wahlen sind umstritten.

Ich bitte dringend Rat und Kommission, sich für diejenigen einzusetzen, die die Rechte der kurdischen Minderheit verteidigen und deshalb inhaftiert oder von einer nicht unabhängigen Justiz verurteilt werden.

3-511-000

**Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR).** - Od kilku lat do Parlamentu Europejskiego wpływają postulaty Kurdów z prośbą o interwencję i pośrednictwo w sprawie ich statusu i traktowania w Turcji. Kurdowie stanowią kilkunastomilionową grupę obywateli postrzeganych częstokroć przez pryzmat stereotypu terrorysty lub żebraka. Są oni obywatelami państwa tureckiego, podobnie jak inne mniejszości: Ormianie, Tatarzy, Asyryjczycy i inni. Wszystkim należy zagwarantować równe prawa mniejszości narodowych oraz ich współistnienie na zasadzie wzajemnego szacunku i zaufania.

Zdajemy sobie sprawę, że kwestia kurdyjska ma różne wymiary. Z jednej strony nagłaśniane są akty terrorystyczne przypisywane kurdyjskim partyzantom, z drugiej cierpi także kurdyjska ludność cywilna. Proces normalizacji nie może przebiegać zbyt gwałtownie, ale powinien postępować harmonijnie, w wyniku wcześniejszego nakreślenia pokojowego planu działania. Przedstawiciele Unii Europejskiej mogą odgrywać aktywną rolę mediatora lub pośrednika. Turcji, która od wielu lat stara się o członkostwo w Unii Europejskiej, powinno najbardziej zależeć na pokojowym rozwiązaniu kwestii mniejszość kurdyjskiej w tym kraju, bowiem żadne wewnętrznie skłócone państwo nie może zostać członkiem Unii Europejskiej.

3-512-000

**William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD).** - Mr President, there are already approximately 200 000 Kurds living in the United Kingdom. The Kurds in the United Kingdom are concentrated in our large cities where, even at the present time, there is profound pressure on public services, especially health and education.

According to the Home Affairs Select Committee of the British House of Commons, should Turkey become a member of the European Union, up to 4.4 million Turkish citizens, of all ethnic groups, would emigrate to Britain, where they would then have the right to benefits and the NHS.

I do not blame the Kurds for wanting to leave. Ankara has a decades-long policy of denying them elementary linguistic and other cultural rights. However, the solution is not mass immigration to the UK and other EU Member States. The solution is that Turkey start to treat its minorities with decency and respect.

We should make it crystal clear that Turkey, an Asian country, cannot join the EU.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-513-000

**Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL),** *question "carton bleu"*. – Je voudrais juste demander à notre collègue s'il a regardé quel était l'ordre du jour de notre réunion de cet après-midi. Il n'est ni question de l'adhésion de la Turquie à l'Union européenne ni question de lutter contre l'immigration, quelle qu'elle soit, mais bien de soutenir un processus de paix qui a besoin de tout notre soutien, au-delà de nos divisions.

3-514-000

**William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD)**, *blue-card answer*. – Madam, I must ask you to understand and accept that you cannot separate, we cannot separate, Turkey's systematic violation of human rights – not just of Kurds but of dissenters, Christians, journalists and so on – from its application to be a member of the European Union. And the establishment parties, of which actually you are not one, should be ashamed of themselves that they systematically and consistently cover these matters up.

3-515-000

**Marie-Christine Vergiat (GUE/NGL)**. - Monsieur le Président, c'est avec beaucoup d'émotion que je prends la parole aujourd'hui dans cet hémicycle.

Effectivement, le 9 janvier dernier, à Paris, trois militantes kurdes, Sakine, Fidan et Leyla, étaient froidement assassinées dans les locaux du centre d'information du Kurdistan, en plein centre de Paris. Je connaissais personnellement l'une d'entre elles.

Ce meurtre horrible a suscité une vague d'émotion sans précédent. Nombre de démocrates ont découvert la tragédie du peuple kurde. À Paris, 50 000 personnes se sont rassemblées le samedi qui a suivi l'assassinat. Des commentaires et des spéculations diverses s'en sont suivis, y compris de la part des autorités turques, et je le regrette.

Dès le jour de ce meurtre, j'ai dit et redit qu'il fallait laisser faire la justice française et demander au gouvernement français de veiller à ce que cette justice travaille en toute indépendance. Ce meurtre, comme d'autres, et diverses autres manipulations en Turquie comme dans d'autres pays de l'Union européenne ne peuvent être vus effectivement que comme des tentatives de déstabilisation du processus de paix qui commence à peine en Turquie.

C'est un moment historique. L'Union européenne doit mettre tout son poids dans la balance et pas seulement, Monsieur le Commissaire, en termes d'aide financière. Elle doit mettre son poids politique dans la balance. Elle a su le faire ailleurs. Tous ceux qui connaissent la situation en Turquie savent comment les autorités turques utilisent la lutte contre le terrorisme pour emprisonner les militants kurdes et tous ceux et toutes celles qui luttent pour la démocratie, qu'ils soient journalistes, avocats, intellectuels et bien d'autres. Huit à dix mille personnes sont des prisonniers politiques en Turquie. Cela ne peut plus durer.

L'Union européenne et ses États membres ne doivent pas prêter le flanc à la critique en la matière. La coopération politique ne peut plus se poursuivre sans une clarification de la définition du terme même de terrorisme. Le PKK, avec qui le gouvernement turc négocie ouvertement aujourd'hui, doit être retiré de la liste des organisations terroristes de l'Union européenne. Tous ceux et toutes celles qui vivent en Turquie ont droit à la paix et ont droit au respect de leurs droits de la même façon. C'est effectivement l'avenir de la région qui est en cause.

L'Union européenne doit aider l'ensemble des parties prenantes à dépasser ce que j'appellerai leurs crispations. Elle doit soutenir activement le processus de paix, peser de tout son poids pour qu'enfin il puisse être mené à son terme.

3-516-000

**Ewald Stadler (NI)**. - Herr Präsident! Im Gegensatz zu meiner Vorrednerin bin ich der Meinung: Die PKK ist eine terroristische Organisation. Sie finanziert sich mit Waffenhandel,

Terrorismus, Drogenhandel, Prostitution und Schutzgelderpressung. Daher bleibt es eine terroristische Organisation. Da habe ich Verständnis für die Position der türkischen Regierung. Dass von der linken Seite eine andere Position kommt, wundert mich nicht.

Aber die Debatte hier läuft sehr blauäugig. Wissen Sie, was die Türkei mit dem Fortschrittsbericht der Europäischen Union gemacht hat? Sie hat ihn einfach falsch übersetzt und dem Parlament die falsche Übersetzung ins Türkische vorgelegt. Der Europaminister, Egemen Bağış, hat gesagt, es sei subjektiv, voreingenommen und engstirnig, was die Europäische Union über die Türkei schreibt. Und der Vorsitzende der türkischen Verfassungskommission hat in einer Live-Sendung der CNN Türkei diesen Bericht in den Müll geworfen. Was wollen Sie mit so einem Partner? Ist das ein ernstzunehmender Partner, der die Republik Zypern, ein Vollmitglied der Europäischen Union, bis heute nicht anerkennt?

Man spricht in diesem Bericht der Kommission, den man falsch übersetzt hat, von dem griechisch verwalteten südzyprischen Landesteil. Das ist ungeheuerlich! Man spricht im Zusammenhang mit dem armenischen Völkermord bis heute vom sogenannten Völkermord. Das ist ungeheuerlich! Man leugnet das Kurdenproblem. Man leugnet bis heute den Militäreinsatz, bei dem 34 Zivilisten in Uludere umgebracht wurden, schlicht und einfach ermordet wurden. Das leugnet die Türkei bis heute. Was wollen Sie von so einem Land?

Dieses Land ist nicht europareif. Dieses Land gehört nicht zu Europa. Die Türkei wird hoffentlich nie ein europäisches Vollmitglied werden. Die österreichische Bevölkerung ist zu 80 % gegen eine Vollmitgliedschaft der Türken in der Europäischen Union, und daher werden wir auch weiterhin gegen diese Vollmitgliedschaft auftreten.

*(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 149 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)*

3-517-000

**Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE),** *blue-card question* . – I would like to ask, via Mr Stadler, if it would be possible for the Commission not only to give the English version of the progress report to the Turkish Government but also to translate it into Turkish so that there cannot be any misunderstanding. The English text was OK. It was only the translation that was wrong.

3-518-000

**Ewald Stadler (NI),** *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte* . – Ich möchte den Vorschlag der Kollegin begrüßen. Aber wir müssen ihn dann auch gleichzeitig an alle türkischen Abgeordneten senden, denn der wird sonst gar nicht weitergeleitet, und wir müssen ihn selbst in der Türkei veröffentlichen, denn das wird eben auch nicht gemacht. Das ist ja das Problem!

Ich meine, ich fand es wirklich ungeheuerlich, dass die türkische Regierung hergeht und unseren Bericht einfach falsch übersetzt und der Öffentlichkeit präsentiert und dann zusätzlich noch einen anderen eigenen Fortschrittsbericht vorgelegt hat, wo sie die Türkei als modellhaft demokratisch darstellt.

Ich meine, das ist ja so etwas von grotesk, dass es ärger nicht mehr geht.



3-519-000

**György Schöpflin (PPE).** - Mr President, the Kurdish problem was built into the Turkish political system from the outset. The Kurdish population of Turkey was denied its political rights as Kurds and, as the country modernised, they began to demand changes. The Turkish state, with its strongly centralising tradition, refused, and the result was violence: a low-level insurgency that has claimed many lives.

What has changed in the last few years is the slow shift in the attitude of the Turkish Government which is moving, however reluctantly, towards accepting that the suppression of the Kurds does not work. Equally, the emergence of a very extensive autonomy in the Kurdish region of Iraq has shown that Kurds are perfectly capable of acting as a factor of stability and do not threaten Turkish territorial integrity. Against this background, it is vital that the Turkish government recognise that, without accepting Kurds as equal citizens, the Turkish state will be the scene of ongoing conflict, one that will gravely weaken the chances of sustaining a functioning democracy.

Let there be no illusions about this: the change we are discussing requires a redesign of the Turkish state and citizen concept, and a shift away from the mono-ethnic basis that has marked Turkey since its emergence from the Ottoman Empire. It has to become markedly more tolerant towards those of its citizens who are not ethnically Turks or Sunni Muslim. But the Kurds too will have to accept that their future lies in Turkey and that they should not dream of restoring the state that was promised them after the First World War by the West. Territorial integrity, as we know, is a neuralgic point for any state. This is what the transformation is about, and we should not pretend that it will be easy. Giving up bad habits is hard.

3-520-000

**Marita Ulvskog (S&D).** - Herr talman! Jag har rätten att tala mitt eget språk här i Europaparlamentet, trots att jag kommer från ett litet medlemsland i EU:s utkant och trots att jag ibland är kritisk till beslut som fattas här. Jämför det med att kurder i Turkiet nu har fått rätten att tala sitt eget språk inför turkiska domstolar. Det är naturligtvis bra att de har fått den rätten.

Men jämförelsen illustrerar ju på ett dramatiskt sätt de många steg som återstår för Turkiet att ta för att man ska kunna säga att man närmar sig de krav som är självklara för oss som lever i Europa. Det är bra att Turkiet nu har öppnat för nya samtal med PKK – ingen annan väg är heller möjlig.

Det finns ett starkt stöd för fredssamtalen bland den turkiska befolkningen, och som vi har hört i den här debatten så finns det också ett väldigt starkt stöd för att de faktiskt ska resultera i tydliga förändringar vad gäller öppenhet, respekt för mänskliga rättigheter, upprätthållande av mänskliga rättigheter och stopp för diskriminering. Det ställer naturligtvis också krav på PKK.

Men ingen annan väg är möjlig än att börja leva som ett land som är så stort och så starkt som Turkiet. Är man stor så ska man vara snäll. Är man stor ska man också veta när man träder över gränsen, och en riktig skamfläck på Turkiets anseende är att man inte respekterar demokratiskt valda politiska företrädare. Leyla Zana, som har fått Sacharovpriset och är parlamentariker i det turkiska parlamentet för BDP-partiet, jagas världen runt trots att hon är parlamentariker och folkvald i Turkiet.

3-521-000

**Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE).** - Arvoisa puhemies, esityslistalla on kurdien ja Turkin välisen rauhan aikaansaaminen ja sen edistäminen. Edellisessä puheenvuorossa tuli esille, että kurdien kielellisen aseman parantaminen on yksi sellainen tavoite.

Me toki EU:ssa odotamme, että korkea edustaja Ashton ja koko EU toimisi aktiivisemmin rauhan edistämiseksi tällä alueella ja muuallakin. Korkea edustaja Ashton totesi Nobelin rauhanpalkinnon saannin yhteydessä ja sen jälkeen, että se myönnettiin nimenomaan sovittelutyöstä. Minä rohkenen olla hieman eri mieltä, sillä EU on ollut liian passiivinen rauhan välitystyössä ja rauhan sovittelutyössä. Turkin asian edistämisessä EU voisi toimia paljon nykyistä aktiivisemmin, ja minusta se ei liity millään tavalla jäsenyyasiaan, vaan rauhan ja ihmisoikeuksien kunnioittaminen Turkissa on tärkeää, onpa se EU:n jäsen tai ei.

3-522-000

**Mark Demesmaeker (Verts/ALE).** - Zoals eens te meer blijkt uit dit debat ligt de oplossing voor de Koerdische kwestie in Turkse handen. En uiteindelijk, als de berichten over het vredesproces kloppen, ziet het er naar uit dat Ankara heeft ingezien dat het met Abdullah Öcalan de sleutel tot de Koerdische oplossing in handen heeft.

Maar ik kijk toch ook met zekere scepsis naar de laatste schuchtere positieve ontwikkelingen. Zij zijn er wel, maar zij komen te schaars en te langzaam. Want telkens als Turkije een deur opende naar democratisering, gooide het een andere deur weer dicht. Ik denk daarbij aan het verbod op de DTP in december 2009, waardoor de fameuze 'democratische opening' van de regering Erdogan geen vervolg kreeg. Ik denk aan het KCK-proces, een rechtsstaat onwaardig, de talloze aanhoudingen van iedereen die kritiek op het regime heeft en die van Turkije 's werelds grootste gevangenis voor journalisten maken.

Ik dring er daarom bij de Commissie, de Raad en de lidstaten op aan niet blind te zijn voor dit gevaar, maar krachtig aan te sturen op een duurzame politieke dialoog met alle Koerdische politieke krachten in het land en zich niet voor de Turkse kar te laten spannen. Zonder volledige taalrechten, politieke autonomie, de afschaffing van de abnormaal hoge kiesdrempel van 10% en een volwaardige constitutionele hervorming met erkenning van de Koerdische rechten, blijven Ankara's intenties haaks staan op de Europese waarden die het zegt te willen naleven.

3-523-000

**Adam Bielan (ECR).** - Panie Przewodniczący! Kurdowie stanowią niemal 20% populacji Turcji – kraju, który aspiruje do Wspólnoty i jest jednocześnie ważnym członkiem NATO. Przedłużający się konflikt wewnętrzny stanowi poważne zagrożenie dla stabilności politycznej państwa oraz oddziałuje na całość jego społeczeństwa. Kwestia kurdyjska jest szczególnie delikatna w kontekście Syrii, względem której Ankara zamierza podjąć działania zbrojne.

Dążące do integracji z Europą władze tureckie uczyniły już wiele w zakresie dialogu z Kurdami: zniesiono zakaz używania ich języka, do czego jako mniejszość narodowa Kurdowie mają pełne prawo. Rząd premiera Erdogana opowiada się za poszanowaniem demokratycznych zasad wolności słowa, zrzeszania się i zgromadzeń. Postulaty Kurdów dotyczące uregulowania kwestii obywatelstwa czy reformy ordynacji wyborczej również należy przedyskutować. Bezwzględnie muszą oni jednak zaprzestać działalności terrorystycznej. Podporządkowanie się zaleceniom tureckiej armii celem rozbrojenia jest

warunkiem koniecznym, tym bardziej że bojownicy otrzymali obietnicę swobodnego opuszczenia terytorium Turcji.

3-524-000

**Νικόλαος Σαλαβράκος (EFD).** - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, εύχομαι να είναι ειλικρινές το πρόσφατο άνοιγμα της τουρκικής κυβέρνησης για το κουρδικό ζήτημα και για τον τερματισμό μιας σύγκρουσης που έχει στοιχίσει χιλιάδες ζωές από το 1984 μέχρι σήμερα. Με δεδομένο ότι οι Κούρδοι αποτελούν το 15 έως 20% του πληθυσμού των 75 εκατομμυρίων της Τουρκίας, είναι σαφές ότι η επίλυση του κουρδικού ζητήματος είναι μείζονος γεωπολιτικής σημασίας για την ασφάλεια και τη σταθερότητα στην περιοχή. Αυτό ενισχύεται εάν ληφθεί υπόψη ότι το κουρδικό ζήτημα εμπλέκει εδάφη τεσσάρων χωρών που όλες σήμερα βρίσκονται σε αναταραχή.

Καταδικάζουμε την πρόσφατη δολοφονία των τριών ακτιβιστριών κουρδικής καταγωγής στο Παρίσι. Το απεχθές αυτό έγκλημα εγείρει ανησυχίες σχετικά με τις προοπτικές των διαπραγματεύσεων. Μας προβληματίζουν επίσης οι μεγάλης κλίμακας συλλήψεις Κούρδων εκλεγμένων εκπροσώπων και σημειόντων αντιφρονούντων. Εξίσου όμως καταδικάζουμε και κάθε πράξη τυφλής βίας.

Πιστεύουμε στην ειρηνική λύση του προβλήματος και στηρίζουμε μια πολιτική λύση στο κουρδικό ζήτημα με δημοκρατικό διάλογο, συνταγματική μεταρρύθμιση και δικαιοσύνη χωρίς διακρίσεις.

3-525-000

**Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa (PPE).** - Panie Przewodniczący! Mówiąc o dialogu na rzecz pokojowego rozwiązania kwestii kurdyjskiej w Turcji, nie możemy zapominać o sytuacji dziennikarzy zajmujących się tymi sprawami. Dla Państwa informacji przytoczę kilka faktów. Według niezależnych szacunków Turcja ma obecnie najwyższą liczbę więzionych dziennikarzy na całym świecie. Wielu z tych dziennikarzy było zatrzymanych na podstawie zarzutów o współpracę na rzecz terrorystycznej działalności związanej z separatyzmem kurdyjskim. Biuro Instytucji Demokratycznych i Praw Człowieka przygotowało szczegółowy raport z listą więzionych dziennikarzy – w sierpniu 2012 r. było ich 78, w tym 53 osoby bezpośrednio związane z kwestią kurdyjską.

W kontekście globalnym liczby te są przerażające. Turcja jest niechlubnym liderem w tej dziedzinie, przed Iranem i Chinami. Pomimo tego, że przeprowadzone w ostatnim czasie reformy konstytucyjne pozwoliły na uwolnienie niektórych więźniów, to pogarszający się trend braku wolności mediów jest mocno zauważalny. Można odnieść wrażenie, że władze w Ankarze, reformując złe prawo, podążają w złym kierunku. Sytuacja w kontekście reform i dobrych intencji ulega systematycznemu pogorszeniu.

Jednak pomimo tych negatywnych sygnałów można zaobserwować, i należy docenić, poprawę jakości stanowionego prawa, m.in. możliwość używania dowolnego języka przez oskarżonych i ich obrońców. Jako Parlament Europejski powinniśmy jednak zachęcać naszych tureckich partnerów do wypełniania zobowiązań i przestrzegania praw człowieka.

3-526-000

**Σοφοκλής Σοφοκλέους (S&D).** - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, έχει ξεκαθαρίσει - και πλειοψηφικά συμφωνούμε - ότι η Τουρκία αποτελεί σημαντικό εταίρο για την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, ότι της δίδεται μια σημαντική ευκαιρία με τον διάλογο που έχει ανοίξει να αποτελέσει μέρος της ευρωπαϊκής οικογένειας, με μία σημαντική προϋπόθεση: ότι θα σεβαστεί σε κάθε περίπτωση τους κανόνες διεθνούς δικαίου και τη διεθνή έννομη τάξη και βέβαια το κοινοτικό κεκτημένο, τους

στόχους και τις προσδοκίες της ευρωπαϊκής ολοκλήρωσης. Η αλληλεγγύη και ο σεβασμός των ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων αποτελούν θεμελιώδη δικαιώματα και υποχρεώσεις των λαών της Ευρώπης. Η συμμετοχή στην Ένωση δεν μπορεί να είναι *à la carte*, ούτε με ωμούς εκβιασμούς που κατά καιρούς εκφράζονται από Τούρκους αξιωματούχους.

Τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα των Κούρδων αλλά και όλου του τουρκικού λαού πρέπει να γίνουν απόλυτα σεβαστά στην πράξη. Οι διώξεις, συλλήψεις, φυλακίσεις και δολοφονίες πρέπει να αποτελέσουν ένα κακό παρελθόν της τουρκικής πολιτικής. Το δικαίωμα του κάθε πολίτη να κρίνει και να έχει άποψη, να έχει τη δική του γλώσσα δεν απαλλοτριώνεται και πολύ περισσότερο δεν εκβιάζεται.

Η τελευταία προκλητική δολοφονία τριών Κούρδων γυναικών στο Παρίσι πρέπει να εξιχνιαστεί, η Τουρκία οφείλει να βοηθήσει προς την κατεύθυνση αυτή και οι δολοφόνοι πρέπει να λογοδοτήσουν στην δικαιοσύνη. Ο κουρδικός λαός, ο κάθε λαός, έχει δικαίωμα να υπερασπιστεί την ιστορία του και να πάρει τις αποφάσεις που τον αφορούν.

Ελπίζω, εύχομαι, η Τουρκία από χώρα επεκτατική να γίνει χώρα φιλειρηνική, χώρα ευρωπαϊκή, χώρα που να σέβεται τους λαούς και να την σέβονται οι λαοί.

3-527-000

**Sarah Ludford (ALDE).** - Mr President, I fully support the point made by Mrs Oomen-Ruijten about making the progress report available in Turkish. That would have been automatic if Turkish had become an official language, as it should have done in 2004 upon the accession of Cyprus.

I strongly welcome this debate. Some of us have tried for many years to put the Kurdish issue in Turkey on the EU agenda. All the EU institutions, not just Parliament, must now give strong political diplomatic and economic support to the dialogue leading to a negotiated solution which allows Kurds, with their language, to be fully recognised and integrated as citizens of the Turkish state. The Commission, High Representative and Council cannot tread any longer around the issues of this matter because it connects so closely with the issues we constantly raise with Turkey: a new constitutional settlement, democratic and journalistic freedoms, the rule of law, the proper role of the army and so on. Solving the Kurdish question is the major key to a stable democratic Turkey at ease with diversity. The EU should press both sides to abandon the military struggle and talk politics.

3-528-000

**Franziska Keller (Verts/ALE).** - Herr Präsident! Ich begrüße die neue Friedensinitiative sehr. Es ist aber auch wichtig, dass diese Initiative zu einem guten Abschluss kommt, der für beide Seiten annehmbar ist. Terror und Gewalt sind nicht akzeptabel und bringen auch keine Lösung. Stattdessen braucht es eine Anerkennung der kurdischen Minderheit und einen politischen Dialog, in dem beide Seiten aufeinander zukommen müssen. Die neue Verfassung kann dabei helfen. Was nicht hilft, sind überzogene Antiterrorgesetze, die Minderjährige für geringe Vergehen bereits ins Gefängnis schicken und die dazu genutzt werden, Kritikerinnen und Kritiker einzuschüchtern.

Ich appelliere sehr an die türkische Regierung, diese einmalige Chance nicht verstreichen zu lassen, sie jetzt zu nutzen und nicht länger zu warten, und ich appelliere ebenso an die Kommission, die türkische Regierung dabei zu unterstützen – die türkische Regierung, aber auch die gesamte Türkei und die kurdische Minderheit –, und ich denke auch, dass

wir als Parlament mit dem Fortschrittsbericht und auch mit einer kontinuierlichen Beschäftigung mit dem Thema dazu unseren Beitrag leisten können.

3-529-000

**Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR).** - Mr President, every month I walk by Rue Lafayette near the Gare du Nord in Paris, where three female Kurdish activists were gunned down in January. I would like to express my condolences to the families of these victims.

I hope that the killings do not further unsettle the fragile peace process between Turks and Kurds. Thankfully, I am pleased that last year's two-month hunger strike by hundreds of Kurdish prisoners and ordinary citizens came to an end without incident. But these events underline the importance of reaching a political settlement on the Kurdish question in Turkey.

I call on the Turkish Government to recognise Kurdish language rights in the public sphere and other fundamental civil liberties. The EU must do all it can to support minority rights in a candidate country of the European Union. The EU should support renewed efforts towards a political solution to the Kurdish issue and help put an end to the 30-year-old conflict which has cost 40 000 lives.

3-530-000

**Frank Vanhecke (EFD).** - Het is uiteraard een goede zaak dat de Europese Unie zich mee inzet voor een oplossing van het Turks-Koerdische conflict, een conflict dat trouwens als gevolg van de ongecontroleerde immigratie ook in onze straten zelf wordt uitgevochten en niet enkel in Parijs, vrees ik. Maar uiteindelijk zullen het toch de Turken en de Koerden zelf zijn die een oplossing moeten vinden, die tot een vergelijk moeten komen.

En dan moeten wij man en paard noemen. Indien het de Turkse regering echt menens is met een vredesinitiatief, dan moeten Erdogan en de zijnen eerst die zeer vele duizenden mensen vrijlaten die vastzitten en wier enige misdaad erin bestaat zich te hebben uitgesproken voor de Koerdische taal en de Koerdische identiteit. Dat is de lakmoesproef waarop de Commissie en heel Europa moeten toezien en waarop wij niets mogen toegeven. Zolang Turkije actief de Koerdische taal, de Koerdische identiteit en de Koerdische cultuur ontkent en bestrijdt, kan er geen vrede komen.

3-531-000

**Μαριέττα Γιαννάκου (PPE).** - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα σχόλια του Επιτρόπου αλλά και των άλλων συναδέλφων δείχνουν μια ενιαία στάση του Κοινοβουλίου σε σχέση με το κουρδικό πρόβλημα. Βεβαίως το πρόβλημα είναι παλιό, δεν έχει αναφύει τώρα. Προκάλεσε πολλές χιλιάδες θύματα τόσο στην κουρδική πλευρά όσο και στο τουρκικό κράτος. Επομένως είναι σωστό και δίκαιο να αναζητηθεί λύση που θα προέρχεται από συζητήσεις και διαβουλεύσεις. Είναι αλήθεια ότι στην Τουρκία τα τελευταία χρόνια έχει γίνει κάποια πρόοδος, δεν ανταποκρίνεται όμως αυτή η πρόοδος ακόμη στα ευρωπαϊκά δεδομένα περί δημοκρατίας.

Ωστόσο, η προσπάθεια της τουρκικής κυβέρνησης να ανοίξει κάποιο διάλογο με την κουρδική πλευρά πρέπει να ενισχυθεί από τη δική μας πλευρά. Και το Συμβούλιο και η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή και το Κοινοβούλιο πρέπει να στηρίξουν κάτι τέτοιο. Οι αναφορές που γίνονται κάθε χρόνο στην έκθεση του Κοινοβουλίου που συντάσσει η κ. Oomen-Ruijten είναι σαφείς. Και αυτή είναι η κατεύθυνση. Κάθε σύγκρουση ή κάθε προσπάθεια να συνεχιστεί αυτή η σύγκρουση, πρώτον, θα

παραβλάβει τη δυνατότητα της Τουρκίας να εκδημοκρατιστεί περαιτέρω και, δεύτερον και κυριότερον, θα παραβλάβει τον ίδιο τον κουρδικό λαό.

Επομένως, νομίζω ότι όλοι στηρίζουμε αυτήν την προσπάθεια, όλοι είμαστε βαθιά λυπημένοι γι' αυτό που συνέβη στο Παρίσι, για την - στην κυριολεξία - δολοφονία των τριών ακτιβιστριών γυναικών, η οποία είχε πιθανώς και άλλα κίνητρα, να υπονομεύσει, δηλαδή, τον διάλογο που έχει αρχίσει ανάμεσα στην κουρδική πλευρά και στην πλευρά του τουρκικού κράτους.

Είναι γεγονός γενικά, κύριε Πρόεδρε, ότι στην Τουρκία ορισμένα πράγματα δεν αναγνωρίζονται. Ειπώθηκε πριν ότι δεν αναγνωρίζει η Τουρκία ένα κράτος μέλος της Ένωσης. Αυτό δεν σημαίνει ότι δεν επιθυμούμε τις στενές σχέσεις με την Τουρκία και την πρόοδο στην υπόθεση της ένταξής της. Πρέπει όμως και εκείνη - και αυτό το μήνυμα πρέπει να στείλουμε - να συνεχίσει τον διάλογο. Μόνο με διάλογο και διαβουλεύσεις μπορούν να δοθούν λύσεις σε παρόμοια προβλήματα.

3-532-000

**Emine Bozkurt (S&D).** - Mr President, we are here today because we want to give out a clear signal that we support the process to solve the Kurdish issue. We also strongly support Turkey's struggle against terrorism. I believe these two should go hand in hand.

What is needed is not a superficial conflict resolution but a wholehearted, sincere transformation of the mentality which has dominated so far, a transformation that will begin with understanding the reasons behind the demands of citizens of Turkish-Kurdish origin. This should also be the starting point which will lead to the creation of a true democracy in Turkey based on the equality of every citizen, not just on paper but in practice and in the hearts of the people. Let us not waste time on anything aiming for less.

It is of course also very important to support the necessary legislative changes. In this regard it is crucial that the Fourth Judicial Reform Package is adopted to improve democracy, freedom of speech and human rights, and this is also valid, of course, for the new constitution. We are ready, as always, to support Turkey in achieving a higher level of democracy and human rights.

3-533-000

**Ryszard Czarnecki (ECR).** - Panie Przewodniczący! Turcja w ostatnich latach wiele zrobiła, aby nawiązać dialog z Kurdami. To pewien polityczny fakt. Należy dążyć do tego, aby Unia Europejska i Parlament Europejski wywierały presję, aby ten dialog miał miejsce i przynosił efekty. Powiedzmy sobie szczerze, po obu stronach, podkreślam, po obu stronach – co na tej sali już padło – są środowiska, są ugrupowania polityczne, są ludzie, którzy tego dialogu nie chcą, którzy chcą się okopać na swoich pozycjach. Tak jest po stronie tureckiej, tak jest po stronie kurdyjskiej. Myślę, że – jak się wydaje – pokazują to nawet ostatnie tragiczne wydarzenia w Paryżu. Rolą Parlamentu Europejskiego jest domaganie się praw człowieka, a jednocześnie działanie realistyczne na rzecz osiągnięcia pewnych konkretnych, wymiernych efektów *step by step*, czyli krok po kroku. Za tym się opowiadam.

3-534-000

**Jacek Olgierd Kurski (EFD).** - Panie Przewodniczący! Ostatnie dziesięciolecia to okres głębokich napięć i przewartościowań na Bliskim Wschodzie. Jednym z kluczowych wyzwań jest kwestia kurdyjska. Ostatnie lata przyniosły falę ważnych dla regionu zmian. Turcja podjęła kwestię kurdyjską – w wymiarze wewnętrznym zliberalizowała nieprzejednaną

dotąd pozycję wobec mniejszości kurdyjskiej, w wymiarze zewnętrznym uznała Kurdów za jednego z kluczowych partnerów w polityce regionalnej. Dzięki temu Kurdowie uzyskali *de jure* znaczną autonomię, *de facto* – pełną niezależność.

Poza nadziejami wzbudza to pewien niepokój: przez tereny kurdyjskie przechodzą szlaki handlu narkotykami oraz bronią. Kurdowie są też kluczem do dalszego rozwoju sytuacji w Syrii, a na rozwiązaniu tej sytuacji Turcji tak bardzo zależy. Jeśli więc nawet ostatnie zmiany w polityce tureckiej są podyktowane pewną skutecznością, interesem i makiawelizmem, to warto rozmawiać o utrwaleniu tych zmian. Szczególnie na kanwie prawa międzynarodowego. Unia Europejska powinna wspierać dalszy dialog turecko-kurdyjski.

3-535-000

**Michael Cashman (S&D).** - Mr President, I make these comments as a friend of Turkey but I have to say that, worryingly, since 2009 over 8 000 pro-Kurdish politicians, lawyers, academics and writers have been arrested on charges of terrorism. Journalists are the latest group to go on trial.

Prosecutions often form a pattern where critical writing, political speeches and participation at peaceful demonstrations are used as evidence of terrorism offences, and this approach is unacceptable. A solution can be found and will be found, but only by including both sides. Therefore we need to work together with Turkey and those elements that wish to reach a solution, so that the EU can be an effective intermediary. The government needs to reform oppressive laws that jail legitimate Kurdish politicians and to make amends for the excessive behaviour of its security forces.

The Kurdish movement, including PKK leaders, must denounce terrorist attacks, must distance themselves from terrorist attacks, and publicly commit to realistic political goals. Above all else, politicians on all sides must legalise the rights of most of Turkey's Kurds, including mother-language education, an end to discriminatory laws, fair political representation and more decentralisation.

3-536-000

**Ismail Ertug (S&D).** - Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich denke, ein Frieden kann gelingen. Das haben wir von 2005 bis 2011 gesehen, als es einen Waffenstillstand gab. In der Zwischenzeit gab es die weitreichendsten Schritte, die es in der Türkei gegeben hat, von einem Fernsehsender, der 24 Stunden lang in kurdischer Sprache ausstrahlen darf, bis hin zu der Tatsache, dass vor Gericht nun auch in kurdischer Sprache verteidigt werden darf, wofür der türkische Staat die Kosten übernimmt.

Aber trotzdem gibt es Fortschrittsbedarf, wenn ich sehe, dass es bei der Schulausbildung in kurdischer Sprache noch Rückstände gibt, und wenn man betrachtet, dass es nach wie vor einen Bedarf nach einer zivilen Verfassung gibt innerhalb der Türkei. In diesem Zuge müssen auch die Antiterrorgesetze angepasst werden, denn sie sind der Ursprung für viele dieser Irritationen, die in der Türkei passieren. Ich denke auch, dass es wichtig ist, sich im türkischen Parlament über die 10-%-Hürde Gedanken zu machen, um auch wirtschaftliche Förderung im südostanatolischen Raum zu bewerkstelligen.

Es ist aber natürlich auch klar, dass Gewalt nie eine Lösung sein darf und dass letztendlich in diesem Bereich auch die PKK ihre Waffen niederlegen muss, um eine gemeinschaftliche friedliche Lösung für die Zukunft zu erreichen.

*(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 149 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)*

3-537-000

**Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE),** *Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte .* – Ja, lieber Kollege, Du hast hier eben die 10-%-Hürde erwähnt. Sie ist in der Tat ein großes Problem, insbesondere für die kurdischen Parteien. Wie wäre es denn, wenn die S&D und die SPE auf ihre Schwesterpartei, sogar Mitgliedspartei, einwirken würden, dass es von der CHP eine verbindliche Zusage gibt, dass man eine solche 10-%-Hürde für den Fall einer Regierungsbeteiligung oder für den Fall, dass man die Regierung stellt, tatsächlich abschafft? Ich halte das für sehr gut, denn auch unter CHP-Regierungen ist leider die 10-%-Hürde nicht abgeschafft worden. Ich höre da aber sehr konstruktive Töne in letzter Zeit.

3-538-000

**Ismail Ertug (S&D),** *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte .* – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege Lambsdorff. In der Tat, das ist ein wichtiger Punkt. Wir Sozialdemokraten sprechen dieses Thema auch bei jeder Gelegenheit mit unserer Schwesterpartei an. Aber es ist auch mein Kenntnisstand, dass dahin gehend mittlerweile Konsens besteht, aber dass es nicht an der CHP liegt. Ich denke auch, dass es in der Tat wichtig ist, diese 10-%-Hürde zu senken.

Der Ursprung war uns bekannt. Man wollte seinerzeit verhindern, dass sich in Südostanatolien irgendwelche Parteien gründen. Aber das ist mittlerweile auch ad acta gelegt, denn wir wissen, über den Umweg der Mitgliedschaften im Parlament als keiner Partei zugehörige Abgeordnete haben sie sich trotzdem einer gewissen Fraktion angeschlossen. Dieses Argument läuft ins Leere. Es ist vielmehr ein Argument, weiterhin diese 10-%-Hürde niederzureißen, sie auf europäische Standards zu senken, um mehr Partizipation zu ermöglichen. Wir werden weiterhin an dieser Sache dranbleiben, auch mit unserer Schwesterpartei.

*(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 149 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)*

3-539-000

**Emine Bozkurt (S&D),** *„blauwe kaart“-vraag .* – Ik wil ook een vraag stellen aan mijnheer Ertug, want het is de eerste keer dat het punt van die 10%-drempel in het debat ter sprake komt en ik vind het een heel belangrijk punt. Mijn vraag luidt: hoe moet dat praktisch bewerkstelligd worden? Kan mijnheer Ertug daar iets meer over zeggen?

3-540-000

**Ismail Ertug (S&D),** *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte .* – Vielen Dank, Frau Kollegin! Auch hier kann ich trotzdem nochmals sagen und die Wichtigkeit und die Bedeutung einer neuen zivilen Verfassung unterstreichen: Es gilt auch hier, eine, wie es in der Türkei gesagt wird, *siyasi parti reform* – das ist praktisch eine Parteireform der politischen Parteien – zu vollziehen und in diesem Zuge, so hoffen wir und so wünschen wir es der Türkei, sollte es möglich sein, diese 10-%-Hürde herunterzufahren, denn alles andere hat sich in der Vergangenheit nicht bewährt.

*(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 149 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)*



3-541-000

**Ria Oomen-Ruijten (PPE),** *Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte . – Herr Präsident!* Ich würde Herrn Ertug gerne darauf hinweisen, dass es beim letzten Versuch, die Verfassung zu ändern – das war vor zwei Jahren – sogar auch die BDP war, die diese 10-%-Hürde abgewiesen hat. Wissen Sie das?

3-542-000

**Ismail Ertug (S&D),** *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte . –* Selbstverständlich weiß ich das, sehr geehrte Frau Kollegin Oomen-Ruijten. Das heißt aber nicht, dass diese Entscheidung richtig war, und wenn man sich mit der BDP unterhält, dann besteht heutzutage eine andere Auffassung dessen, was seinerzeit bestanden hat. Aber trotz alledem – und das werden Sie ja wohl auch nicht ablehnen können – ist es wichtig, hier eine *threshold* oder eine Hürde einzuberaumen, die letztendlich europäischen Standards entspricht. Derzeit entspricht sie eben nicht den europäischen Standards.

3-543-000

**Ana Gomes (S&D).** - O assassinato de três ativistas curdas em Paris em janeiro passado foi revoltante e covarde. Visou, decerto, travar o processo de negociações que o Governo do Primeiro-Ministro Erdogan e o Partido Trabalhista do Curdistão, liderado por Abdullah Öcalan, iniciaram e que deve levar ao desarmamento gradual do PKK. O Governo turco e o PKK estão perante uma oportunidade única de alcançar um compromisso histórico. O diálogo tem de levar também à inclusão política, cultural e socioeconómica dos curdos na sociedade turca. A Turquia tem o dever de garantir o direito à liberdade de expressão, de associação e de manifestação dos seus cidadãos, o que não pode passar pela repressão ou detenção de líderes ou ativistas curdos. É preciso que o Comité de Conciliação Constitucional, na redação de uma nova Constituição, desencadeie um processo democrático que reflita a diversidade da sociedade turca. A sociedade civil tem que ser incluída. É imperativo que as leis antiterroristas e criminais sejam reformadas para não continuarem a atentar contra expressões legítimas da identidade curda. É imperativo que a nova Constituição consagre os direitos humanos da minoria curda, incluindo o uso da língua curda nas escolas e, nesse sentido, saúdo o tribunal turco que assim o entendeu ontem, tornando o primeiro dia, hoje, aquele em que todas as instituições, incluindo os tribunais, vão poder conduzir os seus trabalhos em curdo.

É vital que as autoridades policiais turcas contenham o uso excessivo da força durante manifestações curdas nas ruas. A luta armada no sudeste da Turquia tem de cessar, nesse sentido exorto o PKK a baixar as armas e o Governo turco a libertar os prisioneiros políticos curdos. A Alta Representante tem de assistir o Governo turco na elaboração de uma solução viável e consistente para a integração dos cidadãos de origem curda na sociedade turca no processo de adesão da Turquia à União Europeia.

Finalmente, chamo a atenção que a Turquia é frequentemente apontada como modelo para os países da Primavera árabe, mas sem resolver democraticamente a questão curda será fraco o *soft power* da Turquia na região.

3-544-000

**Richard Howitt (S&D).** - Mr President, some in this debate have once again used this issue simply to bash Turkey; they have no interest in specific political and human rights of the Kurdish community. However, those of us who have pushed for this full European

Parliament plenary debate do, and it is right that those arguments are aired. We seek to persuade Turkey that, although their definition of what it means to be a minority is different from the one adopted in this Chamber, as a future member of the European Union, supporting a pluralist society in which minority rights are fully accepted is part of being a member of the European Union and is not a threat to the unity of the state.

We want our Turkish friends and colleagues to understand that we understand that this is a difficult and sensitive issue in their society. I would never have believed myself that there would be direct talks with Abdullah Öcalan, but the progress that has been made has been made because we have applied constant pressure, and we must continue to do so, as we are doing in this debate today. In that context, it is not just for the government to move: I would like to acknowledge the movement by the opposition Republican People's Party, the CHP, that has taken place.

Teaching of the Kurdish language in Turkish schools is essential, as is its use in police stations and courts and elsewhere in public service. I welcome the new law for Kurdish to be used in legal defence. However, when I went to a court case in the KCK trials in Diyarbakir, I was prevented from entering the courtroom, and I saw the defendants' lawyers walk out because Kurdish was not able to be used in those cases, although I had been told beforehand that an opportunity would occur. Many mayors and political activists remain in jail, arrested because they campaigned in the Kurdish language, and it is essential that all political prisoners are released.

I join with others who say that the Kurdish community itself must distance itself from violence and must support disarmament and not be triumphalist, as occurred when demobilisation took place. For either side there is no military solution to this conflict. The winner must be peace.

3-545-000

**President.** – Colleagues, in principle we should now have catch-the-eye, but as the Commissioner has to leave shortly I will give the floor to the Commissioner and we will have catch-the-eye after the Commissioner.

3-546-000

**Štefan Füle,** *Member of the Commission.* – Mr President, thank you for understanding; no disrespect. Can I make four observations, as this debate is reaching its final stages? First, on the point which has already been mentioned a couple of times, I can confirm that our progress report – and this has been the case for a number of years now – is translated every year by our delegation into Turkish and is put on the website of our delegation.

The second point I would like to make is that I was happy to note in my meeting yesterday evening with a representative of the BDP party – and I saw some of them observing our discussion – that Kurdish politicians and civil society remain fully committed to a successful outcome of these talks. I can only encourage them to maintain this constructive, solution-oriented approach and to resist any provocative action aimed at distracting them from the pursuit of a peaceful solution. We discussed with them what the Commission could do to advance the rights of the Kurds, and as many of you actually referred to this, I would like to say the following.

On the one hand the Commission monitors the compliance of Turkey with the political criteria, of which respect for the rights of people belonging to minorities is an important

component. We raise issues of concern on a regular basis with the Turkish authorities and assist them where we can in their reforms. I would mention the work done in the working group for the chapter on the judiciary and fundamental rights (Chapter 23) under the positive agenda, in which we are working with Turkey on, notably, the adoption of a human rights action plan. I am looking forward to making this chapter available to the Member States as an open chapter, so that we can benefit fully from its transformative power.

We also have a number of projects financed by the pre-accession instrument in South-East Turkey, such as Project M for the empowerment of women, a training project for children on mines and other waste products of conflict, and a project in support of local research on disappearances, unsolved murders and mass graves in South-East Turkey. But we also have programmes targeting the environment and transport infrastructures.

We run projects worth over EUR 400 million which benefit, directly or indirectly, the South-East, and obviously, should a wider effort be requested to support a post-conflict and reconciliation strategy, the Commission would be ready to support this, including through financial assistance.

My final point, if I may: I interpret this debate as strong support for a peaceful solution of the Kurdish issue and for current talks stressing, as you rightly did, the wider context for this: reforms in Turkey. Because of that it has been a very good debate.

3-547-000

*Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)*

3-548-000

**Csaba Sógor (PPE).** - Mindannyian a párbeszéd szükségességéről beszélünk, amikor az EU-n kívüli konfliktusok békés megoldására kerül szó. Ma is ezt kérjük, amikor a törökországi kurd kérdéstről vitázunk. De vajon mi mindent megteszünk, hogy Európában a nemzeti kisebbségek igényeiről komoly vitát folytassunk? Hiteles-e az Európai Unió nemzetközi partnerei szemében, amikor párbeszédre kéri őket a kisebbségi kérdésben, miközben saját területünkön a Bizottság nem érzi magát illetékesnek a kisebbségi jogsértések, az őshonos nemzeti kisebbségek igényeinek napirendre emelése terén?

Azt gondolom, hogy a nemzeti kisebbségek problémái európai megoldást kívánnak, ezért az európai polgárság évének jegyében az európai intézményeknek is foglalkozniuk kell a kérdéssel. Minden uniós polgárt ugyanazon a jogok illetnek meg, nem csak akkor ha másik tagállamban telepednek le, hanem akkor is, ha szülőföldjükön szeretnék megélni uniós polgárságukat. Ha ezen a téren előrelépést érünk el, talán komolyan vesznek bennünket, mikor hasonló nemzetközi ügyekben hangsúlyozzuk a párbeszéd szükségességét. Ma országomban a nemzeti kisebbségemet diszkriminálják, nem engedik szimbólumaikat használni. Uniós országok vannak, ahol nem hogy nem beszélhetnek a kisebbségek nyelvükön, hanem megfosztják őket állampolgárságuktól is.

3-549-000

**Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D).** - Mr President, the Kurdish issue is a long-standing and unresolved problem in Turkey. The Uludere incident and the recent killings of the three Kurdish women clearly show, once again, how difficult is the road to peace if Turkey evades its responsibilities. Now is the time for the EU to send a clear message that it encourages

an extensive dialogue between the two sides in order to reach a solution. The EU must press Turkey to reform its judicial system to protect individual freedoms and respect the rights of all its minorities. There is no excuse for Turkey to use terrorism as an alibi for further violations of human rights.

Let us not underestimate the fact that the Kurdish issue and the Cyprus issue – as well as the human rights violations in Turkey – remain the main obstacles to Turkey's European accession. Will Turkey show a real political will to move forward to overcome these obstacles by fulfilling all its obligations towards its people, its minorities, its neighbours and the EU? As a Cypriot MEP, I have my doubts, having monitored Turkey's provocative behaviour towards my country, Cyprus, and its people.

3-550-000

**Krisztina Morvai (NI),** *Kékkártyás kérdést intéz Sógor képviselő úrhoz .* – Sógor képviselőtársamtól szeretném közös anyanyelvünkön, magyarul megkérdezni - rögzítve azt, hogy nagyon sajnálom, hogy a Bizottság képviselője már nincs itt-, hogy én is tapasztalom azt, hogy az őshonos magyar kisebbségek és egyéb kisebbségek helyzetével is nyilván abszolút nem törődik az Európai Unió, de tudna-e esetleg a jegyzőkönyv kedvéért felsorolásszerűen példákat mondani arra, hogy milyen jogsértések történnek, és hogy az Európai Unió hogy nem törődik ezekkel és miért kell fölhívunk a figyelmet arra, hogy nagyon rossz példával jár elő az Európai Unió saját határain belül, amikor az őshonos kisebbségekkel, illetve az ő jogvédelmükkel nem foglalkozik. Tehát példákat szeretnék kérni és lehetőségeket arra, hogy hogyan tudna az Európai Unió ezekkel foglalkozni, ha akarna.

3-551-000

**Csaba Sógor (PPE),** *Kékkártyás válasz .* – Köszönöm szépen a kérdést. Hosszú lenne a sor, én csak párat említek meg. Még mindig érvényben vannak uniós országokban a második világháború óta közösségeket sújtó intézkedések, fasiszta törvények, hogy így mondjam. Beneš-dekrétum. Állampolgárokat fosztanak meg, nem hogy az egyik képviselő kollegánk említette, hogy a kurdok a bíróságon használhassanak anyanyelvet. Kérem, Romániában sem lehet. Bürokratikus intézkedésekkel, vagy Románia keleti felében, megfélemlítik a gyereket, hogy azt a heti három óra fakultatív anyanyelvi oktatást merjék elvégezni. Sok-sok példa lenne. A megoldás az lenne, hogy ha nem félnénk attól, hogy például a roma mintára lenne egy nemzeti hagyományos, nemzeti kisebbségeket védő kerettörvénye az Uniónak és ha a kopenhágai kritériumokat utólag is számon kérnék, nem csak a belépés előtt.

3-552-000

**Tunne Kelam (PPE).** - Mr President, I think today's debate indicates that the time has possibly come for a breakthrough in this longstanding tragedy. Dialogue with a clear commitment to abstain from violence is the only way to build a minimum of trust between the two parties. Prime Minister Erdoğan's meeting with Mr Öcalan is a sign that the Turkish Government might be willing to start such a dialogue.

However, responsibility lies with both sides. The Turkish Government, as a government, still has a chance to show more generosity, and it holds the keys to provide genuine freedom of expression and fundamental rights for all citizens of Turkey. That means freeing Kurdish journalists and activists from prison and providing the Kurdish minority with the right to use their language and cultivate their national identity. Increased socio-economic aid to

the Kurdish-populated regions could also be helpful, and the EU is there to play a more active part in this.

3-553-000

**Jelko Kacin (ALDE).** - Erdoğan in Öcalan si zaslužita vso našo jasno in odločno podporo. Gre za zgodovinski proces. Tak proces je mogoč le, kadar so vključeni pogajalci, ki imajo politični pogum. Oba ga imata.

Poglejte primer visokega dialoga med Beogradom in Prištino, kjer so v le nekaj mesecih dosegli ogromno. V Bruslju se pravkar srečujeta predsednik Nikolić in predsednica Jahjaga. Opogumiti moramo Erdoğan, da gre v tak dialog tudi s Ciprom. Potrebujemo preboj in okrepitev medsebojnega zaupanja.

Reševanje kurdskega vprašanja znotraj Turčije je strateški proces, ki je ključen za stabilnost regije, še posebej Sirije, Iraka in Irana. Prav je, da ju v Evropskem parlamentu opogumimo in jima pomagamo, tudi tako da Turčiji omogočimo odpreti poglavji 23 in 24.

3-554-000

**Elena Băsescu (PPE).** - Consider și eu că situația minorității kurde poate fi îmbunătățită în continuare de către autoritățile turce, în linie cu recomandările din raportul privind extinderea al Comisiei. Salut cu această ocazie adoptarea recentă de către parlamentul turc a unei legi prin care se dă posibilitatea inculpaților kurzi să se apere în instanță în limba maternă. Măsuri similare ar putea fi adoptate și în ceea ce privește educația în limba maternă, precum și alte aspecte ale vieții civile.

Pentru restabilirea încrederii între cele două părți, va fi nevoie ca PKK să își înceteze definitiv activitatea în Turcia și să-și respecte angajamentele asumate. Oprirea ostilităților ar fi un rezultat istoric și o bună bază de discuție pentru viitor. Negocierile s-ar putea materializa printr-un consens asupra modificării constituției.

3-555-000

**Franz Obermayr (NI).** - Herr Präsident! Zu Recht hat die Kommission zu den Themen Menschenrechte und Meinungsfreiheit in der Türkei ernsthafte Bedenken geäußert. Deutlich wird dies im undemokratischen Umgang mit Kurden, Armeniern, aber auch christlichen Minderheiten. Offensichtlich fühlt sich die Türkei von den Minderheiten in ihrer Identität bedroht, und das ist auch erkenntlich, da hier kaum Reformfortschritte greifen.

Vor einem Monat hat nun erfreulicherweise der Dialog zur Lösung des Kurdenproblems auf der Gefängnisinsel İmralı stattgefunden, doch es bleibt die Skepsis, ob es sich hier lediglich um eine Show für die EU handelt. Denn die Morde von Paris, die Inhaftierung und die Haftbedingungen kurdischer Politiker, Journalisten, aber auch Künstler und auf der anderen Seite die terroristischen Aktivitäten der PKK sprechen ja eine andere Sprache.

Die EU, wie es hier im Hause betont wird, ist halt mehr als eine modifizierte Zollunion. Sie ist eine Werteunion auf Basis gemeinsamer historischer und humaner Ideale und hat daher von der Türkei, aber auch von der PKK ein entsprechendes Verhalten einzufordern, speziell dann, wenn beide Streitparteien glauben, ihre Auseinandersetzung in unseren europäischen Heimatländern austragen zu müssen.

3-556-000

*(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))*

3-557-000

**Lucinda Creighton**, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank all the Members for a very thoughtful and a very important debate. I am grateful to those Members who have expressed their support for the steps taken by the Turkish authorities to make progress towards a lasting solution to the Kurdish issue. I realise, as we all do, that the obstacles to a breakthrough remain formidable.

Many of you have referred to the recent brutal murders in Paris, and I think this clearly shows that there is strong resistance in some quarters to making any progress. I also think that it is very important that we do not allow this to derail the crucial process of dialogue between both sides. I think that this certainly is a strongly-held view in this Chamber, where the vast majority of speakers in this debate have talked about the need for dialogue to move forward and, to quote Mr Kelam, ‘to achieve a much-needed breakthrough’. I think that is certainly the objective.

Notwithstanding the difficulties that exist, I am convinced that the Turkish authorities deserve our full support and encouragement on this path of dialogue. Settling conflicts in our near neighbourhood is not only in our interest, but it is very much in Turkey’s interests. This is even more the case at present as Turkey is confronted with significant pressure as a result of the conflict in Syria.

A number of you have raised the issue of the link between the Kurdish issue and Turkey’s EU accession negotiations. I also touched upon this in my opening remarks. We have repeatedly underlined the importance of a comprehensive approach to the issue. The conditions must be created to allow the predominantly Kurdish population in the East and South-East of Turkey to enjoy full rights and freedoms and full respect for human rights, and we hope that Turkey’s current work on a new Constitution will provide a framework for several important reform efforts, including with regard to the Kurdish issue.

In conclusion, Mr President, I think that it is important that all EU institutions and all Member States will be watching very closely and very carefully the progress that is made in Turkey as this process evolves.

3-558-000

**El Presidente**. – Se cierra el debate.

### ***Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 149 del Reglamento)***

3-559-000

**Boris Zala (S&D)**, *písomne*. – Vážení kolegovia, kurdský problém je výbušninou v celom regióne. Je pozostatkom koloniálneho delenia sveta a dnes sa s ním musí vysporiadať Turecko. Áno, ak sa to podarí, bude to definitívne potvrdenie tureckej európskej cesty. K tomu je však potrebné, aby Turecko akceptovalo predovšetkým v jeho novej ústave jazykové práva Kurdov, odstránilo všetky diskriminačné ustanovenia založené na etnicite, a predovšetkým zabezpečilo plné občianske práva. Udelenie veľkorysej kultúrnej a školskej autonómie je podmienkou spokojnosti Kurdov so životom v Turecku. K tomu patrí aj politická reprezentácia v tureckých inštitúciách, predovšetkým zníženie prahu pre vstup

do Parlamentu z doterajších 10 % na tradičných 5 %. Nepochybne je potrebné zo strany Kurdov definitívne opustiť praktiky PKK a akékoľvek teroristické aktivity. Nie je to až také ťažké, pokiaľ obe strany prejavia vôľu. EÚ musí tejto vôli pomáhať.

### 13. 22<sup>o</sup> período de sesiones del Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas (debate)

3-561-000

**El Presidente.** – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate a partir de la Declaración de la Vicepresidenta de la Comisión y Alta Representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad sobre el 22<sup>o</sup> período de sesiones del Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas.

3-562-000

**Lucinda Creighton,** *President-in-Office of the Council, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy* . – Mr President, it is my pleasure to address you on behalf of the High Representative and to outline the EU's work programme for the upcoming 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the UN Human Rights Council.

Fully committed to a strong and effective multilateral human rights system, the EU is becoming ever more active in bringing its human rights priorities to this important multilateral forum, and thereby asserting that the United Nations matters.

The awarding of the 2012 Nobel Peace Prize to the EU recognised our sustained effort to promote and protect human rights worldwide. We take this as an encouragement to work even harder for this cause. The adoption of the EU human rights strategy and action plan and the appointment of Stavros Lambrinidis as EU Special Representative for Human Rights will help us to deliver on this task.

Throughout the last year, the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva has again demonstrated its willingness to respond to the calls of millions of citizens for their rights. We have warmly supported the fact that more and more partners and other regional groups bring specific country situations to the Human Rights Council.

Turning to the 22<sup>nd</sup> session, let me first underline that the acute crisis in Syria must stay high on the agenda of the Human Rights Council. The recent report of the UN International Commission of Inquiry presents an alarming account of the increasingly sectarian nature of the conflict in that country.

Strongly committed to the fight against impunity, the EU will insist on the need for accountability for the serious human rights violations, including crimes under international law, perpetrated in Syria. Moreover, the mandate of the Commission should be renewed further, and we will push for a one-year extension to give it a solid basis for its work.

The EU will also continue to draw the attention of the international community to the persistent critical human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), which requires greater scrutiny. Together with Japan, the EU will present a resolution proposing the creation of an independent investigative mechanism, or Commission of Inquiry, in support of the special rapporteur, whose mandate should be

renewed. The EU will also reinforce its calls on the government of the DPRK urgently to improve the human rights situation in the country.

Remaining seriously concerned by the worrying human rights situation in Iran, the EU will actively work for the extension of the mandate of the UN special rapporteur, and press to increase the backing for this mandate through outreach and demarches, building on the recent work in the context of the UN General Assembly resolution on Iran.

The EU believes that the issues of accountability and reconciliation in Sri Lanka should stay on the agenda of the HRC, and is moreover concerned about recent attacks on the independence of the judiciary in that country.

Looking ahead, as last year, a key EU priority for the June session of the Council will be the situation of human rights in Belarus, which continues to give rise to grave concern.

The reports of human rights abuses in Mali are of increasing concern and should be discussed, based on the report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, which focuses on the North of the country. The EU also appeals to the authorities to immediately investigate the reported human rights abuses and to hold those responsible for human rights violations to account. The EU calls for a rapid mobilisation and deployment of human rights observers.

Moreover, in this or subsequent sessions, the EU will support the call for the Council to address the state of human rights in Bahrain, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, South Sudan and Sudan. We will also closely follow developments in the human rights situation in North Africa, Russia and in some of the Central Asian countries.

It is heartening that one country regularly on the agenda of the Council in recent years, Myanmar/Burma, is a source of good news. This is due in no small part to the tireless international attention and our collective support to the many democracy and human rights activists in the country, including Nobel Peace and Sakharov Prize laureate Daw Aung San Suu Kyi.

The EU welcomes the cooperation with Myanmar/Burma which led to the consensual adoption of a General Assembly resolution in December 2012, reflecting the important recent progress in the country while also recognising remaining human rights concerns, for instance the remaining political prisoners as well as the situation of the Rohingya in Rakhine State and in the ethnic areas. The resolution, which will be presented at the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the Human Rights Council, will encourage further reforms.

I am now turning to the thematic priorities of the EU. Given our conviction that freedom of religion or belief is an inalienable human right and an essential pillar of safe and prosperous societies, the EU will again present a resolution on Freedom of Religion or Belief.

This year we will also aim at the consensual extension of a strong, independent mandate for the Special Rapporteur. High Representative/Vice-President Ashton is concerned by the increasing number of acts of discrimination based on religion or belief across the world, and has condemned on several occasions the violence against persons belonging to religious minorities everywhere in the world.



Gender equality and women's empowerment is also a core priority for the High Representative, and we are very supportive of the holding of a high-level event celebrating the power of empowered women on 26 February.

As in previous years, together with Latin American and Caribbean countries, the EU will devote particular attention to the rights of the child, this year focusing on the right to the enjoyment by children of the highest attainable standard of health.

Throughout the year, the EU will also work with a cross-regional group of like-minded partners to continue to keep the issue of discrimination and violence against individuals based on their sexual orientation and gender identity on the agenda of the United Nations, in follow-up to the landmark resolution of the Human Rights Council session of June 2011 and the successful cross-regional activities in New York.

The EU will advocate freedom of association and assembly and pay special attention to the promotion and protection of freedom of expression, notably through the internet.

We all recognise that the work of human rights defenders and civil society organisations is essential for democratic societies, and restrictions placed on NGO activities are a growing concern in many countries. The EU regularly defends the role of civil society representatives and human rights activists in the UN context. We are strongly concerned by reports of threats and reprisals affecting those who cooperate with UN human rights mechanisms, including the Human Rights Council and its Special Procedures, and we strongly condemn and speak out against such incidents.

As the full realisation of human rights is important for achieving sustainable development, the EU is pleased that the 'mainstreaming panel' of the Human Rights Council will this year discuss the integration of human rights into the post-2015 global development agenda which the EU will advocate in line with the corresponding commitment in the human rights action plan.

The March session of the Human Rights Council is also a worldwide gathering of human rights activists. The Human Rights Council is a crucial body for the promotion of universal human rights standards and the UN's main forum affording worldwide scrutiny of the human rights performance of all countries.

With this in mind, the EU reaffirms its attachment to the universal periodic review (UPR) and calls upon all UN member states to effectively cooperate with this universal mechanism. The EU is also making every effort to preserve the universality of the UPR and continues to appeal to Israel to resume cooperation with the Human Rights Council more broadly and with the Office of the High Commissioner.

In closing, allow me to emphasise that the unwavering support of this House is very important for the success of our efforts. We look forward to the participation of a European Parliament delegation in the high-level opening week of the Council.

We count on your engagement and continued vigilance to push us further to make good on our commitments. We know that you will use contacts with your counterparts in support of our initiatives and advocate new issues that should be taken up by the international community.

3-563-000

**IN THE CHAIR: ALEXANDER ALVARO***Vice-President*

3-564-000

**Laima Liucija Andrikienė**, *PPE frakcijos vardu*. – Žmogaus teisių pakomitečio delegacija artimiausiu metu lankysis Ženevoje, Jungtinių Tautų Žmogaus teisių taryboje, kur vasario 25 d. prasidės 22-oji Tarybos sesija. Sesijos teminiai prioritetai yra žinomi: religijos ir tikėjimo laisvė, vaiko teisės, prievarta prieš moteris, neįgaliųjų teisės. Sesijos metu bus aptariama situacija šalyse, kuriose žmogaus teisių padėtis yra labai sudėtinga ar net kritinė. Sirija, Birma, Korėjos Demokratinė Liaudies Respublika, Malis, Iranas yra sesijos darbotvarkėje.

Praėjusių metų rugsėį 18 valstybių narių tapo naujomis Žmogaus teisių tarybos narėmis, ir šiuo metu 9 iš 47 yra Europos Sąjungos valstybės narės. Naujuoju Tarybos pirmininku tapo Lenkijos atstovas Remigiusz Henczel. Navanethem Pillay antrajai kadencijai išrinkta Jungtinių Tautų Vyriausiąja žmogaus teisių komisare. Mes ją nuosekliai remiame, pabrėždami jos pareigybės nepriklausomybės svarbą.

Rezoliucijoje, dėl kurios balsuosime rytoj, mes išreiškėme Europos Parlamento poziciją dėl žmogaus teisių padėties Arabų pavasario šalyse, konkrečiai Sirijoje, Libijoje, Jemene, Jungtiniuose Arabų Emyratuose, Bahreine, Egipte, taip pat atkreipiame dėmesį į skaudžiausias problemas ir siūlome jų sprendimo būdus. Svarbi rezoliucijos dalis skirta Europos Sąjungos vaidmeniui Žmogaus teisių taryboje. Mes tikimės aktyvaus ir rezultatyvaus Europos Sąjungos specialiojo atstovo žmogaus teisėms veikimo Taryboje, taip pat raginame Vyriausiąją įgaliotinę dalyvauti vadinamajame „high-level segment“ darbe. Ir, žinoma, tikimės, kad Europos Parlamento delegacija išreikš mūsų susirūpinimą ir poziciją visais klausimais, kurie išdėstyti rezoliucijoje.

3-565-000

**Richard Howitt**, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Mr President, I welcome this debate and our resolution, with its emphasis on the importance in the forthcoming Human Rights Council session of dealing with issues ranging from the negative impact of the financial and economic crisis, the commemoration of the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the adoption of the Vienna Declaration, the interactive debate on the rights of people with disabilities and the panel discussion on human rights mainstreaming. We are working very hard to try to mainstream human rights here in the External Action Service in the European Union and it is right that we support efforts to do so in the United Nations.

On country-specific actions, I welcome what the President-in-Office has said about Bahrain. Having been in Bahrain with the Subcommittee on Human Rights just before Christmas and having visited, with my Portuguese colleague beside me, Jau prison, where it is claimed there are some 800 political prisoners and where I heard testimonies about torture and mistreatment, I think it is absolutely right that we keep up the pressure in relation to that country.

I also welcome what the President-in-Office said in relation to Israel. I had the Israeli political counsellor with me today and I talked to him about the importance of his country's engagement with the Palestinians, while recognising the importance of our engagement

with Israel. Therefore it is extremely disappointing that they do not engage with the Universal Periodic Review in the UN Human Rights Council. I thank her for what she said.

In relation to Sri Lanka, I am disappointed because we worked so hard, both in my group and in this Parliament, to try to build bridges with Sri Lanka in order to move forward on some of the human rights issues. But they have to understand that, if the first woman Supreme Court Chair is removed from office and then the International Bar Association is prevented from visiting the country to investigate what has happened, we will criticise. We do not do it for its own sake but those criticisms must be heard.

I am very disappointed that my group's suggestion for a parliamentary report on the situation of the Western Sahara has been watered down in this Parliament, first of all to the Sahara and now to the Sahel. I agree with the President-in-Office that there are big issues across the Sahel region. We understand that at the moment, but those should not be progressed at the expense of recognising that there are real issues around freedom of expression, freedom of association and the right to demonstrate of the Saharawi people, including political prisoners. A special envoy has of course been appointed and I call on the EEAS to make sure that issue is dealt with in the Human Rights Council.

Finally, on the day of the agreement of my own report on corporate responsibility, I am delighted that there will be thematic attention at the Human Rights Council on the UN guiding principles on business and human rights. Out of 27 of our EU Member States, 19 are undertaking national action plans on the guiding principles. Let us take that enthusiasm and that fervour with us to try to make sure implementation is not just taking place in Europe but is happening worldwide.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-566-000

**Charles Tannock (ECR)**, *blue-card question* . – Mr Howitt, do you not accept both my personal assurances as the rapporteur on the Sahel and the written minutes of the enlarged Bureau that this report on the Sahel will also make reference to human rights in Western Sahara, because I thought that was made very clear? The reason the title was changed is because otherwise it would have been too large a report for any reasonable rapporteur to cope with, if it covered the entire Sahel and the Sahara region with it.

3-567-000

**Richard Howitt (S&D)**, *blue-card answer* . – First of all I accept your personal good faith: I make no personal criticism of my honourable colleague. But the proposal from the Socialist and Democrat Group was for a report on the Western Sahara, and it is disappointing to me that this has not been respected. I am aware of that minute – I accept it – and I am sure you will do your best within the terms of reference that have been given to you. We too will do our best to contribute to the work on your report in a constructive way.

3-568-000

**Marietje Schaake**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group* . – Mr President, the need to protect and promote human rights in today's world is becoming an ever more challenging task. It is essential that the UN plays an effective and credible role, especially regarding human rights, and a lot of work needs to be done. After the cowardly assassination of Chokri Belaid today

we are reminded that challenges remain in North Africa and the Middle East, especially in those countries which witnessed uprisings as the people sought new hope, freedom and opportunity after decades of repression and human rights violations.

Syria is our highest priority. The violence has to end, full stop. All sides of the conflict must take their responsibility and allow the access of humanitarian aid efforts. We should also work on establishing a UN Security Council resolution to guarantee that the aid reaches people safely.

Iran is facing a crucial year with elections and a new round of negotiations on the nuclear file. It is the new role of the UN Human Rights Council and the EU to ensure that human rights are not forgotten or violated to a greater extent than they are today. The special rapporteur for human rights in Iran needs to be able to continue his work, and we jointly need to condemn the arrest of journalists and the violence and executions.

On Bahrain the European Parliament has been among the most vocal in condemning the ongoing human rights violations, and I also support the calls by this House to adopt a resolution on the human rights situation in Bahrain during the 22<sup>nd</sup> session. This would also have to include mechanisms to monitor the implementation of the report of the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry (BICI).

Finally, in Egypt we risk seeing increased violence as a result of abuse of power, both politically and by police forces, and this is very problematic. We should continue to let the people of Egypt know that we support the rule of law, democracy and human rights, that we will hold their new leaders accountable, and that we jointly condemn the death penalty and call for a moratorium on the death penalty, including in the context of the most recent convictions of 21 suspects in the Port Said massacre.

3-569-000

**Barbara Lochbihler,** *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion* . – Herr Präsident! Danke, Frau Ministerin Creighton! Sie haben sehr schön die Prioritäten der EU aufgelistet, die zum großen Teil unsere volle Unterstützung finden, wie sie auch in unserer Entschließung dargelegt ist. Es ist eine sehr umfangreiche Entschließung geworden. Es macht auch deshalb Sinn, sich intensiv damit zu beschäftigen, weil die Ergebnisse im Menschenrechtsrat und die Erkenntnisse, die man dort hat, eine wichtige Grundlage auch für unsere Menschenrechtsarbeit auf europäischer Ebene sind. Deshalb ist die Qualität der Arbeit des Menschenrechtsrates für uns sehr wichtig. Wir bitten Sie – wie jedes Jahr –, dass Sie sich dafür einsetzen, dass die Sonderberichterstatter der UN unabhängig arbeiten dürfen und dass sie verteidigt werden, wenn ihre Arbeit angegriffen wird.

Sie haben auch darauf hingewiesen, Frau Creighton, dass der UPR, der *Universal Periodic Review*, ein sehr wichtiges Instrument ist. Das können wir nur unterstützen. Wir erleben es, dass gerade die Umsetzung der UPR-Ergebnisse Erfolge erzielt, dass es konkret vor Ort zu Verbesserungen kommt. Umso bedauerlicher ist es, dass Israel die Mitarbeit beim UPR-Mechanismus suspendiert hat. Ich hoffe, es gelingt Ihnen, darauf hinzuwirken, dass dieser Schritt zurückgenommen wird.

Oberste Priorität hat die Entschließung zu Syrien. Frau Schaake hat darauf hingewiesen: auch hier volle Unterstützung. Wir haben viele Anregungen gemacht. Umso bedauerlicher ist es, dass beim Verweis der Situation Syriens an den Internationalen Strafgerichtshof die

EU nicht mit einer Stimme spricht. Ich hoffe sehr, dass vielleicht im Rat darauf hingewirkt werden kann, dass Schweden seine Position hier korrigiert.

Neu in unserer Entschließung ist, dass wir die EU bitten, sich dafür einzusetzen, dass die nichtstaatlichen Organisationen nicht mehr so gegängelt werden, wie wir es mit zahlreichen Gesetzen in unterschiedlichen Ländern erleben. Es ist auch vorgekommen, dass Aktivisten in Genf bedroht werden. Das kann eigentlich nicht hingenommen werden.

*(Die Rednerin ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 149 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)*

3-570-000

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**, *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki* . – Pani wie, że bardzo cenię Pani pracę w Parlamencie, zwłaszcza na rzecz praw człowieka. Wielokrotnie zresztą współpracowaliśmy. Proszę wobec tego przyjąć gratulacje z tego powodu. Moje pytanie dotyczy jednak tego, czy nie uważa Pani za nieszczęśliwe, że w tej rezolucji rzeczywiście napominamy Izrael w sprawie praw człowieka, a nie znalazły się tam właściwie wezwania do przestrzegania praw człowieka w Rosji, gdzie sytuacja się pogarsza. Ostatni raport organizacji Human Rights Watch pokazuje zresztą, że poprzedni rok był najgorszy w ostatnim czasie. Czy nie uważa Pani tego za nieszczęśliwe?

3-571-000

**Barbara Lochbihler (Verts/ALE)**, *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte* . – Zu dem Punkt, warum wir jetzt Israel kritisieren: Da haben wir mehrere Ziffern, die die Situation in der Region behandeln. Ich habe hervorgehoben, dass besonders der Schritt, dass die Regierung nicht mehr mit dem *Universal Periodic Review* zusammenarbeiten will, eine Schwächung des ganzen UN-Systems ist. Deshalb habe ich das gesagt. Selbstverständlich sollte die EU dort, wo es sich ergibt, auch die Menschenrechtssituation, die Verletzungen der Menschenrechte in Russland kritisieren.

3-572-000

**Charles Tannock**, *on behalf of the ECR Group* . – Mr President, the 22<sup>nd</sup> session of the UN Human Rights Council offers a comprehensive overview of the world's major human rights trouble spots. Both my Group and I broadly support its conclusions, particularly regarding the Universal Periodic Review and the necessity of guarding and developing human rights in the Arab Spring countries.

Syria, of course, currently offers the bleakest outlook in this regard as the abuses perpetrated by the Assad regime and, sadly, some of the extremist factions within the rebels, show no signs of abating. We must also watch closely the situation in Egypt, Libya and, increasingly, Tunisia, where only yesterday an opposition secular leader was assassinated. The shock over the Egyptian police's treatment of protestors last week also demonstrates how this country risks replacing one form of tyranny, a secular one, with another. The situation in Mali is also worrying at the moment.

Elsewhere the report has valuable things to say on the subject of religious rights. I am a longstanding supporter of Christian rights in countries where they form a minority. Governments in countries as diverse as China, Iran, Vietnam and Eritrea actively persecute Christian minorities. More broadly, people everywhere must peaceably worship as they choose. Linked in with the religious rights is freedom of speech, and the report highlights

the need for journalists, NGOs and human rights defenders to play a full role in their societies.

I also welcome the section on LGBT rights. Clearly there is a long way to go in this regard, but we can all agree that imprisoning gay people, let alone sentencing them to death, as proposed recently in Uganda, is unacceptable. African leaders who claim that homosexuality is somehow a European import are simply mistaken.

One report element that I dislike is the overtly condemnatory tone towards Israel. But overall, nevertheless, the report is very welcome. The EU must harness all the tools at its disposal, from the European External Action Service and the Commission to Parliament delegations, to work with the United Nations to see changes implemented and success delivered for all of us.

3-573-000

**Willy Meyer**, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor Presidente, mi Grupo valora muy positivamente la próxima reunión del Consejo en Ginebra, pero lamentamos que en el mandato del Parlamento no se hayan introducido tres temas, muy importantes, que tienen que ver con la política exterior y con la propia realidad de la Unión Europea.

En primer lugar, no se habla de la situación de los derechos humanos en los países árabes ocupados, como el Sáhara Occidental, un territorio no autónomo que está pendiente de descolonización. Este viernes se celebra el juicio de 24 activistas saharauis en Rabat, precisamente a raíz de una violenta disolución del Campamento de la Dignidad de El Aaiún en 2010.

Tampoco aparece la ocupación turca del norte de la República de Chipre, con una política de colonización inaceptable que atenta contra la integridad turcochipriota del norte de la isla.

Y, finalmente, los vuelos de la CIA: está acreditado que existieron centros de tortura que fueron consentidos por países de la Unión Europea, y que, efectivamente, se utilizó el espacio aéreo para permitir estas acciones ilegales de la CIA.

Yo creo que es muy importante que el Parlamento Europeo, en línea con sus propias resoluciones, recoja temas como el Sáhara Occidental y la situación en ese territorio no autónomo, con continuas violaciones de derechos humanos, así como la situación del norte de la República de Chipre y, finalmente, los vuelos de la CIA.

Son temas que tienen que ver con lo tratado habitualmente en esta Cámara.

3-574-000

**Daniël van der Stoep (NI)**. - De Europese Unie gaat er prat op dat zij opkomt voor mensenrechten, waar ook ter wereld en zonder onderscheid des persoons. Dat is een nobel en waardig streven, iets wat wij Europeanen met de lessen uit ons verleden inderdaad in woord en gebaar moeten uitdragen. Er zijn een aantal supermensenrechten die vallen onder het zogenaamde *ius cogens*. Het *ius cogens* is het allesoverheersende recht waar nooit ofte nimmer van mag worden afgeweken. Voorbeelden daarvan zijn de verboden op genocide, slavernij en foltering. Het is de taak van iedereen in de wereld om daar tegen op te treden.

De mensenrechten waarover wij hier spreken, zijn mensenrechten ontleend aan verdragen. Maar verdragen hebben als nadeel dat zij politieke keuzes zijn. Dat merken wij bij één van

de belangrijkste mensenrechten, namelijk het recht op de vrije meningsuiting. Er zijn maar weinig staten in deze wereld waar die vrijheid echt is gewaarborgd. Zelfs in Nederland is hij niet altijd veilig. Ook andere Europese regeringen zitten in hun maag met het recht dat burgers een eigen mening geeft, om maar niet te spreken van allerhande schurkenstaten in Afrika, het Midden-Oosten, de voormalige landen van de Sovjet-Unie, ja eigenlijk overal ter wereld.

Die constatering móet ons dwingen om de vrijheid van meningsuiting tot absoluut speerpunt te maken van het mensenrechtenbeleid van de Europese Unie. Zonder dat recht zijn burgers niet in staat om autoriteiten uit te dagen en regeringen te controleren. De borging van vrijheid van meningsuiting is ... *(de Voorzitter ontnemt de spreker het woord).*

3-575-000

**Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE).** - Señor Presidente, nuevamente hablamos en este hemisferio de los derechos humanos. El año anterior este tema fue muy importante para la Unión. Fue el de la aprobación del marco estratégico, el del nombramiento del Representante Especial, el de la creación de un fondo europeo para la democracia y, también, en 2012, tres países más de la Unión fueron elegidos miembros del Consejo de Derechos Humanos, elevándose su número ahora a nueve, una cifra que creo que es un récord y que nos obliga a ser muy activos en el Consejo.

El respeto de los derechos humanos es una destacada seña de identidad de la Unión y un importante principio que inspira nuestra política exterior. Dado que los derechos humanos son indivisibles y universales, tenemos que cooperar estrechamente con las Naciones Unidas y, desde luego, con el Consejo, que desempeña un papel indispensable en su defensa.

En las regiones que rodean a la Unión, la cuestión del respeto de los derechos humanos ocupa ahora un lugar muy relevante: me refiero a la ya llamada «Primavera árabe» y a la necesidad de que la libertad, la dignidad del individuo, la igualdad de género, etc. que impulsaron estas revoluciones sean ahora respetadas por los gobiernos que han surgido de estos cambios y de unas elecciones.

El respeto de los derechos humanos, como se ha dicho ya reiteradamente hoy aquí, es una de las cuestiones que también se debate, lógicamente, en ese conflicto, en esa guerra en Siria, en la que el régimen despótico de El Asad, sigue aferrado al poder. Como decía Marietje Schaake, es necesario que la ayuda humanitaria pueda llegar a las víctimas de esa violencia.

También en nuestra vecindad oriental los derechos humanos son protagonistas. Pienso, por ejemplo, como también ha dicho la Ministra Creighton, en Belarús. Por ello, el Consejo de Derechos Humanos ha nombrado recientemente a un relator especial.

Señorías, he citado las dos regiones vecinas de la Unión, pero son muchos los lugares del mundo en los que debemos prestar atención especial al respeto de los derechos humanos. Creo que con ese objetivo tenemos que participar muy activamente este año en el Consejo de Derechos Humanos, un importante órgano multilateral que vela, precisamente, por que las libertades básicas universales sean respetadas.

3-576-000

**Joanna Senyszyn (S&D).** - Popieram rezolucję na 22. posiedzenie Rady Praw Człowieka ONZ. W szczególności zwracam uwagę na trzy kwestie. Konieczne są skuteczne działania Rady Bezpieczeństwa w związku ze wzrastającą liczbą zbrodni wojennych i zbrodni

przeciwko ludzkości w Syrii. Liczę, że uda się uzgodnić tekst rezolucji zmierzającej do wywarcia skutecznej presji, aby położyć kres przemocy i łamaniu praw człowieka w tym kraju. Sytuacją w Syrii powinien zająć się Międzynarodowy Trybunał Karny.

Potrzebujemy też międzynarodowej komisji śledczej, która zajmie się łamaniem praw człowieka w Korei Północnej, gdzie w obozach koncentracyjnych jest przetrzymywanych co najmniej 200 000 więźniów politycznych. Na porządku dziennym są tortury, gwałty, zbiorowe egzekucje i niewolnicza praca. Karę śmierci stosuje się za najmniejsze przewinienia, często bez procesu sądowego.

Kolejna kwestia to konflikt palestyńsko-izraelski. Napięcie pomiędzy Izraelem i Palestyną wciąż narasta i grozi eskalacją na inne kraje. Konflikt rozgrywa się na płaszczyźnie militarnej, etnicznej, religijnej i angażuje wiele państw. Zmiana statusu Palestyny w ONZ może nie odegrać kluczowej roli w rozwiązaniu samego konfliktu izraelsko-palestyńskiego, ale jest wyraźnym sygnałem w kierunku Palestyny, że społeczność międzynarodowa wspiera wizję Abbasa i nie popiera zaborczości Izraela.

3-577-000

**Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR).** - Przygotowywane jest 22. posiedzenie Rady Praw Człowieka ONZ, podczas którego poruszane będą m.in. kwestie wolności religijnej. W przedłożonym projekcie rezolucji naszej grupy, konserwatystów, nawiązującym do tekstu rezolucji ONZ w sprawie wolności religii i wyznania, w punkcie 23 podkreślamy, że wolność wyznania i swoboda wypowiedzi powinny być priorytetowo traktowane w każdym państwie demokratycznym i społeczeństwie.

Mówimy o wolności religijnej, ale tak naprawdę trzeba powiedzieć, że najbardziej dyskryminowaną grupą religijną na świecie są chrześcijanie, co potwierdza ostatni raport organizacji Open Doors. Według tej organizacji na świecie prześladowanych jest około 100 mln chrześcijan. Prześladowanie chrześcijan przybiera różne formy: od dyskryminacji społecznej i środowiskowej, poprzez gwałty, aż po bestialskie mordy. To powinno wybrzmieć nie tylko w Parlamencie Europejskim, ale także na forum Rady Praw Człowieka ONZ. Nie możemy poprzestać na zapisach, ale musimy powołać stosowne gremia wyposażone w skuteczne instrumenty do zwalczania tego zjawiska. Wstrzymanie prześladowań chrześcijan musi być nie tylko priorytetem ONZ, ale także Unii Europejskiej, której założycielami byli wielcy chrześcijanie, tacy jak Konrad Adenauer, Alcide de Gasperi czy Robert Schuman.

3-578-000

**Franz Obermayr (NI).** - Herr Präsident! Der Menschenrechtsrat hat leider ein Grundproblem: seine Zusammensetzung. Da sich jeder UNO-Mitgliedstaat ohne Auswahlkriterien für den Rat bewerben kann und mit einfacher Mehrheit gewählt wird, sind auch Menschenrechte verletzende Staaten in den Rat gelangt. 2010 hat der ehemalige Sonderberichterstatte über Folter, Manfred Nowak, dem Rat attestiert, dass jene Staaten, die die Menschenrechte an meisten verletzen, die Mehrheit haben. Auch werden viele Entscheidungen nicht aus der Perspektive der Menschenrechte getroffen. So schmetteten die stimmenstarken islamischen Staaten regelmäßig Vorwürfe wie zum Beispiel gegen Usbekistan oder Iran ab.

Aber auch Länder, die höchste Ansprüche an die Demokratie stellen, halten sich nicht wirklich an die Spielregeln, wie es leider im Falle Israels der Fall war. So boykottierte Israel einfach eine Sitzung, um sich einer Überprüfung der Menschenrechtssituation auf seinem



Staatsgebiet zu entziehen. Wie so der Schutz der Menschenrechte tatsächlich sichergestellt werden soll, wird wohl sehr, sehr schwer erklärbar sein.

3-579-000

**Michèle Striffler (PPE).** - Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs, Iran, Syrie, Birmanie, Chine et je pourrais citer bien d'autres pays où, aujourd'hui en 2013, les droits de l'homme sont encore bafoués et réprimés. Il est de notre devoir, à nous, Européens, de garantir les droits de l'homme et de porter nos valeurs d'humanité, de solidarité et de fraternité. C'est pourquoi je salue le discours de Mme la vice-présidente/haute représentante de l'Union pour les affaires étrangères et la politique de sécurité, et je salue aussi les résolutions ambitieuses du Parlement européen en vue de la 22e session du Conseil des droits de l'homme de l'ONU, qui se réunira à Genève, du 25 février au 22 mars prochain. Il y va, cher Président, de notre responsabilité de veiller au respect et à la promotion des droits de l'homme dans le monde.

C'est à nous de montrer l'exemple et de défendre toutes les personnes victimes de discriminations ou de violations de ces droits: droits civils, économiques et politiques mais aussi des droits individuels comme les droits des femmes, des minorités et des LGBT. Il nous faut nous saisir de ces sujets trop souvent oubliés ou mis de côté. Le non-respect des droits de l'homme entraîne la xénophobie, le racisme, l'intolérance. Je veux croire, Monsieur le président, que l'Union européenne, avec les outils dont elle dispose aujourd'hui, peut et doit renforcer la liberté et la tolérance.

Certes, le cadre stratégique de l'Union en matière de droits de l'homme est courageux et ambitieux, mais nous devons avoir le rêve qu'un jour chacun aura la possibilité de jouir de ces droits partout dans le monde.

J'espère que mes collègues qui se rendront à Genève pour le Conseil sauront porter notre voix et notre vision d'un monde où nous ne devons plus nous battre pour l'universalité et l'indivisibilité des droits de l'homme.

C'est à nous de bâtir un monde meilleur où chacun pourra vivre dans le respect et la liberté.

3-580-000

**Ana Gomes (S&D).** - A resolução que o Parlamento vai aprovar amanhã é para ser lida com atenção pelos governos, pelas instituições e pelos diplomatas da União Europeia, em particular aqueles que trabalharão no Conselho, em Genebra. Stavros Lambrinidis, o representante da União Europeia para os Direitos Humanos, deve coordenar a atuação dos países membros para garantir mais coerência e eficácia. Para isso, nós temos que começar o trabalho por casa. A União Europeia tem que prestar contas sobre as responsabilidades dos seus Estados-Membros pela colaboração com os chamados voos da CIA, os voos da tortura, porque sem isso não terá credibilidade. Ainda ontem saiu um relatório da Open Society que fala das responsabilidades europeias na matéria.

É lamentável que o Conselho dos Direitos Humanos continue a ter entre os seus membros eleitos países como os recém-eleitos Etiópia e Cazaquistão, que são graves violadores dos direitos humanos relativamente aos seus próprios povos. É uma oportunidade para a União Europeia denunciar essas situações e os confrontar com as suas responsabilidades.

A União Europeia tem também de condenar a recusa de Israel a submeter-se à UPR. É um gravíssimo precedente intolerável.

A Síria tem que ter principal enfoque e tem que se pedir ao Conselho dos Direitos Humanos que consiga que o Conselho das Nações Unidas refira a situação dos criminosos da Síria ao Tribunal Penal Internacional.

Sara Ocidental, Eritreia, Sudão e Sudão do Sul, Barém, Irão, Sri Lanca, Bielorrússia, Birmânia, Rússia e China são situações que deveriam continuar ou estar na agenda do Conselho.

Finalmente, nas questões temáticas, a violência contra as mulheres, crianças e pessoas de orientação LGBT tem...

*(O Presidente retira a palavra à oradora)*

3-581-000

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR).** - Panie Przewodniczący! Jako członek Delegacji do spraw stosunków z Białorusią cieszę się, że posłanka Gomes wspomniała o obszarze postsowieckim i że ta tematyka jest zauważana, bo rzeczywiście obserwujemy pogorszenie się sytuacji na Białorusi w kwestii praw człowieka. Bardzo dobrze, że to znajduje wyraz również na tej sali. Widzę tutaj również Jacka Protasiewicza, wieloletniego szefa tej delegacji, myślę, że znajdujemy ukontentowanie, że ta tematyka państwa interesuje. Z kolei jako członek Delegacji do komisji współpracy parlamentarnej UE-Rosja wyrażam zaniepokojenie czy żal – o czym już mówiłem – że ta tematyka nie znalazła się w naszej rezolucji. Czy ma na to wpływ to, że Rosja jest stałym członkiem Rady Bezpieczeństwa? Mam nadzieję, że nie, bo nie powinniśmy odpuszczać tej tematyki, dlatego że sytuacja w Rosji pogarsza się z roku na rok.

3-582-000

**Michael Cashman (S&D).** - Mr President, let me start by saying that human rights are universal, indivisible and interdependent, and it is indispensable that the EU puts this at the forefront of all its policies. In this respect, I condemn the ongoing attempts to undermine the universality and indivisibility of human rights, in particular with a resolution on so-called traditional values. I welcome the focus of the resolution we will vote on tomorrow in advance of the UNHRC on minority rights, including LGBT rights. I thank the Commission for supporting the regional meeting on violence and discrimination against LGBT people (even though the Commission is not represented here) co-organised by the French Government in Paris in March, and I hope that this is a sign that the Commission is starting to bring forward an LGBT rights roadmap. I take this opportunity to congratulate the work of Navi Pillay, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, and I encourage our colleague Stavros Lambrinidis to work closely with her to continue to contribute to the EU's leadership on this vital issue.

3-583-000

**Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE).** - Mr President, I am sorry for being a little delayed in arriving for the debate, but in parallel there is a meeting of the Conference of Presidents of the European Parliament that is talking precisely about Mr Kwaśniewski and Mr Cox's mission to Ukraine. Coming from that meeting I have no doubt that it is our moral and political obligation as the European Union to support people who strive for human rights and freedoms, especially in the countries along our borders.

Speaking about our immediate neighbourhood, as the Vice-President responsible for the Eastern Partnership countries, I would like to focus specifically and particularly on Belarus,

where human rights defenders go to prison for their activities, where there is violation of freedom of expression and freedom of assembly, and where the death penalty still remains a natural form of punishment and, I am sorry to say, has been regularly abused.

And yet Belarus is not the only example of human rights violations and persecutions in our neighbourhood countries. We know about the human rights situation in Russia, which was mentioned by Mr Migalski, and the deteriorating situation in Ukraine as well in other Eastern European countries, the former Soviet Union countries. We need to use all the mechanisms and international tools available here in the European Parliament, in the European Union and in other international organisations such as the United Nations in order to have strong leverage and effective pressure on the authorities in those countries and mainstream the human rights issue in our agendas.

In this regard I welcome the United Nations Human Rights Council decision on the appointment of a special rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Belarus, another acknowledgement amongst states of the world of a drastic human rights situation in this country. It is a shame that the Belarusian authorities have refused to cooperate with the rapporteur.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-584-000

**Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR)**, *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki* . – Szanowny Panie Pośle! Drogi Jacku! Wspomniałeś o trzech krajach obszaru postsowieckiego, w których sytuacja w kwestii praw człowieka się pogarsza, i ja podzielałam tę opinię. Ale czy zauważasz konieczność gradacji, to znaczy fakt, że wrzucanie do jednego worka Ukrainy, Rosji, a zwłaszcza Białorusi, jest bardzo niesprawiedliwe wobec Ukrainy, ponieważ jak gdyby wpychamy ją do tej grupy państw, w których nie możemy nawet mówić o łamaniu praw człowieka, w ogóle o braku demokracji? Czy ta różnica jest zauważalna?

3-585-000

**Jacek Protasiewicz (PPE)**, *odpowiedź na pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki* . – Rzeczywiście różnica jest zauważalna. Wymieniłem te trzy kraje jako trzy najbliższe, sąsiadujące bezpośrednio z Unią Europejską kraje byłego Związku Radzieckiego, ale faktycznie widzimy różnicę pomiędzy sytuacją i demokracją, i praw człowieka na Ukrainie, gdzie ona jest najlepsza, chociaż niestety pogarszająca się; w Rosji, gdzie próbujemy wpływać na tę sytuację, niełatwą, i Białoruś, która jest krajem całkowicie zamkniętym na jakąkolwiek argumentację płynącą ze strony cywilizowanego świata – nie tylko Unii Europejskiej, nie tylko Zachodu, ale takich instytucji powszechnie szanowanych, do których Białoruś należy, jak Rada Europy, OBWE czy ONZ.

3-586-000

*Catch-the-eye-Verfahren*

3-587-000

**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**. - Adoptarea cadrului strategic, precum și a planului de acțiune privind drepturile omului și democrația, oferă baza acțiunii Uniunii în domeniul drepturilor omului la nivel global, însă eforturile noastre nu sunt de ajuns.

Mă preocupă în continuare folosirea în unele țări, în special în Africa, a copiilor soldați. Conform unor estimări, cifrele variază de la câteva zeci de mii la peste 250 000 de copii care iau parte la acțiuni militare desfășurate de unele guverne sau grupuri militare din Africa. Au fost raportate inclusiv cazuri șocante în care copiii erau obligați să-șiucidă membrii familiei pentru a-și demonstra loialitatea față de liderul militar. Cred că problema copiilor soldați trebuie abordată mai ferm de Uniune atunci când stabilește relații economice sau comerciale cu state suspectate de astfel de practici.

3-588-000

**Andreas Mölzer (NI).** - Herr Präsident! Das Fernbleiben Israels Ende Jänner von jener Sondersitzung, in der seine Siedlungspolitik thematisiert werden sollte, mag man als Eklat werten. Klar ist allerdings, dass im UN-Menschenrechtsrat eine Reihe von Ländern sitzen, die es selber mit den Menschenrechten nicht so genau nehmen. In Russland etwa werden Regimegegner bekanntlich verhaftet, aus Mali und Syrien täglich neue Menschenrechtsverletzungen gemeldet. Leider – und das ist besonders beschämend – haben die USA in ihrem Kampf gegen den Terror, der durchaus legitim ist, auch eine Reihe von anderen UN- und EU-Mitgliedstaaten in Menschenrechtsverletzungen verwickelt. Das wissen wir.

Hinsichtlich Israels sollte jedenfalls kritisch hinterfragt werden, ob die propagierte Zwei-Staaten-Lösung tatsächlich der Weisheit letzter Schluss ist. Mit dem Festhalten an sich selbst auferlegten Dogmen wird man den Konflikt nicht lösen können. Es gilt, nach Mitteln und Wegen zu suchen, wie die Palästinenser zu einer gemäßigten und nicht korrupten politischen Vertretung finden können, statt das Feld weiter radikalen Islamisten wie der Hamas zu überlassen.

3-589-000

**Eduard Kukan (PPE).** - Mr President, I fully support Parliament's resolution on the upcoming Session of the UN Human Rights Council. It is going to be important in relation to the critical situation of human rights in some countries.

We have to pay permanent attention to the challenges faced in Syria, where two and a half million people lack food and the civil population is exposed to violence by the regime and also by opposition groups. Northern Mali has witnessed human rights abuses and the whole region was at risk of turning into an extremist-run state. We should appreciate the engagement of France and also the logistical support given by several Member States. I also welcome the appointment of new special rapporteurs on the situation of human rights in Belarus and Eritrea.

What is most important, I think, is that we must be united, act collectively, and be more coordinated and more ambitious in all international human rights fora.

3-590-000

**Krisztina Morvai (NI).** - Mr President, people should do more than pay lip service to EU citizens' human rights as well. If Baroness Ashton considers freedom of assembly a priority, she should raise her voice against the disproportionate police violence that goes on on the streets of Europe almost daily.

If she is concerned about women's rights and children's rights, she should use her powers to rescue the Hungarian woman, Patrícia Nyíri Kovács and her four-year-old child, who

have been held hostage on the French Polynesian island of Bora Bora for over a year. I am afraid I do not know why Baroness Ashton is not here in person, but I wonder if Ms Creighton could address these questions in her answer and kindly pass on the message to Baroness Ashton. Anything you need to know about this Hungarian case can be found on the Facebook page, 'Not without my son'.

3-591-000

*(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)*

3-592-000

**Lucinda Creighton**, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, allow me to thank all honourable Members for their very constructive exchange on this topic and obviously I will transmit all of your concerns and the issues which you have raised to Catherine Ashton.

We are confident that we can count on you to make the Human Rights Council the important venue for human rights issues that we want it to be: a forum for ensuring accountability for human rights abuses, advancing human rights standard-setting and strengthening cooperation with partners in this domain.

The EU has not wasted any time over the last year to take steps towards enabling the EU machinery to deliver on our strong commitment to advancing human rights around the globe. We have sought to further connect activities undertaken by the EU in UN human rights fora in Geneva and New York with the bilateral relations with third countries, and we have created a network of human rights focal points in EU delegations in order to advance this.

We are raising multilateral human rights issues in nearly all bilateral human rights dialogues and consultations, and these issues are reflected in the tailor-made country strategies that we are continuing to finalise at a fast pace.

We are discussing with partner countries ways and means to implement relevant recommendations stemming from the universal periodic review (UPR) as well as recommendations formulated by Treaty bodies and special procedures, including through technical assistance. We support the office of the High Commissioner in this work and we value very much the independence of that office. We encourage partner countries to cooperate with the UN human rights system.

A number of specific issues have been raised by Members and I will try to touch on as many of them as I can.

Firstly, Tunisia has been raised by a number of Members. The High Representative has strongly condemned the killing of the Opposition leader in Tunisia and we will use every opportunity to make our concerns known.

In respect of Sri Lanka, indeed this is a matter of great concern. Therefore the approach is to highlight the problem of encroachment on independence of justice and that work will continue at EU level.

Mr Howitt and other Members raised the question of Bahrain and here we are hoping to join a cross-regional statement, a strong statement on Bahrain at the HRC.

Mr Protasiewicz and others have raised the question of Belarus. Of course Belarus continues to be a high priority for the EU; that was reflected in the 2011 resolution and indeed in the decision to appoint a special rapporteur in 2012, and that work continues.

I addressed the question of the UPR and Israel in my opening remarks. I think the position of the EU is clear and we expect all countries to be part of the periodical review process.

In relation to Syria, which again has been raised by a number of Members, the Foreign Affairs Council, on 18 February, will address all issues related to Syria including the fight against impunity, the question of the ICC and so on. So it is very much to the fore on our agenda.

A number of Members have raised the question of religious minorities, and rightly so. The EU, as you will be aware, organises a very important side event with the special rapporteur on this issue which is hugely important to us and we will continue to focus on the issue of religious minorities – all religious minorities who were subjected to persecution. That is the correct approach and I know Mr Piotrowski and Mr Tannock raised that point in their interventions.

A number of Members also raised the question of digital freedoms. The EEAS is actively working to implement Human Rights Action Plan 24 to promote freedom of expression online and offline. I think it is fair to say that in a variety of multilateral fora the EU has led on this issue and will continue to do so. There is intense cooperation on developing guidelines on this by the end of the year, including in particular the protection of bloggers and journalists, who are of course targeted and have been subjected to abuse and persecution in many countries, and so we will continue that work.

Finally, as regards the issue which was raised by Mrs Morvai, I would simply say that I do not have an answer to the issue that you have raised but I will of course pass it on to the High Representative and the EEAS will look into it.

3-593-000

**Der Präsident.** – Zum Abschluss der Aussprache wurden gemäß Artikel 110 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung sechs Entschließungsanträge <sup>(1)</sup> eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 7. Februar 2013, um 12.00 Uhr statt.

### **Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149 GO)**

3-594-000

**Kinga Gál (PPE), írásban.** – Örömmre szolgál, hogy az ENSZ Emberi Jogi Tanácsának 22. ülészakáról szóló vita és határozat felkerült e heti plenáris ülésünk napirendjére. Ezáltal is megerősítést nyer az a tény, hogy az EU mint fontos nemzetközi szereplő aktívan részt akar venni az Emberi Jogi Tanács munkájában, egy közös hanggal kíván szólni a tagállamok nevében. Üdvözölni szeretném, hogy a soron következő ülésen az ENSZ Emberi Jogi Tanácsán kiemelt témaként szerepel a gyermekek jogainak védelme. A gyermekek védelme elengedhetetlen a legmagasabb szinteken, hisz ők mindig is a társadalom egyik legvédtelenebb és legsebezhetőbb csoportjához tartoztak. Ők az áldozatok, legyen szó a

<sup>(1)</sup> Siehe Protokoll.

családon belüli erőszakról, a rendszer és az egyén közötti konfliktusról vagy a háború következményeiről. A kisebbségekhez tartozó gyermekek pedig még védtelenebbek. A roma származású vagy a nemzeti kisebbségekhez tartozó gyermekeknek nap mint nap meg kell küzdeniük a megkülönböztetéssel, néha éppen az anyanyelvük használata miatt az utcán, a játszótéren, az iskolában. Remélem tehát, hogy az ENSZ soron következő Emberi Jogi Tanácsán valóban előrelépés fog születni a gyermekek jogainak védelme területén – vonatkozzon ez az EU-n belüli és az azon kívüli államokra egyaránt.

3-594-500

**Indrek Tarand (Verts/ALE),** *par écrit.* – Le débat d’aujourd’hui est de la plus haute importance, et je souhaiterais vous demander ce qu’il en est de la responsabilité de la France lorsqu’elle vend à la Russie des missiles de défense antiaérienne, système d’armes Mistral. Pensez-vous que cela améliorera la situation des droits de l’homme dans le monde?

#### 14. Rule of law and freedom in Bulgaria (debate)

3-596-000

**Der Präsident.** – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu Rechtsstaatlichkeit und Freiheit in Bulgarien (2013/2534(RSP)).

3-597-000

**Lucinda Creighton,** *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Mr President, the Presidency recognises the right of this House to debate issues related to the functioning of any one Member State where these potentially touch on issues relating to the basic values and principles which underpin the European Union.

You will however appreciate that the Presidency cannot take a view on issues where the Council has neither discussed nor adopted any position. I will therefore limit myself to a few remarks which are of a more general nature but which are nevertheless important in the wider context. I hope they will also clarify the situation from the point of view of the Council.

Firstly, and importantly, I would like to stress one point which is well known to all of us: that the European Union is founded on a number of basic values and principles which are set out in the Treaties. These values and principles, which include freedom, democracy and the rule of law, are also enshrined in the constitutional traditions of each of the Member States. The Council attaches particular importance to ensuring that these values and principles are fully respected. I know that this House fully shares that view.

All Member States are required to ensure that their legislation respects the basic values on which the EU is founded. But the rule of law and democratic values have not only to be enshrined in texts, they also have to be put into practice. That means that legislation has to be respected and enforced. If there are any concerns or doubts that this is not the case, this is first and foremost a matter for the Commission.

As far as Bulgaria is concerned, it is one of two Member States which are the subject of a cooperation and verification mechanism (CVM) established when it entered the EU in 2007. This mechanism is designed to assist it in the areas of judicial reform and the fight against corruption and organised crime.

The Commission reports regularly under the CVM, most recently – in the case of Bulgaria – last July. In light of this report the Council adopted conclusions in September 2012 which, of course, are publicly available. These conclusions touch on the issue of the rule of law.

I hope you will understand that I am not in a position to offer a more detailed contribution to this afternoon's debate. I speak as Presidency of the Council, and therefore in the name of *all* 27 Member States. I will however listen with interest to this debate and take good note of your comments.

3-598-000

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the rule of law is an issue that concerns everyone in the European Union. As a Union, we have to be clear on our values, firm on our principles and fair on how we approach this. The European Union is a union of values and a community of law. Of primary importance are principles like freedom, the rule of law and respect for fundamental rights. The most basic functioning of the European Union depends on mutual trust between Member States' systems of law and justice. This needs common standards of respect for the rule of law.

These are the values which have spurred the European Union on in good times and held us together in more difficult times. We all know that there is a diversity of legal and political cultures across the EU, but the coherence and endurance of our Union also relies on important commonalities and standards – the rule of law, multi-party democracy, independent judiciary, freedom of expression, the respect for fundamental rights and an active civil society. None of these is a given. To uphold them, we all need to nurture and to strengthen them every day at all levels of society and in all Member States. Indeed, the EU's commitment to these values goes beyond our shores, as we partner third countries to make them take root and become a universal common good.

Should these fundamental values come into question at home, the Commission has a responsibility to uphold the values of the Treaty. At different times and in different situations the Commission has responded firmly where there was particular pressure put on respect for the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary. The rule of law and democracy are, as we see it, two sides of the same coin, and modern representative democracy is inconceivable without a thriving multi-party system.

Political parties are the bridge between government and society in the ways they translate society's demands into political ideas and programmes and in the way they hold government to account on behalf of citizens. Intimidation of, or violence directed at, legal political parties is therefore an attack on democracy itself, and we must say this clearly: it is unacceptable in any form.

That is why the Commission strongly condemned the attempted assault on 19 January 2013 against Mr Ahmed Doğan, then leader of the Movement for Rights and Freedoms. The Commission has made it very clear from the outset that, while the attack is a matter which is internal to Bulgaria, it will be essential that the Bulgarian authorities conduct an in-depth investigation and bring those responsible to justice – and do so quickly. At the same time, the Commission calls on all political forces to demonstrate responsibility and restraint. Criminal acts must not be allowed to fuel extremist political sentiments. We need responsible political leadership that puts the rule of law and the interests of the citizens first.



So EU membership brings support, and it also brings expectations. This is exactly what the Bulgarian people expect. In a Eurobarometer last summer, 78% of Bulgarians said they wanted their country to achieve standards comparable to other Member States, and 76% wanted the EU to take a strong role in this. In the run-up to the accession of Bulgaria to the EU in 2007, it was agreed that further work was needed to address shortcomings in judicial reform, the fight against corruption and tackling organised crime. These are issues which are very relevant in the context of the rule of law, and this led to the establishment of a framework to support Bulgaria in these areas: the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM).

The Commission follows these issues very closely. We monitor, analyse and make recommendations. We will continue to work to help meet the goals of the CVM. Progress under the CVM will also mean progress in consolidating the rule of law. Achieving the fundamental reforms needed in order to reach convincing results requires the joint efforts of government, parliament, the judiciary and civil society. Particularly over the coming months it is important that the electoral campaign does not interrupt the process of reform.

The rule of law also brings the stable environment so critical to the confidence of partners and investors. This is particularly vital in times of economic crisis. As the democratic overseer of developments in the EU, Parliament can also play a crucial role in monitoring and raising awareness of the importance of the rule of law in the Member States, underlining its indivisible link with democracy. So I hope that all institutions of the EU will continue to work together to encourage the rule of law and freedom in Bulgaria.

3-599-000

**Manfred Weber**, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen aus Rat, Kommission und Parlament! Zunächst stelle ich mir die Frage, was wir heute überhaupt diskutieren. Wir haben eine normale strafrechtliche Ermittlung in Bulgarien, wie sie hunderttausendfach in der Europäischen Union vorkommt, wo Behörden, Staatsanwaltschaften, Polizisten ermitteln und dann dem Richter das vortragen und dann entschieden wird. Und so einen Fall diskutieren wir jetzt im Europäischen Parlament! Sowohl der Rat als auch die Kommission hat faktisch heute nichts gesagt in dieser Einstiegsrede. Warum? Weil es nichts zu sagen gibt. Es ist eine eindeutig innenpolitische Frage, die in Bulgarien geklärt wird, und ich kann Ihnen die Antwort mitliefern. Wir diskutieren es, weil in wenigen Wochen in Bulgarien Wahlkampf ist, Wahlen entschieden werden.

Es wird versucht, Themen nationaler Kompetenzen nach Europa zu ziehen, und dafür ist dieses Haus eigentlich nicht da. Bulgarien handelt, die dortige Regierung handelt. Die Kommission hat bestätigt, dass entsprechende Initiativen ergriffen worden sind, und es ist eine eindeutige bulgarische Aufgabe. Die bulgarische Regierung hat in den Fragen, die dieses Land bewegen – Korruption, Kampf gegen Korruption und auch die Frage der Unabhängigkeit der Justiz – ambitioniert gearbeitet in den letzten Jahren. Das bestätigen die Fortschrittsberichte, die die Kommission regelmäßig vorgelegt hat.

Und wenn ich das am Beispiel Schengen einmal festmachen darf: Wir hatten die letzten Jahre immer Debatten, ob Bulgarien das Sorgenkind ist und deswegen die Schengen Erweiterung heute nicht kommt. Heute ist nicht Bulgarien das Sorgenkind, heute ist Rumänien das Sorgenkind. Warum diskutieren wir Rumänien nicht? Da gab es diese Woche einen Fortschrittsbericht, einen echten Bericht der Kommission zu Rumänien, worin echte Abweichungen gestanden sind, wo die Unabhängigkeit der Justiz in Zweifel gezogen wird,

wo Ponta interveniert gegenüber dem eigenen Verfassungsgerichtshof. Skandalöse Zustände in Rumänien! Wir als EVP wollten das diskutieren hier in diesem Haus. Leider Gottes gab es von den Sozialisten dafür keine Unterstützung, dieses Thema hier zu diskutieren.

Ich sage: Lassen Sie uns über die echten Themen reden, und die echten Themen sind definitiv nicht die Themen, die wir derzeit in Bulgarien haben. Lassen Sie uns nicht hier im Europäischen Parlament nationalen Wahlkampf durchführen!

*(Der Redner ist damit einverstanden, eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“ gemäß Artikel 149 Absatz 8 der Geschäftsordnung zu beantworten.)*

3-600-000

**Rui Tavares (Verts/ALE)**, *Pergunta segundo o procedimento "cartão azul"*. – Caro Colega Manfred Weber, o caro Colega disse que este era um problema da Bulgária. Como sabe estamos a discutir questões de democracia. Eu gostaria que me citasse o artigo 2 do Tratado da União Europeia e que diga onde é que encontra nesse artigo 2, que determina a nossa responsabilidade aqui nesta casa de defesa da democracia, igualdade, estado de direito, liberdade e dignidade humana, que me diga que esse problema, sendo da Bulgária, não é um problema de todos os europeus e se o Senhor, enquanto deputado, não é representante também dos búlgaros enquanto cidadãos europeus.

3-601-000

**Manfred Weber (PPE)**, *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der blauen Karte*. – Darauf kann man ganz einfach antworten, weil nicht ich antworten muss, sondern ich habe der Kommission zugehört. Die Kommission stellt fest, dass die bulgarische Regierung jetzt handeln muss. Das heißt, wir haben es mit einem normalen strafrechtlichen Verfahren zu tun, das dort vor Ort abzuwickeln ist und mit dem zu klären ist, warum es zu diesen Vorfällen auf diesem Parteitag kam. Ich als EVP-Vertreter habe schlicht und einfach volles Vertrauen in die bulgarischen Behörden und in die dortige Regierung, dass sie das Notwendige unternehmen werden. Nicht mehr und nicht weniger gibt es dazu zu sagen.

3-602-000

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar**, *en nombre del Grupo S&D*. – Señor Presidente, este Parlamento Europeo cumple con su deber de hablar cada vez que se plantean desafíos a la calidad de la democracia en cada uno de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea, porque es un problema europeo.

Vela por que los denominados criterios de Copenhague, el respeto del Estado de Derecho, el imperio de la ley y la independencia de un poder judicial capaz de garantizar los derechos fundamentales de los europeos se cumplan en cada uno de los Estados miembros, no solamente en el momento de la adhesión, sino a partir de la adhesión.

Y por eso suscita preocupación que, en Bulgaria, haya tenido lugar un grave atentado contra Ahmed Dogan, líder del MRF, un partido político de la oposición, mientras daba un mitin, a la vista de todo el mundo. Del mismo modo que, a la vista de todo el mundo, en las puertas del Tribunal de Justicia, una persona vinculada a la delincuencia organizada y al tráfico de estupefacientes, Zlatomir Ivanov, también haya sido víctima de un atentado criminal.

Esto nos está diciendo que no podemos relativizar estos hechos, como se ha hecho desde alguna esfera del Gobierno. Y, por tanto, tenemos la obligación de llamar la atención sobre la necesidad de fortalecer el poder judicial en Bulgaria y escrutar la integridad del poder

judicial, la independencia y la calidad de cada uno de sus miembros, en particular, en los estratos superiores, en el Tribunal Constitucional y en el Consejo Superior de Justicia.

Y, por tanto, urgimos a la Comisión a que adelante ese informe provisional relativo al mecanismo de cooperación y verificación en el área de la reforma de la justicia, y a que vele por que los comicios legislativos tan importantes que van a tener lugar en Bulgaria próximamente –y este Parlamento Europeo también tiene derecho a pronunciarse sobre ello– cumplan plenamente los criterios de transparencia y cumplan plenamente las recomendaciones de los organismos internacionales, preocupados por la situación democrática y la separación de poderes en Bulgaria, como lo demuestran los informes de la Organización para la Seguridad y la Cooperación en Europa.

Todos tenemos la obligación de mostrar preocupación. No es un problema búlgaro, es un problema de los ciudadanos búlgaros, en cuanto ciudadanos europeos, y, por tanto, es un problema de todos los ciudadanos europeos, y es un problema para este Parlamento Europeo.

*(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 149, apartado 8, del Reglamento))*

3-603-000

**Krisztina Morvai (NI)**, *blue-card question* . – I am so happy to hear that the European Union actually does have the authority to strengthen the independence of judiciaries of Member States in cases of criminal investigations, in cases of violent crimes. Does this mean that we have a hope in Hungary that finally those police leaders and Socialist government leaders who were shooting at us in 2006 will finally ...

*(The President cut off the speaker)*

3-604-000

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D)**, *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»* . – Señora Morvai, tuve el honor de presidir una delegación de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior, de la que usted también es miembro, precisamente en Hungría, y de recordar en esa ocasión ante cada interlocutor y, en particular, ante los medios de comunicación húngaros, que los diputados al Parlamento Europeo representamos a 500 millones de ciudadanos europeos, lo que supone un estatus de ciudadanía que complementa y mejora el de los ciudadanos de los diferentes Estados miembros, por tanto también el de los ciudadanos húngaros.

Y sí, representamos también a los ciudadanos húngaros cuando nos preocupamos de la separación de poderes, de la calidad de la democracia y del respeto de la ley en cada uno de los Estados miembros, también en Hungría.

*(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 149, apartado 8, del Reglamento))*

3-605-000

**Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE)**, *pregunta de «tarjeta azul»* . – Deseo preguntarle al señor López Aguilar si sabe que el Gobierno de Bulgaria condenó inmediatamente el atentado contra el señor Dogan, si sabe que el ministro del Interior se

personó inmediatamente en el lugar de los hechos, si sabe que el agresor está detenido y si sabe que se enfrenta a penas de entre cinco y seis años de cárcel.

3-606-000

**Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D)**, *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Todos estamos informados, efectivamente, de la secuencia fáctica, lo que no resta gravedad a la cuestión de fondo. No resta gravedad al principio de que los criterios que cualifican a los Estados para tocar a la puerta de la Unión Europea deben mantenerse permanentemente, y de que cuando se producen acontecimientos graves que afectan a la calidad de la democracia, del pluralismo, del proceso democrático y de la igualdad de oportunidades de cada una de las fuerzas políticas que concurren en un proceso electoral y, en particular, aquellas que se encuentran en la oposición, este asunto pueda ser traído al Parlamento Europeo y debatido. Es el caso. Y estoy seguro de que sería el caso si sucediera algo de la misma gravedad en cualquier otro Estado miembro de la Unión Europea.

3-607-000

**Graham Watson**, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I witnessed the attempt on the leader's life at the recent congress of Bulgaria's Movement for Rights and Freedoms. That incident of itself might not justify this debate; the reaction to it by the Bulgarian authorities makes it imperative.

It was first announced that the attacker, armed with a gas pistol and two knives, would be charged with attempted murder. A few hours later, the Interior Minister asked the judiciary to press only minor charges. Attempts were made to trivialise the incident. A charge of hooliganism and a death threat is not sufficient for an attack of this nature, particularly since the Procurator General has today suggested that the attacker did not act alone.

Questions should be asked about the security arrangements for the conference. Two letters from the party to the Interior Ministry requesting adequate security went unanswered, and the attack showed protection to be severely lacking.

We have long been concerned about Bulgaria's judiciary. The Veneta Markovska affair and a controversial judicial appointment have heightened that concern. The European Commission's verification report last July highlighted worries about judicial independence and about the commitment to and direction of reform, in particular the postponement of the new penal code. It is disgraceful for Mr Weber to suggest, in support of a rogue party in his increasingly cynical political family, that this debate is about an election campaign. The sad fact is that the key institutions of justice do not command public confidence in Bulgaria. The Liberal Democrats welcome Commissioner Malmström's commitment to follow the trial. As with Commissioner Reding's action in Hungary, this House expects no less. But the Commission must insist, too, on a full investigation, of which the results must be made public.

The Commission will shortly give the Council an oral update on progress under the cooperation and verification mechanism. Such an update could usefully be given here too. Bulgaria's people are on the right path, but leadership is lacking. We expect Bulgaria to attain and live up to EU standards of justice, and we urge the Union and its Member States to redouble their efforts to help Bulgaria in this task.

*(The speaker accepted to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-608-000

**IN THE CHAIR: EDWARD McMILLAN-SCOTT***Vice-President*

3-609-000

**Димитър Стоянов (NI)**, *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – Първо, г-н Watson, никой, и особено вътрешният министър, не е „натискал“ българските съдебни власти да предявяват каквито и да е обвинения. Но имайте предвид, че при такава атака, която е без заредено оръжие и без намерение, няма умисъл за извършване на убийство. И затова няма и престъпление „опит за извършване на убийство“. Такъв е законът в България. Не знам какъв е законът в Англия.

Искате ли Вие да ми кажете, че понеже атаката е извършена срещу човек с особено обществено положение, българските власти трябва да пренебрегнат българския закон, да го нарушат, само да за бъдете удовлетворен Вие. Това ли искате да ми кажете?

3-610-000

**Graham Watson (ALDE)**, *blue-card answer*. – Mr Stoyanov, I know of your political party and what you stand for but you must know too that the attacker was armed not only with a gas pistol – which, at the range at which it was fired, had it gone off, might well have killed – but was armed also with two knives. That was established immediately after the event.

The Prosecutor for Sofia said that the assailant would be charged for murder. That charge was later reduced, on a request from the Interior Ministry, to a charge of hooliganism and death threats. It seems to us that those charges are insufficient for an issue of this nature, involving as it does a party representing a community which already feels under attack in your country.

3-611-000

**Rui Tavares**, *em nome do Grupo Verts/ALE*. – A União tem uma responsabilidade, está logo no artigo 2, as primeiras palavras substantivas do Tratado: *Respeito pela dignidade humana, liberdade, democracia, igualdade, estado de direito, respeito pelos direitos humanos*. Essa responsabilidade recai diretamente sobre nós, sobre as instituições, que estamos aqui, e recai diretamente sobre os Estados-Membros, que têm obrigações: pluralismo, não-discriminação, tolerância, respeito pelos direitos das minorias.

O caso búlgaro que estamos aqui a debater é emblemático de como esses valores estão em perigo na União Europeia de hoje. As fraudes e irregularidades eleitorais têm várias descrições, as ligações à corrupção, mesmo à criminalidade organizada, por parte das elites políticas estão documentadas, são conhecidas das embaixadas em Sofia, têm a pior classificação na liberdade de imprensa da União Europeia - das piores no mundo desenvolvido -, as pessoas LGBT vivem sob pressão, a comunidade cigana, ou Roma, guetoizada e sem educação. E, claro, isto não se passa só na Bulgária. Cada caso na Europa é um caso, mas vários casos fazem uma tendência: num país é a separação de poderes, noutra país são questões de corrupção, noutra país ainda os jornalistas que estão em perigo.

A União Europeia tem um problema sério de democracia e de direitos civis e políticos e tem de encarar a realidade. Temos de encarar a realidade! Vem aqui o Conselho e diz que não se pode pronunciar, reenvia para a Comissão, a Comissão envia, com todo o respeito,

Senhora Comissária, à Comissária para as Alterações Climáticas e ouvimos um representante do Partido Popular Europeu dizer que este é só um problema húngaro, quando o Tratado diz exatamente o contrário e reenvia para os socialistas, porque os socialistas não falam da Roménia.

Se cada grupo político reenvia para os outros nunca trataremos da nossa promessa perante o povo búlgaro e o povo europeu. A nossa promessa é uma promessa de progresso, de democracia e de paz. É essa a promessa europeia! Está a falhar o progresso, está a falhar a democracia, um dia falhará a paz. Não podemos ter a ingenuidade de pensar que na Europa estas coisas não acontecem. É na Europa que elas aconteceram, é para impedir que elas aconteçam na Europa que a União Europeia foi feita, e é para isso que nós devemos caminhar, por exemplo pedindo que se os países têm de respeitar os critérios de Copenhaga antes de entrarem na União, formemos uma comissão de Copenhaga para acompanhar o respeito pelos valores de Copenhaga também depois da entrada na União.

Com isto termino, Senhor Presidente.

3-612-000

**Geoffrey Van Orden**, *on behalf of the ECR Group* . – Mr President, five years have now passed since Bulgaria's accession in 2007, yet it seems we are still concerned with many of the same issues that troubled us then, and I must express some disappointment.

In my final report on the accession of Bulgaria in 2006, I emphasised the need to enhance the transparency, efficiency and impartiality of the judiciary, the need for substantive results in the fight against corruption (with special emphasis on the fight against organised crime), and the importance of improving the conditions of Roma communities so that they would be more content living in Bulgaria.

While we can see many areas of progress and positive development in Bulgaria, these problems have not been adequately addressed, and some of them are reflected in the Commission's continuing reports under the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism. They are at the root of so many of the difficulties that we see today. Most recently we have seen the very serious criticisms of senior judicial appointments, the continuing accusations of linkage of politicians and state officials with organised crime and the old state security apparatus, Bulgarian criminal gangs active in fifteen Member States according to Europol, the very serious political attack that has just been referred to, and the concerns expressed in a number of Member States about the possibility of an influx of poor migrants that may become a burden on social services in those countries.

Some of these matters need to be addressed by the Member States concerned and by the EU but, Mr President, Bulgaria itself needs to address its long-standing problems with greater urgency. It is time for those politicians of real integrity to offer the Bulgarian people genuine change that is necessary and that they can believe in.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-613-000

**Gerard Batten (EFD)**, *blue-card question* . – Mr Van Orden, if in your report five years ago you highlighted all these problems – which were very serious problems then and which you now say are still very serious problems and in fact even worse probably than when you wrote your report – why did you then feel it necessary to recommend Bulgarian entry

to the EU when it clearly did not fulfil the criteria that one would expect, the most basic criteria about rule of law and democracy in an entrant country?

3-614-000

**Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR)**, *blue-card answer* . – I am very happy to answer that. The questions that were raised then are valid today, as I have now indicated. But the reasons why it was right for Bulgaria to accede at that time were absolutely correct and remain correct.

This was at a time when Bulgaria needed to have the confidence of being very much part of a western club. It was at a time of growing Russian influence in that part of the world, when they needed economic confidence and when investors in Bulgaria needed to have the prospect of stability, and at a time when there were extremist forces on the rise in Bulgaria that needed to be allayed.

For all of those reasons it was right for Bulgaria to join the European Union. But at that time we made it very clear that there was a need for continuing reform and, in particular, reform in those areas which I have now indicated. My disappointment is that they have not addressed those concerns with sufficient urgency.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-615-000

**Krisztina Morvai (NI)**, *blue-card question* . – I was just wondering whether the need for the Bulgarian market was not on the list by any chance – access to the Bulgarian market by Western businesses.

3-616-000

**Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR)**, *blue-card answer* . – Well, one of the reasons why we have been very much in favour of enlargement of the European Union is that eventually market opportunities will be increased for all of us.

That is the whole point of the single market of 500 million people. That is the whole idea, but there are a lot of specific reasons why it was right to bring Bulgaria in at that particular time.

3-617-000

**Gerard Batten**, *on behalf of the EFD Group* . – Mr President, in January 2014 the final restrictions will be lifted on immigration into Britain from Romania and Bulgaria. A further 29 million people will be given the automatic right of entry, and it is estimated that this will result in at least 50 000 extra immigrants per year over the next five years.

Britain is already overwhelmed and swamped with immigration because, as a member of the European Union, we have surrendered our right to control it. The British have nothing against Bulgarians or anyone else: we do not blame them for wanting to better their lives. But why do so many Bulgarians want to leave their country? Bulgaria is a desperately poor country under the control of criminals. Let me quote from the New York Times: 'Politics is played to the death in Bulgaria, where the lives of politicians can be as cheap as spent bullets and murky business groups wage a murderous struggle for their cut of everything from real estate deals to millions in European aid'. Atanas Atanasov, a former

counter-intelligence chief, has said, 'Other countries have the mafia; in Bulgaria the mafia have the country'.

How can democracy prosper under these conditions? There is a lack of a free media and press, a corrupt judiciary and legal system, widespread electoral fraud and criminal control of business. It is no surprise that many Bulgarians will choose to move somewhere else. One good thing that the EU did do was to suspend payments to Bulgaria. It is not right to send millions in aid for their criminals to plunder and make them richer. I feel desperately sorry for decent Bulgarians, but I feel even sorer for my own country, which is being destroyed by membership of the European Union. The British political establishment is dedicated – or seems dedicated – to turning Britain into a third-world country. Britain cannot solve Bulgaria's problems by importing Bulgarians.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-618-000

**Diane Dodds (NI)**, *blue-card question* . – Much has been made of individual rights and liberties in this very interesting debate. Would you agree with me that it is time that governments from the Member States who are represented here in this Parliament caught up with the international community, notably the United Kingdom and the United States, in classifying Hezbollah as a terrorist organisation, given the fact that last night an investigation concluded that it was behind the bombing attack in Bulgaria in July 2012 which killed five Israeli tourists?

3-619-000

**Gerard Batten (EFD)**, *blue-card answer* . – Yes Mrs Dodds, I would agree with you. I think that we should designate groups like that as terrorism because the last thing that we want to see is what happened in Northern Ireland. Terrorism and politics often go hand in hand and I would hate to see it happen in my country, as it did in Northern Ireland, that the terrorists actually propel people into government, where they are now.

Of course, I would like to see action taken against Islamic fundamentalism wherever it raises its head because it goes hand in hand with terrorism. In London we now have Sharia patrols intimidating people on the street on what they can or cannot do or can or cannot wear, and gays have been intimidated in the Bethnal Green area.

I think it is very important, I take your point and I totally agree with you.

3-620-000

**Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR)**. - I would like to point out to Mr Batten that Northern Ireland is his country.

3-621-000

**Gerard Batten (EFD)**. - It is part of the United Kingdom, and I accept that: that was a slip of the tongue. But of course the European Union is busy regionalising our nation, so very soon it probably will not be the United Kingdom anyway when Scotland chooses to leave, and I expect you probably as a Conservative would be in support of (*microphone momentarily switched off*) as well.



3-622-000

**Димитър Стоянов (NI).** - Г-н Председател, всъщност за Ваша изненада ще кажа, че България действително има проблем със свободата. Знаете ли, г-н Watson, че лицето, което защитавате толкова силно в момента, е бил осъждан за тероризъм в България? Неговата партия — Движението за права и свободи, е „феодализирала“ цели райони от България. И когато дойдат избори, техните емисари ходят и събират хората от къщите им и ги карат като стадо в секциите за гласуване, за да подадат гласовете си. Иначе им отрязват всякакви социални привилегии.

Движението за права и свободи е единствената партия в България, която е осъждана за фалшифициране на изборни резултати. През 2009-та година бяха касирани над 20 хиляди гласа за тази партия като фалшифицирани. Ахмед Доган — лидерът на тази партия, беше оправдан от българския съд за това, че е взел половин милион евро рушвет. Какво ще кажете за такива обвинения в корупция, г-н Watson?

Какво ще кажете за Ахмед Доган, който през 2009 година излезе и каза, че в България нямало нужда от парламент, защото със или без парламент той разпределял цялата власт в държавата. Ето това е лицето, което Вие защитавате. Да Ви е срам от това, че го защитавате, защото това не е свобода и демокрация. Вие защитавате точното обратното в България.

*(Ораторът приема да отговори на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта (член 149, параграф 8 от Правилника за дейността)).*

3-623-000

**Graham Watson (ALDE), blue-card question .** – I would like to ask Mr Stoyanov whether he believes that the Satanisation of a political party – and this is not the first example, sadly, of such expressions from members of his party in his country – particularly a political party representing a minority community in his country, is likely to lead to confidence in the rest of the European Union in the development of Bulgaria as a modern democracy.

3-624-000

**Димитър Стоянов (NI), отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта .** – Г-н Watson, това, в което вярваме е, че Движението за права и свободи, наречено „Национално движение за права и свободи на турците в Република България“ е било терористична организация, която е залагала бомби, които са убивали хора в България преди 30 години. Това представлява тази организация. Последният атентат, който тя извършва, е бомба, заложена във вагона за майки с деца. Ето това не мога да приема. Един човек, лежал в затвора за тероризъм, да бъде защитаван тук в тази зала на демокрацията.

3-625-000

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE).** - Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, chers collègues, je dois vous dire que je ne comprends pas vraiment la pertinence du débat que nous tenons aujourd'hui.

L'état de droit et la liberté sont des valeurs et même des obligations européennes: un certain nombre d'entre vous l'ont rappelé, la commissaire aussi. La Bulgarie fait des efforts pour s'y soumettre. Il faut d'ailleurs se réjouir de l'élaboration d'un code électoral bulgare permettant de fixer des règles claires et empêchant ainsi des changements stratégiques et peu démocratiques quelques semaines avant les élections. Les organisations internationales

le reconnaissent toutes. Le 8 janvier 2013, le GRECO, le groupe d'États contre la corruption, du Conseil de l'Europe, a félicité la Bulgarie pour ses réformes.

Rappelons aussi que ce pays détient le second score le plus élevé dans le classement du rapport "Liberté dans le monde 2013" de Freedom House pour les libertés civiles et les droits politiques.

Aussi, je ne peux m'empêcher de m'interroger sur les raisons sous-jacentes à ce débat. Estime-t-on qu'une agression au pistolet à gaz, qui a d'ailleurs échoué, à un congrès national est un événement d'envergure européenne? Certes, c'est un événement dramatique pour la personne qui le vit, tout le monde le reconnaît, et on le condamne. D'ailleurs, la police bulgare a arrêté le responsable et le prétendu coupable de cette agression vraiment condamnable, mais est-ce une raison pour en débattre aujourd'hui? Est-ce, je le répète, un événement d'une envergure européenne?

Ce sont malheureusement des choses qui arrivent. Il y a des déséquilibrés dans tous les pays européens, en France aussi. Par exemple, le président de la République française que vous avez écouté hier a subi la même chose. Il s'est fait enfariner pendant sa campagne électorale et il n'en a pas fait une affaire d'État, si je puis dire. Autre exemple malheureux: le maire de Paris, Bertrand Delanoë, a subi, il y a quelques années, une dramatique agression. Il s'est fait poignarder d'un coup de couteau, souvenez-vous. Tout le monde l'a soutenu dans cette affaire dramatique.

Bref, des déséquilibrés, il en existe partout, mais est-ce une raison pour prendre en otage un hémicycle européen? Il n'est pas acceptable que ce Parlement soit instrumentalisé pour un débat de politique nationale. C'est une affaire interne. La commissaire l'a d'ailleurs rappelé au début des débats.

Or, je constate que, depuis quelque temps, les élections bulgares sont l'objet d'un véritable harcèlement de la part d'un certain nombre de groupes politiques au Parlement, que ce soit au sein de la commission spéciale sur la criminalité organisée, la corruption et le blanchiment de capitaux, ou encore lors de la dernière plénière durant le débat sur la corruption, alors que ce n'était pas indispensable, ainsi qu'à l'occasion d'un certain nombre d'auditions politiques. Ce problème national doit être réglé d'une façon ...

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

*(L'oratrice accepte de répondre à une question "carton bleu", conformément à l'article 149, paragraphe 8, du règlement)*

3-626-000

**Ana Gomes (S&D)**, question "carton bleu". – J'ai écouté attentivement ma collègue Véronique Mathieu, et puisqu'elle minimise ce qui s'est passé le week-end dernier, je voudrais lui demander si elle trouve normal qu'un premier ministre reste silencieux sur cette affaire pendant plus d'une journée, si elle trouve normal que les autorités de sécurité n'aient pas pris des dispositions pour garantir la sécurité de la manifestation politique – qui, d'ailleurs, comptait des personnalités internationales, y compris des collègues de notre Parlement qui ont vu ce qui s'est passé – et, enfin, si elle trouve normal que cela soit réduit, en fait, à une question de hooliganisme, quand on sait que cela encourage des rivalités ethniques en Bulgarie?

3-627-000

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE)**, *réponse "carton bleu"*. – J'ai dit que la police a arrêté le coupable. Bien évidemment, je condamne cet acte, comme tout le monde l'a fait. C'est condamnable. Le déséquilibré a été arrêté par la police et il est, à l'heure actuelle, en prison. La police a fait son travail et la justice le sien. Et je pense que tout a été fait d'une façon...

*(Le Président interrompt l'oratrice pour un problème technique)*

3-628-000

**President**, *speaking to Franz Obermayr*. – You say there is no German interpretation, but we can hear German down here. This is a Strasbourg problem – I am so sorry. We will get the technical services to look at this.

3-629-000

**Véronique Mathieu (PPE)**. - Je réponds à Ana que la police a donc arrêté le présumé coupable et qu'il est entre les mains de la justice en ce moment. Quoi de plus naturel, me semble-t-il? Est-ce que la réponse te convient, Ana?

3-630-000

**Claude Moraes (S&D)**. - Mr President, I knew there was a way you were going to get Strasbourg into the conversation.

There is a continual tension – and I have been involved in this tension as coordinator on the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs – when we focus on an individual Member State clearly in a state of flux, particularly in relation to its record on the judiciary and on policing and criminal justice. There is no question that this creates tension and conflict.

The stimulus for this debate is clearly an incident which is causing deep emotion, and that is well placed. But there is no question that we have Copenhagen criteria and there is no question that this is a matter for the whole of the European Union. We are a community of values. If we can help a Member State by focusing on those values – the Centre for European Policy Studies has said that after 20 years of democratic development judicial independence still remains a key and deep problem – and if, five years after accession there are still deep problems and there is some way we can address these problems, that is something we have to do. If this debate helps to do that, then that is something that we need to debate.

3-631-000

**Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)**. - Mr President, first of all this debate is not about cornering Bulgaria, or singling out Bulgaria. The rule of law and democracy are common European values.

If you wanted to concentrate on my country, we also have had attacks: Theo van Gogh was murdered in my country, Pim Fortuyn was murdered there. We have looked for international and European cooperation and we have never said the European Parliament may not debate this issue. Therefore, this is not against Bulgaria; it is in the interests of Bulgaria.

Like Graham Watson, I was in the Congress Hall and I saw what happened. I also heard and saw that there were no police there, neither in the Cultural Palace nor outside it, although this was requested. This has to be answered.

We also need to know: Has international cooperation been brought to the attention of the Bulgarians? What did the Commission do? And has assistance been requested by Bulgaria?

International crime and international terrorism know no borders, and in Europe we have too many borders. What I would ask is to let us cooperate in this case, let us investigate and let us debate it, not against Bulgaria but in the interests of Bulgaria.

*(The speaker agreed to take a blue-card question under Rule 149(8))*

3-632-000

**Андрей Ковачев (PPE)**, *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта* . – Г-н Председател, аз искам да попитам г-н van Baalen и също така да отговоря на г-н Watson и на г-жа Gomes, защото всички говорят за това, че нямало охрана. А задължението да има охрана на това партийно мероприятие е на самата партия ДПС. Те са си имали договор с една охранителна фирма за охраната.

Разбира се, личната охрана на г-н Доган е понесла своята отговорност за това, че не е била достатъчно бърза. Но задължението да охранява партийното мероприятие е на самата партия ДПС. Ако беше обратното, ако беше пълно с полиция, щяха да кажат: „Защо има толкова полиция? Защо охраняват или подслушват какво прави партийната сбирка на съответната партия?“. Така че нека да бъдем коректни и да не говорим неща, които нямат нищо общо с реалността.

3-633-000

**Johannes Cornelis van Baalen (ALDE)**, *blue-card answer* . – The fact is that this should be clarified because what we know – Sir Graham Watson and I – is that the police were asked to come and there was no response. The MRF asked for police protection and it was not given. I am not implying anything, but let us answer the questions. Let us raise them here and I would like the authorities in Bulgaria to answer.

3-634-000

**Андрей Ковачев (PPE)**. - Г-н Председател, за ДПС формален повод да поиска днешния дебат бе опитът за покушение срещу лидера им Ахмед Доган. Този опит беше осъден в специална декларация на Народното събрание в София.

Европейската комисия и Европейският съвет смятат, че разкриването на всички аспекти на инцидента, включително и възможни съучастници и подбудители, е вътрешна работа на България. ДПС даже изрази удовлетворение от приетата декларация от Българския парламент и от факта, че разследването е поето от НСС и е под прякото наблюдение на главния прокурор. От това следва, че сегашният дебат е абсолютно безпредметен от гледна точка на повода.

Защо сме обаче тука? Тука сме, защото явно българската опозиция има огромното желание да използва тази зала за предизборната си кампания. Лидерът на БСП и отскоро лидер на ПЕС, който загуби от ГЕРБ 7 поредни избора в България в последните 6 години, много иска да покаже, че и той може да печели нещо. ДПС е тръгнала заедно с БСП на последен бой без скрупули и задръжки и не се колебае да дискредитира страната си.

Използват се критики по отношение на Избирателния кодекс, за който трябваше днес в 13.00 ч. в Българското Народно събрание да има среща на политическите партии. Това не се случи, защото тя беше бойкотирана от ДПС и БСП, разбира се, за да могат да направят днешното си представление тук, без предупреждение.

Прави се манипулация относно липса на свобода на медиите и цензура в България от представители на опозицията, които от сутрин до вечер са в медиите в България — по екран, в интернет, говорят за „тотална цензура“ и развиват своите тези срещу правителството и лично срещу министър-председателя. Новото тук е, че те се оплакват от това, че нямали възможност да се оплакват, което е абсолютно недостойно, грозно и несправедливо.

Разбирайки, че нямат никакъв шанс да спечелят изборите в България и да станат първа сила, г-н Станишев грабна на въоръжение старата отечественофронтowska идея и тръби наляво и надясно, че демокрацията в България е в опасност и здравите и най-демократични сили, а именно ДПС и БСП трябва да вземат властта отново. Девизът на всички е „всички срещу ГЕРБ!“ Много хубаво, но годината не е 1944, а е 2013 година и хората помнят кой кой е в българската политика.

Наблюдава се в последно време огромно високомерие и агресивно поведение от българските опозиционни партии, които по всякакъв начин се опитват да очернят правителството и лично премиера.

Обръщам се особено към ДПС. Говорите, че не трябва да се сее омраза, а правите точно обратното — изолирате и плашите българските етнически турци, за да са те вечен ваш електорат. Това не е интеграция, етническа толерантност и демокрация.

И най-накрая, не мога да не направя връзката между последните опити за дестабилизация на страната и волята на правителството да скъса веднъж завинаги със старата комунистическа Държавна сигурност и нейните връзки със сегашните служби. Те работеха под покровителството преди това на БСП и на БКП, и на бившия президент — също агент на комунистическата Държавна сигурност, без закон до сега. Въпреки задкулисният отпор, въпреки компроматите, промените се случват и България става наистина демократична и европейска държава.

Бих призовал колегите си от опозицията да не мислят само за изборите, а да живеят и между изборите, и да осигурим едно достойно и с висок жизнен стандарт и сигурност бъдеще и настояще на нашите граждани.

3-635-000

**Илияна Малинова Йотова (S&D).** - Г-н Председател, този, който изнася предизборни речи, преди малко си седна. Но в тази зала днес слушахме и по-ценни неща. Чухме една вълнуваща реч на президента на Тунис, в която многократно звучаха думите „свобода, законност и демокрация“. Сега отново се връщаме към тях, но без аплодисментите от преди обяд. Защото става дума за грубо нарушаване на тези понятия в държава – членка на ЕС.

И понеже Вие, г-жо Комисар, засегнахте темата за изборите, ще Ви кажа, че натиск, хаос, купуване на гласове от управляващата партия — това е характеристиката на последните избори в България от 2011 г. Няколко месеца преди парламентарния вот сега, 60 % от българските граждани не вярват, че ще гласуват свободно. Доказателство е опитът за манипулации на току-що проведенния първи свободен референдум в страната. В България няма спор за различните програми на партиите, за ляво и дясно, за център, а как да се предотврати фалшификацията на изборите и подмяната на резултатите.

32 препоръки на ОССЕ останаха без резултат. Вместо преговори с всички опозиционни партии, властта замрази новия Изборен кодекс. Натискът върху институциите е безпрецедентен и блокира тяхната работа. Вместо реформа в съдебната система — криза; вместо борба с престъпността — стрелба пред Съдебната палата; вместо правов ред — опит за покушение срещу опозиционен лидер.

Завършвам г-н Председател, защото настоявам за цялостен мониторинг от ЕК.

*(Председателят прекъсна оратора)*

3-636-000

**Филиз Хакъева Хюсменова (ALDE).** - Г-н Председател, поводът, довел ни до днешния дебат, е покушението срещу лидера на Движението за права и свободи — д-р Ахмед Доган. Вече знаете, че този безпрецедентен акт на посегателство се случи на Осмата ни национална конференция.

Оценяваме справедливото осъждане на покушението от Президента на Републиката, от Народното събрание и позицията на Главния прокурор — реакции, предизвикани и от активността на ДПС.

Днес съм тук заради опитите на управляващите да negliжират събитието и да формират определено обществено мнение; заради това, че правните квалификации предхождат изясняването на обстоятелствата; заради разпространяването на неверни данни, свързани с акта на покушението. За всичко това има един израз и той е „политическо вмешателство“.

Ние приемаме, че покушението срещу г-н Доган, е поръчков опит за политическо убийство на опозиционен лидер в навечерието на парламентарни избори. Европейският съюз е основан на върховенството на закона. И тук опитът за убийство се определя като престъпление.

Затова, от най-високата трибуна на Европа призовавам Европейската комисия да наблюдава хода на делото за покушението като част от делата с висока обществена значимост. Надявам се, че ще бъде проведено обективно разследване и ще се осигури реален достъп до правосъдие.

*(Ораторът приема да отговори на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта (член 149, параграф 8 от Правилника за дейността)).*

3-637-000

**Андрей Ковачев (PPE),** *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта.* – Аз мога да използвам синята карта и за двете предишни изказвания.

Г-жо Хюсменова, Вие казахте от една страна, че сте удовлетворени от това, че и Българското народно събрание, и Българският парламент, и разбира се управляващата партия ГЕРБ застана зад декларацията на Народното събрание. Не са, обаче, достатъчни за Вас и изказванията на Главния прокурор, че това е под неговото пряко наблюдение.

Вие искате и още нещо, което другите страни членки при такива актове не са искали, примерно, да бъде специално наблюдавано делото от Европейската комисия. Тук аз виждам една последователност на Вашата политика заедно със сестринската Ви партия БСП. Както в ПЕС гласуваха срещу отпадането на постмониторинговия доклад за България, така и сега искате допълнителни доклади и допълнително следене на България. Това е много странно.

Г-жо Йотова,

*(Председателят прекъсна оратора)*

3-638-000

**Филиз Хакъева Хюсменова (ALDE)**, *отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – Г-н Председател, добре е да се спазва времето все пак на изказванията, така както ние го правим.

Движението за права и свободи заяви категорично, че ние търсим подкрепата на Европейската комисия в лицето на комисаря по правосъдие и вътрешни работи Сесилия Малмстрьом, делото срещу извършителя на покушението срещу г-н Ахмед Доган да бъде следено отблизо и то да бъде включено в рамките на Механизма за сътрудничество и оценка сред делата от висока обществена значимост, защото смятаме, че Европейската комисия е тази, която може да приложи законодателството и да прецени дали органите в България си вършат работата по европейските правила.

3-639-000

**Моника Ханс Панайотова (PPE)**. – Г-н Председател, за съжаление, под претекст, че колегите от социалистите и либералите водят антиправителствена кампания, явно те все по-често водят антибългарска кампания. Това пролича сред изказванията от някои от колегите от другите държави.

Тази кампания, обаче, вреди на имиджа на страната ни и рефлектира негативно от индивидуалното ниво на пътуващия, учещия, работещия, пребиваващия българин в чужбина до позиционирането на страната ни на европейската сцена.

Всичко, което бе изказано до момента, предстои да бъде изказано и от следващите колеги социалисти и либерали. Всичко това е част от тяхната компроматна предизборна надпревара. Мобилизирането на електората с антикампания обаче показва само едно — липсата на аргументи и визия за адекватна, алтернативна, а не популистка политика за развитието на страната ни. Често критиките, които биват отправяни към сегашните управляващи, всъщност са неоснователни опасения на бившата коалиция от либерали и социалисти, че ще бъдат прилагани спрямо тях същите действия и методи, както когато те управляваха.

Например през 2009 година за изборите за сегашния парламент измененията в Изборния кодекс се правеха на тъмно, в последния момент, а в ръководството на нито една избирателна комисия не бе допуснат представител на опозицията. Председателите, заместник-председателите и секретарите бяха единствено и само от управляващата тогава тройна коалиция.

Сега всичко се прави при пълна прозрачност, с активното участие на неправителствения сектор, медиите и перманентното допитване до опозицията. И не властта замразява Избирателния кодекс, а опозицията, която дори и днес не се е явила на консултациите, за да защити аргументирано своите предложения, въпреки готовността на управляващите за промяна в Кодекса и гарантиране конституционното право на глас на всеки български гражданин както в страната, така и в чужбина.

Във връзка със спекулациите относно миналото на нашия премиер, които също се завъртяха в последните дни, искам да отбележа, че отново всичко се случва прозрачно и то е разсекретено. Това, което предизвика голяма полемика, в момента е достъпно за всеки, който има желание да се запознае с него. Това всъщност е част от поредния предизборен дебат на опозицията. След като обявихме безкомпромисна битка срещу организираната престъпност, корупцията и сивата икономика, за нашите опоненти остава да правят само

това, в което са най-добри — използването на компроматни похвати за срыв на доверието в правната държава.

(Ораторът приема да отговори на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта (член 149, параграф 8 от Правилника за дейността)).

3-640-000

**Евгени Кирилов (S&D)**, въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта . – Г-жо Панайотова, всъщност странното е, че днес само вие, колегите и Вашите приятели от ЕРР говорят за избори. Дайте да говорим за нещо по-сериозно, дайте да говорим за стандарти.

Вие току-що дойдохте от българския парламент и станяхте член на Европейския парламент. Може ли да ми отговорите как оценявате това, че вече два месеца Вашият премиер не се е появявал в парламента на парламентарен контрол? И даже след това покушение, за което днес говорим и стрелбата пред Съдебната палата, той трябваше в петък да се яви пак на парламентарен контрол, взе си един отпуск и в същото време като министър-председател се показваше по всички медии.

3-641-000

**Моника Ханс Панайотова (PPE)**, отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта . – Говорим за избори, г-н Кирилов, защото Вие измествате всъщност предизборната кампания в тази зала и всички преждеговорящи всъщност колеги от ЕРР именно подчертаха, че мястото за това не е тук и са абсолютно прави.

Относно премиера, мисля, че премиерът управлява и взема решенията, които определят дневния ред на страната, при пълна прозрачност. Не е работа на премиера да обяснява какво се е случило на Конгреса на Движението за права и свободи. Съответните институции са поели своята отговорност и нека дори отгук чрез подобен дебат не упражняваме натиск върху прокуратурата и съдебната система, за която всъщност всички подчертават, че искате да се реформира, а същевременно, когато не ви изнася, я критикувате.

3-642-000

**Kinga Göncz (S&D)**. - Többször beszéltünk itt arról, hogy a csatlakozás előtt álló országok esetében az Uniónak erős ösztönzők vannak a kezében ahhoz, hogy a demokratikus átalakulást segítse, arra, hogy számon kérje a média szabadságát, a jogállamiság működését. Azt látjuk, hogy a motiváció a csatlakozás után sokszor nem nemcsak alábbhagy, hanem a folyamat vissza is fordul. Most ezzel a veszéllyel nézzünk szembe Bulgária esetében is, ahonnan egyre több olyan hír érkezik, amely szerint a média tulajdonviszonyainak átláthatatlansága és a médiakoncentráció miatt veszélybe kerülhet a sajtó szabadsága, sokszínűsége. Az előző választás után az EBESZ választási megfigyelői számos kifogást, javaslatot fogalmaztak meg, amelyek átültetése a jogrendbe azóta sem valósult meg. Így kérdések merülhetnek fel a nyáron esedékes parlamenti választások tisztaságával kapcsolatban. Arra kérjük a Bizottságot, hogy folyamatosan kísérelje figyelemmel, hogy nem sérülnek-e a jogállami normák, a választások tisztasága, a politikai verseny egyenlő feltételei Bulgáriában.

3-643-000

**Станимир Илчев (ALDE)**. - Г-н Председател, най-лесно е днес да се говори само за един инцидент, обект на който е само един политик в България. Но това не изчерпва замисъла на тези разисквания.



Нашата страна преживя всъщност най-тежкия атентат в новата си история много наскоро. До едно българско село чужди командоси проведоха мистериозна операция, обявена за екстремна спортна проява. За партийния лидер, който беше обект на покушение, вече говорихме. А наскоро беше открита автоматична стрелба по един знаков обвиняем като за фон беше използвана сградата на Съдебната палата в София.

Искам да кажа, че преди три години правителството твърдеше, че ще удари олигархията, ще поднесе на българите ред и справедливост. Тези цели останаха непостигнати. Олигархията се радва на много добро здраве и на плътна анонимност. Истинските конструктори на подземния свят са в чудесна кондиция. Шумните полицейски акции по-скоро дават на обществото да разбере кои са покровителствани, след като не са сред преследваните.

Междувременно правителството смачка няколко бизнеса в своя полза и в полза на своите партизани. От сутрин до вечер то обгрижва собствения си образ чрез контролирани медии, а сигурността на гражданите е оставена на самите тях. Наблюдаваме дезинтегрираност на сектора за сигурност, като инструментите за сигурност се използват срещу политически опоненти и за реструктуриране на икономическата среда.

Затова и събитията, които изброих, станаха възможни. И те не бяха планирани и проведени от опозицията, защото идвали избори.

Разбира се, тази статистика е много по-тежка и много по-дълга. Изводът е един: днес българският гражданин е в опасна зависимост от една безучастна и арогантна държава, чийто министър-председател се изживява като неин универсален собственик.

*(Ораторът приема да отговори на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта (член 149, параграф 8 от Правилника за дейността)).*

3-644-000

**Андрей Ковачев (PPE)**, *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта* . – Г-н Илчев, все пак говорите за някаква статистика. Аз не чух да посочите никаква статистика нито да правите сравнения. Направете някакви сравнения за отвлечените, за убийствата, за кражбите, за магистралните грабежи.

Каква е Вашата статистика за това, че в момента в България българското правителство не прави нищо срещу организираната престъпност? Нека да оставим оценката по този въпрос на независими международни организации, а не на предизборен дебат, било то и в Европейския парламент. Не е достойно.

3-645-000

**Станимир Илчев (ALDE)**, *отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта* . – Колега Ковачев, няма как да четем докладите за статистиката. Спрях се на най-драстичните — умопомрачителните събития, които превръщат днес България в едно объркано, потиснато, безпомощно общество, което загуби крехката перспектива, която имаше преди няколко години.

Как да Ви прочета статистиката за престъпността, която залива беззащитните български села, малките градчета, за масовите самоубийства на бивши военноръжници? Най-хладнокръвно тренираните хора в нашата страна извършват семейни самоубийства, което има аналог само по време на антиотоманските въстания. Тази среда е функция на лошо управление. Каква статистика да Ви чета аз — българин на българин в тази зала?

3-646-000

**Надежда Нейнски (PPE).** - Г-н Председател, темата на днешния дебат не е покушението срещу Ахмед Доган. Това беше конкретният повод. Темата на дебата е върховенството на закона и свободата.

Като бивш външен министър и български евродепутат се чувствам обидно, че след 23 години демокрация в моята страна, България е обект на такава дискусия. За мен в основата на всичко стои опитът на управляващата партия да подмени истината за демократичния преход, да го криминализира и да оспори неговите достижения, сред които са защитата на човешките права, свободата на медиите и върховенството на закона.

Така излиза, че категоричната подкрепа на Европейския съюз за дясното реформаторско правителство 1997 — 2001 г. е била подкрепа за криминални реформи, че решението на ЕС за отпадане на визите за българските граждани, след покрити критерии, забележете, в сферата на правосъдието и вътрешните работи е било погрешно решение, че подкрепата на ЕС за членството на България всъщност е била подкрепа за криминална държава.

След такива тежки обвинения, логично е да се запитаме, къде са били хората, които ги отправят, по времето на същия този преход? От коя страна на барикадата? И каква е днес политиката им, която предизвиква този дебат?

Как бихте реагирали например Вие, г-н Weber, ако някой в Германия реабилитира комунизма и говори за неговите достижения? Или вие, г-жо Mathieu, можете ли да си представите контрол върху медиите във Франция? Кадрова ли някъде в Европа вътрешен министър в съдебната система? Въпреки всички уверения, че сме спазили техническите критерии за Шенген, въпреки вербалната подкрепа на ЕС, Вие знаете, че България все още е извън Шенген. И нека си признаем, за това не са виновни само популистите.

Този дебат днес унижава България. Но нека той е сигнал за Европа, че демокрацията няма партиен цвят и трябва да се отстоява от всички.

3-647-000

**Tanja Fajon (S&D).** - Danes ne gre za napad na Bolgarijo in njene državljane, danes govorimo o stanju demokracije in temeljnih vrednot. To je v našem skupnem interesu.

Od vstopa Bolgarije v Unijo je minilo že več kot pet let in še vedno prejemamo številne pozive Bolgarov, ki opozarjajo na kratenje svobode izražanja, infiltracije skupin organiziranega kriminala v odločevalske strukture in v luči prihajajočih volitev tudi na nesprijemljive posege v volilno zakonodajo ter na popolno nezmožnost nacionalnih institucij, da se same spopadejo s temi izzivi.

Nedopustno je, da smo morali biti priča tako ekstremnim dogodkom, kot je poskus atentata na vidnega političnega predstavnika, da se zdramimo.

Bolgarija ni osamljen primer. Naraščajoča korupcija in posledično nezaupanje ljudi v institucije se pojavlja v številnih državah članicah, tudi v moji državi Sloveniji. Naša Unija je demokratična in socialno pravična zgolj toliko, kot so trdni njeni najšibkejši deli.

Zato sprašujem Evropsko komisijo, kaj poleg objavljanja poročil o stanju vladavine prava namerava storiti, da v Uniji preprečimo razkroj naših skupnih demokratičnih temeljev.

*(Govornik se je strinjal, da bo sprejel vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka (člen 149(8)).*

3-648-000

**Димитър Стоянов (NI)**, *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – Г-н Председател, г-жа Фаян, познавам Ви като истински борец за правата на гражданите и затова искам да Ви задам един въпрос.

Знаете ли, че нападателят над Ахмед Доган беше линчуван веднага след това от делегатите на конференцията? Г-н Watson и г-н van Baalen бяха там и са го видели, съжалявам, че не можах да ги попитам тях; той беше смазан от бой от делегатите на тази конференция, обаче сега Движението за права и свободи не споделя с властите кои извършиха саморазправата, за да бъде търсена и от тях отговорност.

Какво ще кажете за това?

3-649-000

**Tanja Fajon (S&D)**, *Odgovor na vprašanje, postavljeno z dvigom modrega kartončka*. – Najlepša hvala, spoštovani kolega, to vprašanje ste že prej postavljali tudi mojim drugim kolegom.

Tu gre predvsem zato, da se ne spuščamo v neke ideološko-politične delitve. Gre za to, da govorimo preprosto o stanju demokracije ne zgolj v Bolgariji, ampak v vseh naših državah članicah Unije in se javno in glasno kot institucija, kot Evropski parlament oglašamo takrat, ko so ti temelji demokracije v naših državah ogroženi.

In zato je danes ta razprava tudi zelo pomembna.

3-650-000

**Мария Габриел (PPE)**. – г-н Председател, дотук в дебата чухме хвърлени с учудваща лекота обвинения, критики и zlepоставящи България уж реалности.

В борбата с престъпността, г-н Илчев, нека оставим наистина цифри, факти и резултати да говорят.

Цифрите показват следното за 2012 г.: едно от най-ниските нива на регистрирани умишлени убийства, най-ниско ниво на посегателства на МПС, най-ниско ниво на грабежи, най-нисък брой взривявания.

Показните убийства за периода 1993–2008 г. са 180. За сравнение, по време на управлението на ГЕРБ, едно-единствено през 2010 г. Факти: вече няма знакови фигури като покойните Доктора, Самоковец и Георги Илиев, осъществяващи престъпна дейност под чадъра на политически партии.

За периода 2009–2012 г. частично и напълно е пресечена престъпната дейност на повече от 660 организирани престъпни групи; над 3375 досъдебни производства.

Резултати: задържането на групата „Наглите“ през декември 2010 г.; в страната вече няма нито едно отвличане с цел откуп. Да напомним: 18 отвличания за периода 2008–2009 г. След задържането на престъпната група „Крокодилите“ от 2010 г. насам в страната няма нито един магистрален грабеж.

След операция срещу групата „Килърите“ през 2010–2011 г. няма данни за извършени поръчкови убийства с почерка на групата. Операциите „Кокаинови крале“, „Картел“, насочени в борбата срещу наркотрафика, са високо оценени от международните ни партньори и Европол.

Имаме още работа, колеги. Нека не броим трупове и се атакуваме, а да водим диалог. Да работим за страната си, а оставим гражданите да правят оценка на свършеното.

3-651-000

## PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ROBERTA ANGELILLI

*Vicepresidente*

3-652-000

**Ana Gomes (S&D).** - Na Bulgária, de há muito há preocupantes alegações de ligações entre o Primeiro-Ministro e a máfia. Segundo a Europol, o crime organizado representa 5% do PIB da Bulgária. O país desceu dez lugares no último índice da liberdade de imprensa, passando para o último na União Europeia.

As autoridades têm uma lista negra de jornalistas que se opõem ao governo em violação dos mais fundamentais direitos e liberdades. As populações roma e outras minorias, incluindo a LGBT, são vítimas de discriminação. A tentativa de assassinato de um líder político de origem turca no último fim de semana destabilizou a vida política e atíça perigosas rivalidades étnicas. As alterações ao código eleitoral são alarmantes. A Bulgária tem de seguir as recomendações da OSCE e urgentemente, tendo em conta que as eleições irão ter lugar já em julho próximo.

A União Europeia não pode ficar impassível face ao que se passa na Bulgária. A Comissão tem que proceder a todas as investigações e diligências possíveis e exigir ao governo búlgaro que assegure os princípios básicos da democracia, do estado de direito, eleições livres e limpas e respeito pelos direitos fundamentais. Não é tolerável que, para se entrar na União Europeia, os princípios de Copenhaga tenham de ser observados pelos países candidatos e, uma vez dentro da União Europeia, possam passar a violá-los.

Como disse o Colega van Baalen, tudo isto que eu disse não é contra a Bulgária, é pela Bulgária, é pelos interesses da Bulgária, é pelos interesses da União Europeia. É por isso que exigimos à Comissão, ao Conselho, aos governos europeus, que exerçam as suas responsabilidades, nos termos do artigo 2º. do Tratado, e atuem para defender a democracia e o estado de direito na Bulgária, o que quer dizer no seio da nossa União. Todos nos sentimos búlgaros hoje!

*(O orador aceita responder a uma pergunta "cartão azul" (n.º 8 do artigo 149.º)).*

3-653-000

**Андрей Ковачев (PPE),** *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта* . – Г-жа Gomes е получила ролята от нашите български колеги да говори със слухове срещу министър-председателя и българското правителство. На какви източници се базират Вашите изказвания, че има някаква престъпна връзка между министър-председателя и нерегламентирани източници на финансиране? Аз мога да Ви кажа точно обратното — тези нерегламентирани източници на финансиране бяха спрени към БСП и към ДПС от сегашното правителство.

Може би знаете също така и за аферата по САПАРД, когато двама от спонсорите на БСП бяха уловени от ОЛАФ за злоупотреба с европейски фондове и които все още не са осъдени в България. В Германия техните съучастници вече са осъдени от германския съд и излежах

своите присъди. Така че нека да говорим с факти, а не някой чул или не чул. Все пак ако имате достоверни доказателства, ги кажете.

3-654-000

**Ana Gomes (S&D)**, *blue-card answer*. – Mr Kovatchev, I have not read this in the Bulgarian press because unfortunately I cannot read Bulgarian. I have read it widely in the international press, including in the press of my country, Portugal. These allegations are serious and deserve to be investigated, considering the whole situation in the country, and the relevance of organised crime in Bulgaria, as Europol attests.

I have every respect for the members of this government, including our former colleague Nikolay Mladenov, whom I count as a friend. So obviously this is not something that I believe taints members of the government.

But of course these allegations are important. More important than ever are the serious allegations of basic rights and freedoms that are under threat in Bulgaria, as the attempted murder last weekend illustrates.

3-655-000

**Владимир Уручев (PPE)**. - Г-жо Председател, днешният дебат съвсем не е заради някакво застрашаване на свободата и демокрацията в България, още повече заради криминалния акт срещу лидера на ДПС. Напротив, поводът е да се използва трибуната на Европейския парламент, от която да се нагнетява недоверие и объркване с чисто предизборни цели.

Свидетели сме на една безскрупулна реакция срещу излизащите напоследък все повече доказателства за прастични нарушения и пренебрегване на законите по време на управлението на опозицията, при което са нанесени милиони щети на Българската държава.

Разсекретени документи в Българския парламент дори показват как по времето на премиера от БСП — Сергей Станишев, с министър на енергетиката Румен Овчаров, тайно, без никакви процедури за обществени поръчки, тяхно приближено лице е договаряло сделка за ядрено гориво с Русия. При това със заобикаляне на европейските изисквания, които страната трябва да спазва с влизането си в Европейския съюз.

Едва ли това са свободата, демокрацията и европейските ценности, които можем да защитаваме въобще. Българският гражданин, обаче, не е толкова лесно да бъде заблуден. Това той го показва на проведения референдум за строителство на нова ядрена централа като не излезе да гласува и така провали замислите на социалистическата партийна централа.

Именно заради тази мъдрост на българските граждани днешното омаскаряване на страната е крайно непочтено и обидно за достойнството на българите. Жалко, че инициаторите на днешния дебат пренебрегват това.

*(Ораторът приема да отговори на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта (член 149, параграф 8 от Правилника за дейността)).*

3-656-000

**Luis Yáñez-Barnuevo García (S&D)**, *pregunta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Deseo preguntarle al orador si cree que es un procedimiento eficaz, adecuado, desde el punto de vista parlamentario, acusar a los demás y creer que hay una campaña internacional para denigrar al Gobierno de Bulgaria. Debe haber un esfuerzo de aclaración para el resto de los diputados

que no somos búlgaros, para saber qué ha ocurrido, qué está ocurriendo en Bulgaria, y así contribuir con la Comisión y el Consejo a aclarar la situación.

No creo que hablando de una campaña orquestada internacionalmente lleguemos a ningún sitio, ¿no cree?

3-657-000

**Владимир Уручев (PPE),** *отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта* . – Не представителите на управляващата партия сега са инициатори на този дебат тук.

Инициатори са хора от опозицията, които много ясно искат да използват тази трибуна за предизборни цели и те това и правят. А кампанията, която се води срещу управляващите и срещу премиера на страната, е явна и целенасочена. Не одобрявам използването на европейската трибуна за „омаскаряване“ на държавата — то не е от полза за страната, не е почтено и е обидно за българските граждани.

*(Ораторът приема да отговори на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта (член 149, параграф 8 от Правилника за дейността)).*

3-658-000

**Метин Казак (ALDE),** *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта* . – Аз искам само да попитам, ако наистина в България всичко с върховенството на закона и свободите върви по мед и масло, защо България все още е под наблюдение от страна на Съвета на Европа?

Защо, въпреки пропагандираните постижения в областта на правосъдието и вътрешните работи, все още сме под мониторинг? Защо още не сме членове на Шенген? Защо езикът на омразата предизвиква такива грозни терористични актове — такива покушения, които управляващите се опитват да замажат и да оправдаят като някакъв безразсъден акт на някакъв луд тип?

Защо в демократична България се случват такива неща?

3-659-000

**Владимир Уручев (PPE),** *отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта* . – Управляващите не се опитват да замажат този драстичен криминален акт. Този акт беше осъден от Народното събрание, беше осъден от политическата партия, която управлява нашата страна.

Вашият въпрос — защо имаме мониторинг — е твърде риторичен. Мониторингът беше наложен тогава, когато Вашата партия участваше в управлението на страната. И сигурно има достатъчно много причини да има мониторинг, защото тогава, чухте от колегите, и престъпността, и корупцията имаха място в страната.

3-660-000

**Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE).** - Señora Presidenta, aquí se ha hablado negativamente del Gobierno de Bulgaria. Yo daré datos objetivos del Primer Ministro. Le conocí siendo Secretario de Estado para la Seguridad. Le conocí siendo Alcalde de Sofía. Le conocí fundando el Partido con el que hoy gobierna. Y le conocí como Primer Ministro. Y tengo que informar a la Cámara de que el Reino de España le condecoró en la Asamblea Mundial de Interpol por su colaboración y por su compromiso con la lucha contra la delincuencia organizada. Este es un hecho objetivo.

También es un hecho objetivo y comprobable que la OSCE facilitó un informe muy positivo después de las elecciones regionales y presidenciales de 2011. Y es un hecho muy positivo que el GRECO (Grupo de Estados contra la Corrupción) felicitara calurosamente al Gobierno de Bulgaria por su nueva ley y su nuevo código electoral.

Yo ahora me pregunto si una cuestión como la del Estado de Derecho y la libertad en Bulgaria sería objeto de debate en el Reino Unido, en Italia, en Francia o en España. La respuesta naturalmente es «no». ¿Esto qué indica? Indica que si todos los ciudadanos europeos somos libres e iguales, todos los países europeos no son libres e iguales.

*(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 149, apartado 8, del Reglamento))*

3-661-000

**Антония Първанова (ALDE)**, *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – г-жо Председател, г-н de Mera, съжалявам, че само към Вас трябва да се обърна, но днес тук не става въпрос нито за министър-председателя на България, нито дори за този акт на покушение над лидера на една политическа партия.

Става въпрос за нещо много сериозно. Вие знаете ли, че в България от октомври месец Конституционният съд не функционира, защото парламентът не може да излъчи свой представител, а Конституционният съд трябва да контролира работата на българския парламент, поради което става политически заложник точно на този същия парламент, който трябва да контролира?

Ето това се казва нарушение на върховенството на закона и за това говорим. Това знаете ли го?

3-662-000

**Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE)**, *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Su pregunta me brinda la oportunidad de desarrollar lo que he dicho anteriormente.

Todos estamos de acuerdo con el fortalecimiento institucional de Bulgaria y de todos los Estados de la Unión Europea, sin ninguna duda. Todo el mundo condena, como no puede ser de otra manera, el ataque al señor Dogan. Pero todo el mundo también debe cuestionar el hecho de que estas preguntas se planteen en el Parlamento Europeo cuatro meses antes de las elecciones.

Algo huele a podrido en Dinamarca. Esto no es razonable, y esto no se aplicaría a cualquier otro Estado de los llamados fundadores, o de los llamados grandes de la Unión Europea.

De modo que reivindico la igualdad a la que nos obligan los Tratados.

*(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 149, apartado 8, del Reglamento))*

3-663-000

**Илияна Малинова Йотова (S&D)**, *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – Г-н de Mera, след като така добре познавате кой и коя институция какво добро е казала за премиера на България и за правителството, бихте ли ми отговорили на въпроса: знаете ли защо всички опозиционни партии в България, включително и партии, които са членове на

Европейската народна партия, включително и партиите от центъра и от левицата, отказаха дебатите по новия Изборен кодекс в българския парламент?

Кое според Вас наложи такова обединяване на хора с различна идеология, с различни политически възгледи, от различен спектър на политическото пространство?

3-664-000

**Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE)**, *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Gracias por su pregunta, pero me es imposible contestarla en los términos en los que usted la formula. Sin embargo, me da pábulo y oportunidad para decir lo siguiente.

En primer lugar, el señor Boiko Borísov pertenece a la familia política del Partido Popular Europeo, con todo derecho, como cualquier otro líder y como cualquier otro partido de los que están en el seno de nuestra familia política.

En segundo lugar, a través de mis experiencias personales, no de escritos, ni de comentarios, afirmo y reitero el compromiso del señor Borísov –constatado por mí–, en relación con la lucha contra la delincuencia organizada, no solamente en el interior de su país, sino también colaborando a nivel internacional en ese ámbito.

A mi juicio, deberíamos tener infinitamente más comprensión con un país que lucha por conseguir más y mejores garantías y reformas en el ámbito de la institucionalidad para hacerse absolutamente homologable con lo que disfrutamos en la Unión Europea.

3-665-000

**Моника Ханс Панайотова (PPE)**. – Не, г-жо Председател, не за синя карта. Искам само да обърна внимание за начина на водене на разискването, защото в началото давахте възможност за една синя карта на преждеговорившите. На последните двама, и на г-н Díaz de Mera, и на г-н Уручев, бяха зададени две. Просто нека да спазваме правилата.

3-666-000

**Presidente**. – Io ho dato la parola a tutti i colleghi che l'hanno chiesta con la *blue card*. Quindi rispetto le regole e cerco di rispettarle.

*Procedura "catch the eye"*

3-667-000

**Michael Gahler (PPE)**. - Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wissen Sie, wann dieser kriminelle Akt, den wir hier debattiert haben, tatsächlich ein Fall für dieses Haus wäre? Wenn ein Vertreter der Regierungspartei auf Herrn Doğan geschossen hätte, der Innenminister die Freilassung angeordnet hätte und der Justizminister den Staatsanwalt angewiesen hätte, alle Ermittlungen einzustellen, und die Regierung sich geweigert hätte, diesen Fall zu verurteilen. Dann wäre das in der Tat ein Anlass gewesen, hier kritische Fragen zu stellen. Hier aber gehen die Ermittlungen ihren normalen Gang, und der Täter ist auch in Untersuchungshaft. Deswegen haben Rat und Kommission ja auch an dem Verfahren gar keine Kritik geäußert, sondern nur die Erwartung, dass nach Recht und Gesetz gehandelt wird.

Losgelöst von diesem bedauernswerten Zwischenfall, liebe liberale Kollegen, schauen Sie sich doch bitte an, von welcher obskuren Partei Sie sich hier vor den Karren spannen lassen, wie demokratisch Herr Doğan seine Partei nach innen organisiert – offenbar ist er ja der



Führer auf Lebenszeit – und welche Hinweise es auf die Verwicklung in die organisierte Kriminalität gibt. Ich glaube, das ist auch eine Antwort auf die Frage, wie man das einzuordnen hat.

3-668-000

**Преслав Борисов (PPE).** - г-жо Председател, каквото и да си говорим днес, за съжаление става въпрос само за едно, а то е предстоящите избори в България и това, което колегите днес тук се опитаха да направят, е да направят изказвания, които утре да бъдат отразени в българския печат и да покажат тяхната активност, независимо от факта, че твърдят колко голям чадър има над медиите и те не могат да се изказват.

Но е това изключително срамно и позорно поведение — ние да представяме държавата си в такъв негативен аспект тук, пред Европейския парламент, като явно много бързо забравихме кога, как и къде се създаде организираната престъпност в България, кои са нейните истински основоположници и по времето на управлението на кого спряха европейските фондове.

Мога да ви кажа само, че по оперативна програма „Транспорт“ над десет проекта бяха спрени по времето на управлението на Тройната коалиция. Помощите по ИСПА бяха спрени и беше замразено строителството на магистрала „Люлин“.

Днес магистрала „Люлин“ се движи, ние всички можем да минем по нея да спестим време, влизайки в София. Не са ни спрени нито един от фондовете и както виждате държавата се развива абсолютно планомерно и както е необходимо за една европейска страна.

Днес дебатът, предизвикан от опозицията, за съжаление обаче не доведе до нищо конкретно и нищо, което да може да решим, така че България наистина да получи едно по-добро развитие. Затова призовавам колегите от опозицията —нека да дадем правото на хората в България да дадат своя вот и да покажат за пореден път какво те искат, а ние просто да бъдем конструктивни в своята работа.

3-669-000

**Zita Gurmai (S&D).** - Madam President, I feel empathy towards Bulgaria's citizens because what we have been seeing in Bulgaria for a while now sadly reminds me of what is happening in my country, Hungary.

The recent assault on Mr Doğan and the lack of an appropriate reaction from the Bulgarian authorities are unfortunately only the tip of the iceberg. We have been witnessing repeated breaches of the rule of law under the current Bulgarian Government.

The Bulgarian Government is organising a witch-hunt against citizens who demonstrated during the recent referendum on the nuclear power plant. This is just another example of violations that we know too well in Hungary. We are also sadly familiar with the restrictions on media freedom that we are witnessing in Bulgaria today.

The problems of a single Member State are the common concerns of our community based on democracy, the rule of law and shared values. Moreover, similar events in other Member States show how contagious this tendency can become.

Therefore I urge the Commission and the Council of Europe to follow closely the current developments in Bulgaria and to take the appropriate measures. The credibility of the European Union and of Bulgaria is at stake.

3-670-000

**Ивайло Калфин (S&D).** - Г-жо Председател, като депутат, избран в България, съжалявам, че присъствам на такъв дебат и се надявам той да бъде последният за страната ни. В България живеят малко над 7 милиона европейски граждани, които като всички останали се борят с кризата, безработицата, спадащото равнище на европейските услуги, с липсата на ефективни институции, с конфронтационната среда, която се създава от управляващите в страната.

Дебатът обаче е полезен поради две причини. Първо, защото Европейският парламент е институция, която е особено чувствителна по отношение на демокрацията и всички опити да се мачка, да се погазва върховенството на закона, да се въздейства от страна на изпълнителната власт на останалите институции.

Факт е, че българските медии са не само последни в Европа, но вече се насочват и към последните в света и това се случва само за няколко години. Факт е, че последните избори бяха оценени, включително от международни наблюдатели, като най-лошите организирани досега, за 25 години в България, говори, че има проблем с демократичните институции в страната.

И втората причина този дебат да е полезен е заради българските граждани. Те трябва да получат увереността, че в Европейския парламент се следи какво се случва в България. И това е много важно за тези, които искат да променят тази среда.

3-671-000

**Антония Първанова (ALDE).** - Г-жо Комисар, десет неправителствени организации, между които Съюзът на съдиите, Съюзът на юристите, Българският хелзинкски комитет и други, изпратиха доклад до Европейската комисия като форма на вътрешен мониторинг. Основният извод е, че процедурите по избор на Висш съдебен съвет, конституционни съдии и Главен прокурор са били непрозрачни, манипулирани и предизвестени. Посочва се, че този тип назначения създават политическа обвързаност, компрометират независимостта на съдебната система и блокират възможността ѝ да се справи с организираната престъпност и корупцията.

Според доклада, липсата на независими медии също спира съдебната реформа. Липсата на прозрачност в собствеността, финансирането и корпоративния контрол върху медиите ограничават журналистическата независимост. Държавните ведомства непрозрачно финансират определени медийни организации, предимно с европейски средства.

Бих искала да попитам какви ефективни стъпки ще бъдат предприети от Европейската комисия и кога ще бъдат предприети, ако българското правителство продължава да не зачита върховенството на закона и гарантирането на свободата на медиите?

3-672-000

**Ivailo Kalfin (S&D).** - I do accept it, but I think we are going a little too far with the blue cards. I would happily answer Mr Kovatchev on whatever he wants to ask, but I think the procedure is that he has to ask Mrs Parvanova. Mr Kovatchev has already had at least 15 minutes' speaking time in plenary. This really violates the Rules of Procedure and the principle of equality here, so I ask you to stop the blue cards. I refuse to answer his questions.

3-673-000

**Андрей Ковачев (PPE)**, *въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – Мисля, че изказванията от страна на опозиционните партии в България бяха много повече, г-н Калфин. Г-жо Първанова, Вие също засегнахте темата с медиите и казвате, че в тях има някаква цензура или манипулация. Аз искам само да Ви попитам дали знаете примерно как се отразяват българските евродепутати от опозицията и от управляващите?

Аз съм си направил труда да направя справка за миналата година от април до юли и от нея излиза, че четиримата членове от БСП имат много повече отразявания отколкото петимата членове на Парламента от ГЕРБ. Така че нека, когато говорим за отразявания в медиите и цензура в тях, да не леем крокодилски сълзи, тъй като това не е истина. Просто погледнете българските медии и ще видите, че няма абсолютно никаква цензура.

3-674-000

**Антония Първанова (ALDE)**, *отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – Много се радвам, г-н Ковачев, че точно на мен зададохте този въпрос, защото:

Първо, аз цитирах десет много сериозни неправителствени организации и заключенията в техния доклад, обаче конкретно по Вашия въпрос, искам да Ви кажа, че когато аз направя нещо в този парламент, макар дори и да съм докладчик по определено законодателно досие и Вие се изкажете, в българските медии се отразява само Вашето изказване, а когато Вие не се изкажете, се отразява, все едно само се е случило в Европейския парламент.

Ето такава е цензурата върху моите действия в този парламент и работата ми като български евродепутат.

3-675-000

**Метин Казак (ALDE)**. - Г-жо Председател, аз също съжалявам, че този дебат беше представен от страна на колегите от ЕНП като предизборен. Това е един дебат на загриженост от страна на основни политически сили, каквито са либералите, зелените, социалистите и демократите за това, какво се случва в България след 23 години демократичен преход.

За това, че е възможно в една демократична уж страна да се случи такова позорно покушение срещу най-известния лидер на този демократичен преход, г-н Ахмед Доган, и че управляващите се опитват да омаловажат случая и грубо да насочат разследването в удобна за тях посока. За това, че толкова време правителството остава глухо и няма към исканията на всички опозиционни партии за честни избори.

Аз смятам, че затова Европейската комисия трябва много сериозно да наблюдава процеса, който ще се проведе срещу извършителя на този атентат и много внимателно в следващия доклад да оцени управляващите имат ли или нямат напредък в тази област.

3-676-000

**Jaroslav Paška (EFD)**. - Bulharsko je mladým členom Únie a všetci si uvedomujeme, že civilizovaná demokratická správa štátu si vyžaduje istý čas na to, aby si ju tak obyvateľstvo, ako aj politické špičky osvojili. Tvrdé konflikty medzi vládnucim zoskupením a opozičnými silami naznačujú, že vecný, kultivovaný dialóg o konštruktívnom riešení problémov spoločnosti bol v tejto krajine nahradený neľútostným bojom o peniaze a moc. Nie som si istý, či vieme odtiaľto z Bruselu určiť mieru zodpovednosti jednotlivých politických lídrov za tento stav, som však presvedčený o tom, že bulharskí občania si zaslúžia čestné,

spravodlivé a dôstojné spravovanie verejných vecí. Politická pluralita, sloboda médií, nezávislosť súdництва sú základnými atribútmi demokratického právneho štátu. Ak v predvolebnom období prerastá politická nervozita do fyzických útokov na lídrov politických strán, je, myslím si, našou zodpovednosťou apelovať na naše partnerské politické strany v Bulharsku, aby sa vrátili k čestnému a vecnému politickému dialógu a vytvorili priestor pre pokojné a slobodné rozhodovanie ich voličov.

3-677-000

**Franz Obermayr (NI).** - Frau Präsidentin! Im Kommissionsbericht des letzten Jahres wurden Bulgarien Fortschritte bei der Erlangung einer EU-konformen Rechtsstaatlichkeit attestiert. Die Einrichtung des Obersten Justizrates war sicherlich ein wichtiger und richtiger Schritt. Die Förderung von Unabhängigkeit, Integrität und Leistung des Rechtssystems muss für so ein altes Kulturvolk, wie es die Bulgaren sind, natürlich noch besser werden. Aber ich muss mich schon wundern, dass wir heute bei einem jungen Mitgliedstaat offensichtlich scheinheilig mit zweierlei Maß messen, wo wir doch durchaus Mitgliedstaaten haben, die länger Mitglieder sind – etwas südlich von Österreich gelegen –, die seit Jahrzehnten die gleichen Probleme, aufweisen: Korruption, Kriminalität, organisiertes Verbrechen und Wahlbetrug. Wir messen heute mit zweierlei Maß. Das ist mir parteipolitisch orientiert. Ich glaube, Bulgarien ist auf einem richtigen Weg, und wir sollten diesen richtigen Weg unterstützen – ehrlich, aber nicht scheinheilig parteiorientiert.

3-678-000

(*Fine della procedura "catch the eye"*)

3-679-000

**Presidente.** – La discussione è chiusa.

#### **Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 149)**

3-680-000

**Слави Бинев (EFD), в писмена форма.** – Колеги, България е пример на нарушаване на правата на човека, на демокрацията и принципа на правовата държава. В последните 23 години се наблюдава една размяна на властта от шепа хора излезли от бившата комунистическа партия. Нарушени са четирите основи на демокрацията – липсва свобода на словото, не може да има бизнес извън управляващата партия ГЕРБ, съдът е корумпиран, липсва и свобода на вота.

Целият държавен апарат, дори и в този момент, се използва за личен ПР на правителството и съответно за разчистване на сметки с икономически и политически опоненти на министър-председателя.

В страната върлуват монополи, с европейски пари се сключват корупционни сделки, назначават се висши магистрати с откровено престъпна автобиография, медиите са съсредоточени в ръцете на две компании, които са пряко подчинени на управлението. Свободната журналистика е подложена на заплахи. Журналисти биват уволнени от водещи медии само защото са казали или написали истината. В ток шоута има „черни“ списъци на гости, неудобни на управлението.

Това е България днес! Това е страна членка на ЕС! Вие преценете дали е правова и дали хората там са свободни.

3-680-500

**Светослав Христов Малинов (РРЕ), в писмена форма.** – Вземам думата като представител на традиционната българска десница, чийто антикомунизъм и евроатлантическа ориентация върна България на картата на Европа.

За жалост днес новата десница в лицето на партия ГЕРБ е изоставила ценностите на ЕНП и потъпква принципите на демокрацията. И няма как да бъде другояче, когато виждаме, че самият премиер Борисов постоянно „флиртува“ с носталгията по комунизма и откровено реабилитира комунистическия диктатор Живков; че обявява за престъпления радикалните реформи, които поставиха основите на пазарната икономика в България; че непрекъснато дискредитира постиженията на десницата по време на прехода към демокрация, благодарение на които моята страна получи покана за членство в ЕС; че парламентарното мнозинство на ГЕРБ отказва да приеме препоръките на ОССЕ и се опитва да ограничи прозрачността на изборите и представителството на опозицията чрез новия Изборен кодекс.

И всичко това се прави пред очите на българските граждани от партия, която се радва на безусловната подкрепа на ЕНП! Идват избори — тази година за национален, следващата — за европейски парламент. Ако не престанем да правим компромиси с ценностите си и принципите на демокрацията в името на дребни политически игри, то българската десница ще се отклони от своя европейски път, а европейската десница ще загуби уважението на българите.

## 15. Convenzione quadro delle Nazioni Unite sui cambiamenti climatici (discussione)

3-682-000

**Presidente.** – L'ordine del giorno reca la discussione su:

– l'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale al Consiglio sui preparativi dell'UE in vista della conferenza UNFCCC COP 19 di Matthias Groote, a nome della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare (O-000214/2012 – B7-0107/2013), e

– l'interrogazione con richiesta di risposta orale alla Commissione sui preparativi dell'UE in vista della conferenza UNFCCC COP 19 di Matthias Groote, a nome della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare (O-000215/2012 – B7-0106/2013).

3-683-000

**Matthias Groote, Verfasser.** – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Ratspräsidentin, Frau Kommissarin! Die COP 19 steht vor der Tür. Bei der COP 18 habe ich das Gefühl, als ob sie gerade erst gewesen ist. Wir sind dort langsam vorangekommen. Mehr als erwartet, weniger als erhofft, kann man sagen. Aber Kyoto 2 ist beschlossen worden, 37 Industrienationen werden jetzt dort mitmachen, und es ist ein Fahrplan verabredet worden, wie wir uns in Zukunft international auf ein Abkommen zu bewegen, ein Kyoto-Nachfolgeabkommen.

Wir waren mit dem Parlament als Delegation wieder anwesend. Ich muss sagen, es war eine sehr gute Delegationsreise. Wir haben viele nützliche Gespräche geführt, auch mit verschiedenen internationalen Akteuren über EU-Gesetzgebung, interne Gesetzgebung gesprochen. Nur während der Debatte in Doha musste man verzeichnen, dass die EU von Ratsseite mehrmals Klärungsbedarf hatte. Das ist auch in der Außenwelt angekommen. Insofern ist das eigentlich der Grund, warum wir heute diesen Tagungsordnungspunkt

beantragt haben, oder besser gesagt, diese Anfrage gestellt haben. Denn die Konferenz COP 19 wird in Europa stattfinden, und wir hatten hier gestern einen Besuch, hier wurde gestern eine richtig gute europäische Rede gehalten, „*the real EU-speech*“. Die hat hier stattgefunden, nämlich von François Hollande. Er hat in seiner Rede auch noch einmal erwähnt, dass wir nämlich auf der COP 21, die höchstwahrscheinlich in Paris stattfinden wird, dann endlich ein Abkommen unter Dach und Fach bringen wollen, und darum haben wir ein ganz großes Anliegen vonseiten des Parlamentes: Wie gedenkt eigentlich der Rat, eine Roadmap Richtung Paris zu gestalten? Aber der erste Schritt ist natürlich erstmal in diesem Jahr der in Polen, wo wir den Schritt in die richtige Richtung machen müssen.

Ich muss sagen, die Performance war nicht sehr gut in Doha. Wir haben auch im Plenum erlebt, dass es dann Abstimmungsbedarf gab, dass es nicht die Amerikaner und nicht andere Staaten waren, sondern die Europäische Union, die auf einmal auf der Bremse stand. Da sind wir sehr daran interessiert, dass Sie dort einmal aufklären: Haben Sie dort eine Strategie? Wird es unter irischer Ratspräsidentschaft und dann unter der weiteren Präsidentschaft geklärt? Und welche Schritte gibt es darüber hinaus? Denn ich glaube, wir sind hier als Europäer in der Bringschuld, und ich kann Ihnen nur versprechen, dass wir als Parlament den gesamten Prozess sehr genau beobachten werden und auch des Öfteren, wenn es die Möglichkeit zulässt, hier miteinander die Debatte suchen, dass wir auch eine breite Öffentlichkeit an der Stelle generieren. Denn die, muss man sagen, hat auch in Doha wieder gefehlt.

Ich sage des Öfteren: Ich habe zu ACTA jeden Tag 300 bis 400 E-Mails erhalten – wie alle Kollegen hier auch. Aber zum Thema Klima – wie geht es eigentlich weiter mit unserem Klima und auch mit internationalen Abkommen? Das ist doch nicht so reichhaltig gesät, und ich glaube, wir müssen noch einmal die Wichtigkeit dieses Themas unterstreichen und dass wir als Europäer nicht auf andere warten sollten, sondern weiter einen Weg gehen sollten – hin zu einer kohlenstoffarmen Gesellschaft, hin zu einer nachhaltigen Gesellschaft – und die 194 Staaten mit ins Boot holen.

Dass das nicht ganz einfach ist, wissen wir auch. Das sehen wir auch hier jeden Tag im Parlament. Auch in diesen Wochen erfahren wir es immer wieder, dass man um den besten Kompromiss ringt und dass das bei 194 Staaten nicht einfacher wird. Aber darum ist es ganz besonders wichtig, dass im Vorfeld der COP 19, 20 und 21 Europa dann wirklich geschlossen auftritt, mit einer Stimme spricht und dass wir dort auch mit Vertrauen auftreten können, denn wenn wir dort mit einem Schlingerkurs auftreten, wie es in Doha der Fall war, ist es, glaube ich, nicht gut.

Ganz konkret möchte ich das zum Beispiel an Finanzierungszusagen abmachen. Ich finde, das ist doch etwas Gutes, wenn Mitgliedstaaten sich dazu bekennen, dass man Geld zur Verfügung stellen will für den Kampf gegen den Klimawandel, was schon bei einer COP vorher miteinander verabredet worden ist. Wenn es aber fast nicht in der Öffentlichkeit stattfindet, sondern am Rande stattfindet, dann braucht es dort auch mehr Koordinierung, dass die Europäer sagen: Wir legen Geld auf den Tisch, wir sind dafür, dass der Klimafonds wirklich an Fahrt aufnimmt und dass die Aufgaben, die uns ins Haus stehen, auch solide durchfinanziert werden. Darum mehr Koordinierung, darum heute die Aussprache. Ich bin gespannt auf die gleich folgende Debatte.

3-684-000

**Lucinda Creighton**, *President-in-Office of the Council* . – Madam President, I believe that it is indeed a very good time to take stock of what happened in Doha and to look ahead,

not only to the next COP in Warsaw at the end of this year, but also to Paris at the end of 2015. In this context I think the question is very timely.

Although it was a difficult and challenging COP – and I certainly take note of Mr Groote's points – Doha did manage to achieve its stated aims, namely to finalise the rules in order to make operational the second commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol, to close the track on long-term implementation of the Convention, and to address the work on the only remaining negotiating track for the coming three years, the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

Let us not forget that this result was achieved thanks to the fact that the EU had a common position and spoke with one voice on the issues, including on issues relating to the Kyoto Protocol. It is certainly not always easy to reach such a common position amongst 27 Member States – it can be challenging – but we got there and that is what counts at the end of the day.

Now the task ahead is twofold: implementation of all the decisions that were adopted, and continuation of the negotiations on the Durban Platform track. These negotiations, which should be concluded by 2015, consist of two workstreams – devising the principles and structure for a post-2020 agreement, which will be legally binding for all 195 parties to the UNFCCC, and exploring how we can increase the level of mitigation ambition between now and 2020.

These negotiations will require a lot of innovative and outside-the-box thinking since we are devising a regime that will start in 2020 and will need to provide some longer-term perspective. The debate on this new regime will be further informed by a Green Paper that the Commission will publish shortly. I am sure that Commissioner Hedegaard will give you more insights on that.

The various actors, the EU institutions, Member States, but also the private sector and the public at large, are already starting to think about what kind of global climate regime we want to agree by 2015 in order for it to be in place and taking effect in a post-2020 world. The EU will then need to devise how best to achieve the desired outcome by the end of 2015.

It is worth noting that two EU Member States will be playing a leading role in the UNFCCC process leading up to this new post-2020 climate regime since, as you know, Poland and France will be the conference hosts in 2013 and 2015 respectively. There are expectations and opportunities for the EU and its Member States to play a key role in facilitating agreement and in continuing to lead an ambitious agenda to keep global temperature increases below the 2°C threshold. In their 18-month programme presented within the three successive presidencies, Ireland, Lithuania and Greece have committed themselves to preparing and coordinating the EU's position effectively within their respective semesters.

The Council will establish the EU position for the Warsaw conference by October of this year. In this context, as has been in the case in previous years, we very much look forward to the valuable input from the European Parliament.

3-685-000

**Connie Hedegaard**, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I will try to address the very specific question that Mr Groote put forward here of how we can ensure that Europe speaks with one voice. I think that those of us who have lived through these many

years share the concern, and sometimes also the frustration, over how difficult it is to bring Europe to speak with one voice. I would say that we should continue to do what we did in Cancún, what we managed to do in Durban and what we also managed to do actually in Doha.

Obviously it is not always easy, as the Irish Presidency also just said, but I think that in fact we have managed to do so and we should, of course, do this again this year. We will work with the presidencies, we will work from the Commission with the Member States, we will listen to the advice from Parliament, and in the case of COP 19 in Warsaw, we will of course also try to work very closely with the Poles, acknowledging that they have a different role here as the COP Presidency for the whole world and not just as part of the EU. I myself will go to Warsaw in just a few weeks from now to discuss how to manage this year with the incoming Polish Presidency.

It is, of course, true that there have been examples of it being difficult for Europe to find its common position in due time. But I also think that it is fair to say that there is one issue in particular that has, for years, been the symbol of this and that was the Assigned Amount Units (AAUs). There, I agree, it did not look too beautiful to the rest of the world but in fact the good news from Doha was the internal coordination within the EU.

For the first time in many years we actually managed to solve this problem with the AAUs. It took a lot of time and energy in Durban but was still not solved. The same in Qatar but there the problem was solved. We could have full carry-over but restricted use – down to 2 % – and no use in the European Union in order to comply with our own rules. What is more, there was a declaration from all the relevant parties – all the parties taking the second commitment period post-Japan – that they will not buy AAUs. So I think that what has been a contentious issue for many years has now been solved and, all other things being equal, that this should strengthen the chances in good time before COPs of having a unified European position not on almost all the issues, but on all the issues.

It is true, as we just heard from the Presidency, that we are preparing in order to stimulate the debate; the debate prior to Warsaw, but also prior to 2015. We are trying to stimulate that in the Commission by presenting a Green Paper soon. This will invite Member States, naturally, but also all other stakeholders – and Parliament too of course – to discuss the difficult issues up to 2015. We will also use the Council meetings, the informal Council meetings, as well as the many meetings where different groups of Ministers from the EU meet together, to try to come closer to what is the ideal way, what is the maximum we can achieve by 2015.

It is very clear that the Commission will continue efforts of that kind but I also think that it is fair to say that we should not fool ourselves. It will be tough for Europe to preside over two of the next three COPs up to the 2015 agreement and that will make the burden on us to find a consolidated EU position even heavier. That goes for Poland this year but it also goes for France in the very decisive year of 2015. It is more imperative than ever that the EU gets its act together, that we jointly define our priorities and that we are, as was also said in the beginning, good at communicating them in a strong and united way.

I basically think that this work already starts now. For instance, with our American colleagues it seems that there is maybe a window of opportunity of maybe 18 months where, if they can move anything, then it has to be done before the mid-term elections. It cannot be done in the last months of 2015. So we will raise all these difficult issues in the Green Paper – the ambition level from 2020 onwards, the ambition gap before 2020, the



finance issue as was mentioned, the legal form and, maybe even more controversially, how to account for all the many different initiatives outside the UNFCCC: access to sustainable energy for all, getting rid of fossil fuel subsidies, all these other kinds of initiatives, the ICIs too. How can they all be used to play a positive role when it comes to the UNFCCC?

I would like to say too that in the Green Paper we are preparing we will ask some quite clear questions about the UNFCCC process itself; not that we are questioning the UNFCCC process, but how we can improve that process.

So there are lots of difficult issues on the plate for months to come and we will do whatever we can to ensure that in 2013, and also in 2014 and 2015, Europe will manage to speak with one voice. That is the way that we can get the impact on the negotiations that we should have.

3-686-000

**Karl-Heinz Florenz**, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Meine Damen Präsidentinnen! Ich freue mich, dass ich heute schon mehrfach hören konnte, dass wir für die Klimadebatte eine neue Zeitrechnung haben. Das glaube ich persönlich auch. Die Zeit von Kyoto I – lass sie gut oder schlecht sein – ist vorbei. Da haben wir uns gestritten um die Frage: Wer ist drin, und wer ist nicht drin? Und der, der nicht drin war, wollte nun gar nichts machen. Andere, die dennoch drin waren, haben auch nicht viel getan. Ich glaube, die Durban Platform ist ein Plateau, auf dem wir für die Zukunft arbeiten können. Es sollte uns Hoffnung geben. Bis dahin müssen wir natürlich mit Kyoto II leben. Aber das halte ich eigentlich für machbar.

Ich denke mir, dass wir die Motivation, die aus dieser Durban Platform herauskommt, dazu nutzen müssen, neue Strategien im Umgang auf diesen Riesenkongressen zu finden. Dazu ist Europa gefordert. Das waren wir allerdings immer, aber wir haben leider Gottes festgestellt, dass auf unseren letzten beiden Konferenzen – da hat der Vorsitzende des Ausschusses Recht – die Europäer im Rahmen des Rates nicht auf Kurs waren. Wir müssen zugestehen, dass wir jetzt glücklicherweise in einem Land eingeladen sind, in dem es auch Probleme gibt. Deswegen hat Polen eine ganz außergewöhnlich große Chance, trotz der eigenen Probleme. Die will ich hier gar nicht aufzählen, aber ich meine, alte Kohlekraftwerke, Schwerindustrie – das ist schon eine Herausforderung. Das will ich überhaupt nicht bestreiten. Da müssen wir also sehen, dass wir dennoch einen positiven *drive* hineinbekommen, um die Strategie Europas da auch wirklich vorzuführen. Ich glaube, dass wir das können. Ich glaube, dass Polen da eine gute Vorlage liefern wird. Denn wir haben ja gelernt, dass immer dann, wenn die Gastgeber innovativ und hoffnungsvoll waren, es dann auch gute Strategien in diesen Konferenzen gab.

Frau Kommissarin, ich glaube, wir brauchen eine *To do*-Liste, damit nicht jeder hier über andere Punkte redet, sondern damit wir Europäer in den nächsten zwei, drei Monaten wirklich einmal herausfinden: Was ist unser Punkt? Wo wollen wir hin? Wie kommen wir dahin?

3-687-000

**Dan Jørgensen**, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, probably apart from the reports by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, I do not think any report has been quoted as frequently as the Stern Review of 2006 in which Sir Nicholas Stern tells us just how catastrophic and costly the effects of climate change will be if we do

not act. Last week Nicholas Stern gave an interview in which he said that he had got it wrong on climate change and that it is far, far worse.

This is in line with what the World Bank has also concluded and with what, I guess, more or less all scientists that work on this issue have concluded. We need to act now. Global emissions need to peak in 2015 if we are to stay below 2°C, after which the self-enhancing effect sets in. This is why we cannot wait until 2020. This is why it is all very well that we will get a legally binding agreement in 2015, but the COP process needs to create other results long before that.

This will only happen if the EU leads. This will only happen if the EU shows direction and, to be honest, we have not done that for a few years. I value your work, Commissioner. You know that. I think you struggle and that you do everything you can, but you also have to admit that sometimes some countries are blocking. Normally we are very polite and do not mention them, but today I would like to mention Poland – unfortunately – because Poland has been blocking. Poland is now going to be President so we need to put maximum pressure on Poland to live up to that responsibility.

Can I ask you one question, Commissioner? Why is it that you do not advise the Council to start perhaps taking decisions in a different way? Why is that we do not use majority voting? Why is it that one country can block progress for the European Union? It simply is not satisfactory.

3-688-000

**Chris Davies,** *on behalf of the ALDE Group* . – Madam President, we have gone to climate change conferences in the past and one of our strategies has been to lead by example. That is why we look at the range of initiatives that must be taken and we see, for example, carbon capture and storage, something which we are told will be necessary to reduce our emissions by 2050 by up to 25% globally. And so in 2007 our governments said they wanted to have up to 12 CCS projects in operation in the European Union by 2015. And what have we got six years later? Not even one project identified and going forward. We have slipped back appallingly. It has been a European failure. We have been far from taking a lead.

But projects are going elsewhere. There are 17 CCS projects either in operation or under construction across the world, saving up to 37 million tonnes of carbon dioxide. The majority are in the United States and Canada. We criticise those countries over greenhouse gases but they are doing something. We criticise China over its fossil-fuel power stations but under their ten-year plan, their five-year plan, say up to 10 CCS plants will be developed. So we are being left behind here on an advanced technology. We cannot afford that.

Now there is no blame. There is a lot of disappointment amongst the Commission officials and amongst companies. One of the reasons for it is the collapse in the carbon price which has sucked out the economic drive behind CCS, but there are things we must do. I do not think the division between DG Climate and DG Energy over CCS helps. I think the NER300, our funding mechanism, is too inflexible and there are really only two projects around in Europe that it could fund in future, so there is no point in that. We have placed too much reliance on the carbon price, not enough on direct subsidies. We subsidise renewable energy and yet CCS can save vastly more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in the atmosphere than renewables. And finally, we need to use binding instruments, regulatory instruments, targets. We need to drive forward this technology. We cannot afford to be left behind.

3-689-000

**Bas Eickhout**, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank the Irish Presidency and the Commissioner for explaining what we are going to do for Europe and for the climate treaty by 2015. But I would like to stress that time is running out.

In 2015 Europe needs to be ready with a 2030 package because, if Europe is not ready, then who will be? So Europe needs to be ready by the end of 2015. 2014 is a European election year with a new Parliament and a new Commission. So time is running out. I feel that there is a lack of urgency here, on the part of the Irish Presidency as well, to work and to deliver on a time schedule that will enable us to have a 2030 climate package with three targets ready by 2015.

I have another concrete question to the Council. As we saw in 2012, one of the big problems always present at the international negotiations is the lack of financing pledges by the EU. We can be annoyed by it, but we do know that all the developing countries will look to Europe. What are you going to deliver? What will the Irish Presidency do to make sure that the EU will have a pledge on the table and that the Ministers of Finance are included in this debate, because that is the key. It should not only be the Ministers of the Environment who get the blame in Doha, in Durban or in Warsaw.

Just a word to my colleagues in conclusion. Everyone is always saying in this room how important climate is. Well, then show it. Show it in saving the emissions trading scheme, and in showing that backloading should be supported.

3-690-000

**Marina Yannakoudakis**, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, while the challenge of climate change must not be underestimated, we must also remember our constituents face their own challenge, paying the high cost of energy bills. So as we head towards beautiful Warsaw I would like the EU to take a negotiating position which addresses both challenges.

Ambitious targets for cutting greenhouse gases are all well and good but they must allow us to keep pace with the growing demand for energy. Green energy also needs to offer consumers value for money. We must ensure a multifaceted approach to addressing climate change which includes renewables, as well as other sources of energy such as nuclear power and shale gas. We need to make our energy resources more sustainable and our energy consumption more efficient. I welcome the UK Government's Green Deal scheme to improve energy efficiency and help families cut their household energy bills. We also need to invest in energy-efficient technology. Any deal which is negotiated in Warsaw needs to be good for climate, good for the country and, most importantly, good for the consumers.

3-691-000

**Tadeusz Cymański**, *w imieniu grupy EFD*. – Pani Przewodnicząca! Walka z ociepleniem klimatu to nie jest problem europejski, to jest problem dotyczący całej planety i wszystkich krajów. Dlatego nowe porozumienie dotyczyć musi wszystkich, a w szczególności tych, którzy zanieczyszczają najbardziej: Chin, Stanów Zjednoczonych, Indii. Same Chiny obecnie zużywają tyle węgla, co cała reszta świata. Podczas gdy Unia Europejska przyjmuje coraz bardziej ambitne plany redukcji, inni – najwięksi emitenci zanieczyszczeń – nie podjęli nawet formalnych zobowiązań redukcyjnych. W takiej sytuacji kolejne redukcje,

podnoszenie poprzeczki, traci nie tylko sens ekologiczny, ale staje się przede wszystkim pozbawione rozsądku gospodarczego. Przemysł europejski przestaje być konkurencyjny, firmy są przenoszone do krajów, gdzie nie ma takich surowych zasad, a nasi obywatele płacą coraz wyższe rachunki za energię. Trzeba również bardzo zwrócić uwagę i zadbać, aby cele redukcyjne w Europie były dostosowane do realnych możliwości i sytuacji poszczególnych państw.

3-692-000

**Sabine Wils**, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Bei der Klimakonferenz in Doha ist nicht viel Substanzielles für den Klimaschutz herausgekommen. Die Vorbildfunktion, die von der EU reklamiert wird, hat keine Glaubwürdigkeit. Die Koalition, die die EU in Durban mit kleinen Inselstaaten und anderen gebildet hat, gab es in Doha nicht mehr. Das Reduktionsziel von 20 %, mit dem die EU auf der COP 18 verhandelt hat, wurde bereits erreicht. In wichtigen Verhandlungsfragen gab es in Doha keine Einigkeit innerhalb der EU, und das selbst ernannte Hauptklimaschutzinstrument, der Emissionshandel, steht kurz vor dem Kollaps.

Der einzige Ausweg, mit dem die EU die Weltklimaverhandlungen voranbringen kann, ist, selbst klimapolitische Ambitionen zu zeigen. Das heißt, das Reduktionsziel bis 2020 auf mindestens 30 % zu erhöhen und möglichst bald mit Vorschlägen für drei neue Ziele für 2030 herauszukommen. Wie will die Kommission Verhandlungsdruck auf der COP 19 in Warschau aufbauen, wenn der Beitrag der EU zum Klimaschutz unglaublich ist?

3-693-000

**Richard Seeber (PPE)**. - Meine sehr verehrten Damen Präsidentinnen, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich stimme mit den Vorrednern überein, dass es entscheidend sein wird, ob wir es schaffen, in Europa mit einer Stimme zu sprechen. Noch wichtiger aber ist es, dass wir klar festlegen: Was wollen wir für 2015, für das beginnende neue weltweite Klimaregime 2020? Das ist die inhaltliche Frage, die wir klären müssen.

Es heißt immer, die Gemeinschaft, die EU, soll führen, wir haben hier eine historische Schuld. Auch hiermit stimme ich überein. Wir dürfen nicht vergessen, dass wir im internationalen Wettbewerb sind, aber trotzdem, wir haben hier eine Bringschuld. Nur, jetzt die Frage an die Frau Kommissarin und auch an die Präsidentschaft: Wo hat Europa bis jetzt eigentlich seine *commitments* nicht erreicht? Wir haben uns diese drei Ziele gesteckt. Meines Wissens sind wir eigentlich überall auf guter Erfüllung. Wo schaffen wir es nicht, sozusagen das, was wir international versprochen haben, zu erreichen?

Das betrifft auch die finanziellen Zusagen, die *fast track*-Finanzierungen, die meines Wissens von Europa bis jetzt voll geleistet wurden. Hier sollten wir einmal überprüfen, ob wir wirklich irgendeinen Fehler begangen haben, um dann zu schauen, was wir besser machen können.

Das zentrale Problem, das wir haben, ist, dass das Thema Klimaschutz in der öffentlichen Wahrnehmung, in der öffentlichen Debatte eindeutig an Wichtigkeit verliert. Es gelingt uns nicht, die Bürgerinnen und Bürger auf der Straße zu überzeugen, dass hier ein dringender Handlungsbedarf besteht. Da nützt es auch nichts, dass wir diese Horrorszenarien an die Wand malen, wenn die Bürger auf der Straße über steigende Energiekosten klagen, wenn sie über Arbeitslosigkeit klagen, und wir hier eine Politik verordnen, die eben in diese Richtung geht, und sie das Gefühl haben, wir gefährden sie. Hier sind wir alle gefordert,

diese *message* zu transportieren, denn sonst bleibt das ein Elitentema und wir haben keine Chance, hier die Zustimmung der Bevölkerung zu bekommen.

Noch eine letzte Frage: Wie reagieren wir auf die neuen Herausforderungen wie beispielsweise diese Schiefergasrevolution in den USA, die billig Kohle auf den europäischen Markt bringt, während wir hier wirklich ein Problem haben bei den erneuerbaren Energieträgern?

3-694-000

**Edite Estrela (S&D).** - Senhora Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Senhora Ministra, acho que é útil começar por um balanço dos resultados de Doha. A prorrogação do Protocolo de Quioto foi positiva, mas dele continuam excluídos alguns dos maiores emissores mundiais, como a China e os Estados Unidos, países a que se juntaram o Japão, o Canadá, a Nova Zelândia e a Rússia. Assim, este acordo abrange apenas cerca de 15% das emissões mundiais. O que põe em causa o objetivo de limitar o aumento da temperatura global a 2°C.

De acordo com um estudo recente das Nações Unidas, os níveis das emissões de gases com efeito de estufa continuam a aumentar e encontram-se 14% acima das metas previstas para 2020. Se nada for feito, e com urgência, haverá, neste século, um aumento da temperatura entre 3 e 5°C. Um outro estudo do Banco Mundial confirma que a temperatura mundial poderá aumentar 4°C, provocando o agravamento das crises alimentares e dos fenómenos meteorológicos extremos, o que afetará, em particular, os mais pobres. É preciso agir rapidamente. Chega de adiamentos e hesitações.

Subsistem também muitas dúvidas quanto ao financiamento. Em Cancún foi acordado que os países desenvolvidos mobilizariam 100 mil milhões de dólares para financiar, anualmente, até 2020, ações relativas ao clima dos países em desenvolvimento. Mas não se sabe como se vai concretizar este financiamento. É necessário que a UE tenha uma posição clara e coordenada relativamente a esta questão.

3-695-000

**Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy (ALDE).** - Madam President, if the EU does not speak with one voice we have the influence of 28 dwarves in the land of giants and that is close to zero. But we, Europe, become a giant if we climb upon each other's shoulders and speak with one voice. I think that is the key issue here.

Let us be honest in our European house of democracy. We cannot blame the Commission for this and we cannot blame Parliament for this. The core of the problem is the Council and maybe especially the hybrid structure of the Council and the total lack of transparency. Of course the Presidency defends the interests of the Council as an institution, but it does not talk about the position of individual Member States. I think that is where the problem lies.

Why can we not in Parliament invite the Polish Minister to explain his position on climate change? We do not need a Treaty change for that. All we need is political will and more transparency. This week we had the French President Mr Hollande in this House, not only delivering a speech but also having a debate with us, the Members of the European Parliament. I would like to ask the Presidency in particular: if we as a Parliament invite individual Ministers, can you please urge them to answer this invitation and to come to

our House to listen to our questions and not always hide behind the Council as an institution?

3-696-000

**Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE).** - Arvoisa puhemies, hyvät kollegat, täällä on jo puhuttu yhä vakavammiksi muuttuvista tutkijoiden ja asiantuntijoiden, mm. Nicholas Sternin, varoituksista. Kansainvälinen energiajärjestökin, jota perinteisesti on totuttu pitämään fossiilienergian äänitorvena, varoittaa, että kaksi kolmasosaa tunnetuista fossiilivaroista pitäisi jättää maahan. Kun asiantuntijoiden varoitukset käyvät yhä vakavammiksi, Eurooppa samaan aikaan lähinnä polkee paikallaan.

Meidän on todellakin aika ryhdistäytyä. Meidän tulee näyttää maailmalle esimerkkiä asettamalla vuodelle 2030 kolme tavoitetta: päästöt, uusiutuva energia ja energiatehokkuus. Meidän tulee korjata päästökauppamme, jotta se oikeasti kannustaisi investoimaan puhtaisiin vaihtoehtoihin. Ne firmat, jotka haluavat investoida Euroopassa, vetoavat meihin, että korjaamme päästökaupan. Jos parlamentti ei tue päästökaupan korjaamista, se tulkitaan maailmalla signaaliksi, että haluamme tuhota päästökaupan, jolla olisi tietenkin mitä huonoin kansainvälinen vaikutus. Eri puolilla maailmaa, Australiassa, Koreassa, Kaliforniassa ja Kiinassa, ollaan ottamassa käyttöön päästökauppaa meidän esimerkkiämme seuraten. Olisi häpeä, jos samaan aikaan antaisimme oman päästökauppamme kuihtua merkityksettömäksi.

3-697-000

**Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR).** - Wielu posłów domaga się, by Unia Europejska zajęła jednolite stanowisko podczas konferencji klimatycznej. Mówiła o tym także dzisiaj pani komisarz. Postulat ten jest mało realny, zważywszy z jednej strony na sprzeczne konkluzje sformułowane przez naukowców co do faktycznego wpływu człowieka na zmiany klimatyczne oraz jego skali, z drugiej zaś na fakt, że państwa członkowskie mają w tym względzie sprzeczne interesy. Cała europejska akcja walki z tzw. globalnym ociepleniem ogniskuje się wokół redukcji emisji dwutlenku węgla, czyli CO<sub>2</sub>. Jeśli np. we Francji ok. 75% energii pochodzi z atomu, a w Polsce ponad 90% energii z węgla, to w praktyce mimo szczerych chęci trudno oczekiwać jednolitego stanowiska w tej sprawie. Nawet przy założeniu poważnego wpływu człowieka na atmosferę nie można w krótkiej perspektywie czasowej domagać się poświęcenia na ołtarzu klimatycznej bitwy gospodarek narodowych wielu krajów członkowskich Unii. Doprowadzi to w trybie ekspresowym do podwyżki cen energii, jednocześnie potęgując nastroje antyunijne.

3-698-000

**Jaroslav Paška (EFD).** - Na nadchádzajúcom rokovaní konferencie strán rámcového dohovoru OSN o zmene klímy v závere tohto roku by sme sa mali usilovať posunúť dopredu s presadzovaním našich skromných cieľov. Skúsenosti s koordináciou našej pozície s politikami členských štátov pri príprave pozície Európskej únie na konferencii v katarskej Dauhe by nám mohli pomôcť k tomu, aby reprezentanti Európskej únie na Varšavskej konferencii prezentovali jednotné stanoviská v záujme dosiahnutia čo najvýraznejšieho pokroku. Preto je potrebné, aby Európska komisia v dostatočnom predstihu rokovala s členskými štátmi o spoločných postojoch k parciálnym témam a oboznámila tak tieto štáty s cieľmi, ktoré chce vo Varšave dosiahnuť. V záujme reálneho nastavenia našich cieľov a očakávaní z Varšavskej a následnej Parížskej konferencie by bolo možno užitočné vopred poznať aj isté posuny v pozíciách ďalších krajín, najmä Číny a Spojených štátov amerických,

ktoré by nám umožnili koncentrovať sa na tie oblasti, v ktorých budú účastníci konferencie ochotní podporiť významnejší pokrok.

3-699-000

**João Ferreira (GUE/NGL).** - Senhora Presidente, há poucos dias, o preço da tonelada de carbono atingiu um novo mínimo de 2,82 euros. Ficou ainda mais longínquo qualquer estímulo para a transição para tecnologias hipocarbónicas.

De acordo com alguns analistas, este estímulo exigiria que o preço do carbono fosse de, pelo menos, 20 euros a tonelada, ou seja, sete vezes superior ao atual.

Depois das fraudes que permitiu e depois de garantir lucros fabulosos para os poluidores, o mercado do carbono revela, uma vez mais, a sua essência: incentivar a especulação e o *business as usual* no que às emissões diz respeito. É ineficaz e é perverso.

Agora, mesmo a "solução" de retirar licenças do mercado - que não altera a essência do problema - parece estar em risco.

Seria bom ouvirmos não apenas a Comissão e o Conselho, mas também o que têm a dizer todos os que neste Parlamento defenderam e defendem as soluções de mercado e o mirífico comércio de emissões: da direita à social-democracia, passando pelos liberais e até os verdes, que saem desta história nada verdes mas muito cinzentos.

3-700-000

**Peter Liese (PPE).** - Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wenn man sich die internationalen Klimaverhandlungen ansieht, dann kann man schon ernüchert sein. Das, was notwendig ist nach Ansicht der Wissenschaft, was wir uns auch gemeinsam vorgenommen haben, ist leider in weiter Ferne. Vor Kopenhagen hatten wir Erwartungen, die jetzt nicht erfüllt wurden, und deswegen müssen wir natürlich realistisch sein. Aber, ich glaube, Realismus heißt nicht Resignation. Wenn wir ein gravierendes Problem mit dem Klimawandel haben – und davon bin ich überzeugt, auch als jemand, der eine wissenschaftliche Ausbildung genossen hat, und ich weiß, in der Medizin haben wir oft wesentlich weniger Wissenschaftler, die zu einem Konsens kommen, und da müssen wir uns daran halten, es gibt praktisch keinen Bereich der Wissenschaft, wo der Konsens so groß ist wie beim Klimawandel –, dann können wir die Hände nicht in den Schoß legen.

Ich glaube, es ist auch keine gute Agenda für die europäischen Wahlen, wenn wir sagen, wir haben zwar ein Riesenproblem, wir haben auch versucht, es zu lösen, aber leider hat es nicht funktioniert. Wir müssen schon auch – obwohl es schwierig ist – Wege aufzeigen, wie wir das Problem lösen.

Da hätte ich drei konkrete Wünsche an Rat und Kommission für die nächsten Monate. Erstens: Packen Sie John Kerry bei der Ehre! Er war der große Klimaschützer, hat Gesetze eingebracht in den Senat, und er muss jetzt als Außenminister Verantwortung übernehmen und muss auch Risiken eingehen und muss innerhalb der Administration die Bremser an die Kandare nehmen, sonst verliert er seine Glaubwürdigkeit. Das muss in jedem Gespräch der Europäischen Union gegenüber den Amerikanern deutlich gemacht werden.

Zweitens: Stärken Sie die Allianz – die in Durban stattgefunden hat, die dann in Doha wieder etwas schwächer war – der Europäischen Union mit den Entwicklungsländern! Das ist eine Chance, und die muss gestärkt werden.

Drittens, das geht an uns alle: Wir müssen zu Hause die Vorbereitungen treffen. Wir müssen in der Klimapolitik jetzt darauf vorbereitet sein, dass es ein Jahr 2021 gibt. Deswegen bin ich persönlich für *backloading*, und ich bin persönlich dafür, dass wir möglichst schnell drei klare Ziele für 2030 festlegen, realistisch aber ambitioniert.

3-701-000

**Kriton Arsenis (S&D).** - Madam President, COP after COP the negotiations do progress, but it is clear that the pace of progress is slower than we need if we are to be realistically optimistic about a global agreement for 2015. We need to speed up, both in the EU and internationally.

In the EU we have made a mistake and are only just now starting to realise it. We have spoken to our people too much about the actions we are taking and too little about what other nations are doing. We have created a fake conviction that only the EU is taking action and all the others are sticking to their old policies. This is now becoming the excuse for inaction within the EU. We urgently need to end this misinformation and to tell the truth, which is that every year new legislation is being adopted and implemented in almost every country in the world regarding climate change.

I urge the Commissioner to take the lead in communicating this message to our people. It will seriously help us speed up the pace of negotiations and give the global climate agreement a chance.

3-702-000

**Riikka Manner (ALDE).** - Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa komission jäsen, Euroopan unionin on syytä pohtia hyvin tarkkaan sitä, kuinka se valmistautuu seuraavaan YK:n ilmastomuutoksen puitesopimuksen sopimusosapuolten kokoukseen.

Haluan esittää komission jäsenelle kaksi kysymystä. Ensinnäkin erittäin tärkeä asia globaalissa ilmastokeskustelussa on LULUCF eli maankäyttöön, maankäytön muutokseen ja metsätalouteen liittyvä raportointi. Olisi erittäin mielenkiintoista kuulla arvoisan komission jäsenen arvio siitä, miten LULUCF tullaan ottamaan globaaliin ilmastopimukseen vuoden 2020 jälkeen. Kioton pöytäkirjassa, kuten hyvin tiedämme, se on ollut mukana, mutta edelleen asiaa voisi kehittää.

Toinen asia koskee maataloutta ja raportointia maatalouden aiheuttamista maankäytön muutoksista ja maankäytöstä. Mikä on komission jäsenen mielestä maatalouden rooli globaalissa ilmastopimuksessa?

3-703-000

**Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE).** - Tack! Det är mycket tal om att vi ska tala med en röst, men om priset för det är att vi ständigt sitter och pratar med varandra i stället för att hitta lösningar med omvärlden så hjälper inte den enade rösten. Jag tycker att ministerrådet ska komma överens i förväg och ha alternativa planer för alla möjliga utfall och sedan, när vi kommer till de här mötena, så ska alla ministrar sprida budskapet om ett aktivt globalt klimatarbete.

Vi ska heller inte komma till dessa möten med tomma fickor, utan vi ska ha finansiering till de länder som behöver det och vi ska ha intressanta handelspolitiska lösningar så att vi kan sprida grön teknik. Då kanske vi kan nå framgång. För ärligt talat är det globala klimatarbetet ett totalt misslyckande, och jag tror inte att en enkel teknofix räcker. Vi måste



också tala om livsstilsförändringar. En ensidig tro på tillväxt, finansierad med ständigt höjda lån, kommer att leda till ständigt ökad resursförbrukning.

Vi behöver ta ut effektiviseringsvinster i form av mer tid, livskvalitet och icke-materiella värden för att ha en chans att lösa klimatutmaningen. Rent ekonomiskt behöver vi tänka nytt.

3-704-000

**Martina Anderson (GUE/NGL).** - Madam President, the economic crisis currently being experienced in developed countries such as Ireland must not be used as an excuse to ignore or to divert attention away from the extremely important issue of climate change. I would urge the junior minister that it be prioritised in Ireland.

As Bairbre de Brún, my predecessor, who did sterling work on this matter, would have done, I urge countries to move towards a sustainable and low-carbon economy where jobs can be created, whilst protecting the economy.

At Conference of the Parties (COP) 19 in Warsaw the EU must set out an ambitious, strong and effective stance in seeking a deal on climate change. I urge the Irish Government to use the opportunity afforded to it during its Presidency to demonstrate strong leadership in preparing for this and to outline its strategy, which unfortunately I do not think we heard in the opening address from the minister.

3-705-000

**Sophie Auconie (PPE).** - Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Madame la représentante du Conseil, chers collègues, comme vous le savez, la prochaine conférence sur le climat, dénommée COP-19, se tiendra à Varsovie, en Pologne, en novembre et décembre 2013. Cette conférence sera essentielle. La dernière conférence climatique, celle de Doha, en décembre 2012, n'a permis d'atteindre que des résultats modestes, alors même que les enjeux sont majeurs. Nous n'avons obtenu que le minimum, ni plus ni moins.

À défaut d'une réforme profonde, le protocole de Kyoto a été prolongé. L'Union européenne, grâce à une position claire et unie, a pu poser les prémices d'un accord global qui devrait débiter durant la période 2015-2020. La prochaine COP à Varsovie devra transformer l'essai et, enfin, obtenir cet accord mondial.

Nous devons être ambitieux. Nous ne pouvons nous satisfaire de ne chercher que le plus petit dénominateur commun entre les pays. Rares sont ceux qui osent contredire l'urgence de lutter contre le changement climatique. Humainement, économiquement et écologiquement, les conséquences sont nombreuses et dangereuses.

Certes, l'Union européenne conserve un leadership environnemental au niveau mondial et n'a pas attendu ses partenaires pour agir. États-Unis, Chine, Russie, Inde et tant d'autres doivent impérativement s'investir davantage. Cette responsabilité incombe à tous mais ces efforts nécessitent des financements car ils sont très coûteux. Ils représentent un poids pour nos entreprises. Le risque de brider notre compétitivité et donc notre reprise économique existe.

Pour autant, il est clair qu'en investissant aujourd'hui, nous garantissons également notre avantage compétitif pour demain. Ne nous voilons pas la face, tôt ou tard, tous sans exception devront lutter contre le changement climatique, qui est une réalité inéluctable des prochaines décennies.

J'ai beaucoup d'autres choses à vous dire mais ce que je tiens à dire, Madame la Commissaire, c'est que l'Union européenne doit réformer son système ETS pour avoir une politique climatique efficace.

3-706-000

**Marita Ulvskog (S&D).** - Fru talman! Jag valde att se det positiva med Doha-mötet. Det var ändå så att Kyoto-processen fortsatte och det var ändå så att tåget rullade vidare trots att vi befinner oss i en svår ekonomisk kris, inte bara i Europa utan också i en del andra delar av världen. Jag väljer också att se det positiva med kommissionär Hedegaards inledning: hon kommer att lägga fram en grönbok och hon tycker att vi ska undersöka och fördjupa oss i USA-spåret.

Samtidigt är det naturligtvis så att vi befinner oss vid ett vägskäl, och framtiden ser mörk ut. Som flera talare redan påpekat måste vi lägga väldigt mycket mer press på rådet. Polen måste få hjälpen och trycket på sig att faktiskt vara en enande kraft som också är beredd att ta ansvar – kanske inte att gå före men ändå ta en ledande roll under den tid vi har framför oss. Också andra länder måste få pressen på sig, inklusive andra EU-medlemsländer.

Det är inte okej att kommissionären ska tvingas stå i Doha och säga att det är okej när medlemsländer fuskar med klimatbiståndet, dvs. döper om ett gammalt ordinarie bistånd till klimatbistånd. Kommissionären måste få hjälp av oss andra med att se till att få ett utsläppshandelssystem som fungerar och inte brakar samman samtidigt som vi har fått en förlängning av Kyoto-protokollet.

Vi har alldeles för låga ambitioner för att kunna tala med USA och Kina. Vi måste faktiskt se till att rådet levererar och jag tror inte, som kommissionären föreslog, att det är en kommunikationsfråga om vi ska klara det här. Det är en fråga om att leverera, inte att kommunicera, och där måste vi hjälpas åt.

Det är faktiskt så att det här parlamentet har sin absolut viktigaste uppgift i klimatfrågan. Den är inte en fråga för eliterna, utan den är en fråga som handlar om långsiktig överlevnad. Det är tillväxtpolitik, det är industripolitik, det är energipolitik, det är familjepolitik – det är allt detta som är avgörande för samhällsbyggandet.

3-707-000

**Jolanta Emilia Hibner (PPE).** - Pani Przewodnicząca! To nie Polska jest hamulcowym w realizacji celów w skali globalnej ochrony klimatu, ale największy emitenci. Polska podpisała protokół z Kioto i za polskiej prezydencji negocjacje klimatyczne w Durbanie poszły najdalej naprzód. Po prostu nasz kraj jest realistą.

Jeśli chodzi o efekty, to można o nich mówić, jeżeli będziemy mieli podpisane porozumienie, ale globalne, nie z wyjątkami, nie tylko dla jednego obszaru. Powietrze na całej kuli ziemskiej dotyczy nas wszystkich, nie tylko Polski, Chin czy Stanów Zjednoczonych. Dlatego my powinniśmy przede wszystkim skupić się na tym, jaką drogą mamy iść (cele już określiliśmy), jaką drogą i w jakim czasie. Czy ten czas, który sobie założyliśmy, jest czasem realnym? Następne pokolenie nie chce niczego innego: chce mieć czyste środowisko, zdrowe życie, ale też pracę i godne życie, ale w Europie.

Kolejny szczyt ma się odbyć w Warszawie. Będzie to bardzo trudny szczyt i trudne negocjacje. Przede wszystkim przyjęliśmy sobie za cel podpisanie zobowiązania, ale w

skali globalnej. Nie wiem, czy wszystkie gospodarki świata pójdą za nami. A to jest przede wszystkim warunek.

Druga sprawa – mamy podjąć wiążące decyzje w sprawie wsparcia finansowego dla najbardziej potrzebujących, czyli tych, którzy cierpią z powodu zmiany klimatu, ale też tych, którzy muszą w jakiś sposób dostosować swój przemysł. Europa podejmuje wiele ambitnych wyzwań w dziedzinie polityki klimatycznej. Warto i trzeba iść do przodu, ale wysiłki spełzną na niczym, gdy do tych celów nie dołączą inni. Mądrość Europy to wypracowanie konsensusu i rozwiązań, które poprą inni.

3-708-000

**Gilles Pargneaux (S&D).** - Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, Madame la Ministre, chers collègues, il y a urgence. Le temps presse et l'Europe doit, d'ici à 2015, renforcer son rôle moteur pour convaincre, comme l'a précisé tout à l'heure dans son intervention notre président de la commission, Matthias Groote.

Comme vous l'avez rappelé, Madame la Commissaire, à Lille la semaine dernière, où nous étions ensemble dans le cadre d'un débat sur l'adaptation au changement climatique, seuls quatorze États membres disposent d'une stratégie nationale d'adaptation au changement climatique. Si nous voulons être crédibles sur la scène internationale, les treize autres doivent rapidement avancer. Il y va de notre crédibilité. Je vous fais confiance, Madame la Commissaire, je fais confiance à votre détermination telle que vous l'avez déjà prouvée depuis que vous êtes en poste.

Pour plus d'efficacité, toutes les initiatives concernant changement climatique doivent ainsi adopter une perspective transnationale permettant de mieux identifier les besoins de financement de chaque État, spécialement dans la perspective de la mise en place d'un fonds vert, dont l'apport financier des États contributeurs devra être précisé.

Oui, il y a urgence. Le temps presse, comme en témoignent, par exemple, les nombreuses inondations qui touchent régulièrement ma circonscription du nord-ouest de la France. Nous commençons à vivre dans un climat modifié. C'est pour cela qu'il y a urgence. Je vous fais confiance, Madame la Commissaire, pour que, ensemble, nous puissions convaincre.

3-709-000

## **VORSITZ: ALEXANDER ALVARO**

*Vizepräsident*

3-710-000

**Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE).** - Senhor Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhora Comissária, congratulo-me com o acordo alcançado em Doha de prolongar a vigência do Protocolo de Quioto. Apesar dos países incluídos no segundo período do cumprimento de Quioto representarem apenas 15% das emissões globais, esta é uma decisão importante pois o Protocolo de Quioto constitui o único acordo legal vinculativo de combate às alterações climáticas.

Quanto à Plataforma de Durban os avanços registados em Doha limitaram-se praticamente à discussão de calendário e de questões processuais e menos de conteúdo e de substância. Esta é uma oportunidade que a UE deve aproveitar para manter a sua posição de liderança através da elaboração de uma proposta sólida que contemple não só as preocupações

ambientais mas também a competitividade industrial e a segurança no abastecimento da energia.

Gostaria, pois, de colocar a seguinte pergunta à Comissão: na opinião da Sra. Comissária, quais são os princípios, em termos de substância, que deverão estar incluídos na Plataforma de Durban? Está já a Comissão a preparar tal proposta? Irá a Comissão apresentar na próxima COP em Varsóvia a sua posição sobre o que quer ver incluído na Plataforma de Durban para um futuro sustentável, a compatibilizar a parte ambiental, a competitividade da economia e a segurança do abastecimento de energia?

3-711-000

**Kinga Göncz (S&D).** - Az Unió számára stratégiai kérdés a klímaváltozás megelőzése és a globális felmelegedés elleni küzdelem. A zöld technológiákba való beruházásoktól azt várjuk, hogy erősítsék Európa versenyképességét és munkahelyeket teremtsenek. Ahhoz, hogy az európai elkötelezettség globális eredményekhez vezessen Európának szüksége van szövetségesekre, minden, az egyezményhez csatlakozni kívánó országra. Tajvan a föld huszadik legnagyobb szén-dioxid-kibocsátója, éppen ezért önként vállalta, hogy bár eddig nem lehetett tagja az ENSZ éghajlat-változási keretegyezményének, csökkenteti károsanyag-kibocsátását és csatlakozik a megállapodásban vállalt globális célokhoz. Tajvan, amely a világ legnagyobb led-gyártója, második legnagyobb napelem előállítója, és a világ egyik legjelentősebb szélturbina-generátor készítője, vállalta, hogy fejleszti nap- és szélenergia termelését is. Kérem a Bizottságot és tagállamokat is, hogy törekedjenek arra, hogy Tajvan is, ahogy minden elkötelezett szövetséges részt vehessen ebben a munkában, csatlakozhasson az egyezményhez, hogy 2020-ra illetve 2050-re elérhessük kitűzött céljainak a klímaváltozás kapcsán.

3-712-000

**Róża Gräfin von Thun und Hohenstein (PPE).** - Panie Przewodniczący! Bardzo dobrze, że takie pytanie zostało zadane Radzie i Komisji. A to pytanie dotyczy wspólnego głosu Unii Europejskiej podczas konferencji klimatycznej COP 19, konferencji klimatycznej ONZ, która odbędzie się w Warszawie, z czego jestem niezwykle zadowolona i chyba mogę powiedzieć, że jestem z tego dumna. Na tę konferencję pod koniec tego roku solidnie się przygotowujemy, bo zdajemy sobie sprawę z tego – i tu w zupełności zgadzam się z panią komisarz – że najważniejsze jest to, żeby Europa mówiła jednym głosem. Ale trzeba też sobie zdawać sprawę z tego, że musimy do tego tematu podchodzić globalnie, tzn. nawet ponadeuropejsko, prawda? Żeby osiągnąć ten wynik, musimy więcej rozmawiać z obywatelami, potrzebujemy więcej konsultacji, więcej kontaktów, lepszej debaty. To też powinniśmy przygotować i o tym także powinniśmy mówić pod koniec roku w Warszawie.

Tak, Pani Komisarz, to wspólne stanowisko jest konieczne, ale muszę też przyłączyć się do innych głosów, które padały już dzisiaj na tej sali. Wspólne stanowisko będzie możliwe, kiedy weźmiemy pod uwagę różniące się polityki państw członkowskich. Ograniczamy emisje, wspieramy odnawialne źródła energii, ale musimy tak samo korzystać np. z gazu łupkowego. Europa posiada bardzo znaczne złoża tego surowca. Za zmiany klimatyczne muszą odpowiadać wszyscy emitenci, więc nie będzie globalnego porozumienia bez takich krajów jak Chiny, Brazylia czy Indie, ale musimy do tego podjąć skuteczne działania. Musimy się zastanowić, jak Europa może przekonać tych partnerów do większego zaangażowania. Może powinniśmy poruszyć te kontrowersyjne tematy, jak np. zawieranie umów o wolnym handlu a redukcja gazów cieplarnianych czy udzielanie pomocy

rozwojowych a stosunek do nowego porozumienia klimatycznego. Jeżeli tego nie zrobimy, to pośrednio też jesteśmy emitentami.

3-713-000

**Romana Jordan (PPE).** - Danes smo na glasovanjih glasovali o resoluciji o konferenci CITES, ki je po mojem ena izmed zelo uspešnih konferenc, kjer je bil dosežen mednarodni dogovor, iz katerega se lahko tudi mi veliko naučimo.

Pomembna sporočila s teh pogajanj so predvsem tri, in sicer, prvič, na tej konferenci je bilo jasno, kaj je tisto zlo, ki ga želimo preprečiti. Drugič, resnična želja, motiv in volja velike večine držav, da ukrepajo. In tretjič, pravična porazdelitev odgovornosti.

Petkrat sem že sodelovala na konferencah za podnebne spremembe in zdi se mi, da nobeden od teh treh pogojev ni uresničen. Prvič, mislim, da večina držav si resnično ne želi ukrepanja. Drugič, da tudi pravične porazdelitve odgovornosti ni, saj se je za nadaljevanje Kjotskega protokola odločila le peščica držav, med njimi predvsem evropske države in Avstralija, ki skupaj predstavljajo samo 15 procentov izpustov. In tretjič, tudi jasne definicije zla nimamo, saj izhajamo od spodaj navzgor in tako izgubljam tisto rdečo nit, ki pa je, da se moramo dogovoriti, za koliko bodo države znižale izpuste, da bodo bremena za zmanjšanje globalnega segrevanja pravično porazdeljena.

Komisarka, jaz spoštujem vašo energijo, ki jo imate, da vztrajate na teh pogajanjih. Vendar pa vas zdaj pozivam, da se v nadaljnjih pogajanjih osredotočite na en problem, to pa je na pravično zmanjšanje emisij v državah in da se ne zgubljam na ostalih področjih, ki niso tako pomembna.

In drugo vprašanje je, ki ga želim zastaviti Komisiji in Svetu: kaj je plan B, kaj je načrt B poleg načrta A? V mednarodnih pogajanjih moramo biti fleksibilni in moramo računati na to, da nam ne bo uspelo izkoristiti oziroma doseči do popolnosti vsega, za kar si prizadevamo. In zato vas sprašujem, kako fleksibilni smo.

3-714-000

*Catch-the-eye-Verfahren*

3-715-000

**Bogusław Sonik (PPE).** - Panie Przewodniczący! Zgadząmy się co do tego, że trzeba walczyć ze zmianami klimatycznymi i wprowadzać różnego rodzaju przepisy i artykuły, które będą powodowały, że będziemy mogli po prostu powiedzieć, że rzeczywiście jesteśmy skuteczni. Natomiast problemem jest niestety ideologiczne podejście, które skazuje z góry węgiel kamienny oraz gaz łupkowy jako te źródła energii, które są niepotrzebne Europie. I tutaj bym chciał Panią Komisarz poprosić, aby odeszła od takiego ideologicznego podejścia, aby skupiła się na tym, że możemy również i w tej materii dojść do porozumienia po prostu. Zachęcam do tego podejścia...

*Przewodniczący odebrał mówcy głos.*

3-716-000

**Elena Băsescu (PPE).** - Conferința de la Doha a marcat un pas important în adoptarea unui cadru global privind schimbările climatice. Acest cadru reprezintă un obiectiv major, care va defini un nou mod de dezvoltare sustenabilă la nivel global. În condițiile în care

Protocolul de la Kyoto nu a reușit să reducă emisiile la nivel global, este clar că avem nevoie de un instrument mai puternic.

Pe lângă sursele de energie regenerabilă, consider că și gazele de șist ar putea contribui la reducerea emisiilor de carbon. Dau exemplul Statelor Unite, unde exploatarea gazelor de șist a redus emisiile de carbon, determinând producătorii de electricitate să înlocuiască centralele pe cărbuni cu cele pe gaze. De aceea și țara mea urmărește diversificarea surselor de aprovizionare cu energie, în vederea asigurării independenței energetice și reducerii emisiilor.

3-717-000

*(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)*

3-718-000

**Lucinda Creighton**, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I would like to thank the Honourable Members for their contribution to this very important debate.

I agree with the many contributions which said that this is an urgent matter and that we have to address it as such, and in a coherent and effective manner. That is one of the biggest global challenges that we face, but it is one that the EU and our Member States can take the lead on in shaping a new legally binding agreement for all. That is our clear objective. That is the objective of the Irish Presidency and it is the objective of all of the European institutions.

Listening to the comments here, all our institutions share that ambition to take real action which can embrace, and indeed champion, the move to a low-carbon and more sustainable economy. That is what we have to work towards.

Each of us has opportunities to actively engage and to promote more concerted and ambitious action by other countries besides the European Union. I would encourage all of you to continue to speak to your counterparts and to try to build momentum towards 2015, which is what we will be doing.

I will address a number of points that were specifically made and the questions asked. Mr Eickhout asked what the Irish Presidency is doing about leading on the development of a 2030 target. As I said in my introduction, as the Presidency we are working closely with the Commission. We are facilitating a debate at ministerial level at the forthcoming informal Council meeting in April, which will involve both energy and environment ministers. This will make an important contribution to driving the debate forward.

On the issue of climate finance, which was raised by a number of contributors, the Irish Presidency intends to move forward the analysis, and indeed the debate, on climate finance, especially in relation to future finance flows. The EU has fully met its fast-start finance contribution of over EUR 7 billion, and in Doha countries have made pledges over EUR 5 billion for 2013 and beyond. We want to make further progress and to ensure that we deliver effective financial assistance to the least-developed countries. That work is ongoing and we will continue it.

The Irish Presidency is working collaboratively with all Member States, including Poland, and with our other partners through the UNFCCC groupings, in order to further clarify and to better understand our respective positions and to find ways to move closer to an agreed solution.

That is the process. It is a process of achieving consensus and of moving together and finding ways in which we can move forward. That is precisely the role of us as Presidency and it is precisely what we are trying to do in the Council.

In response to Mr Gerbrandy's question, the Irish Presidency will do its utmost to engage with Parliament. We will also ensure that the key messages which have been sent here this evening will be communicated back to Council and to Member States.

There are a just a few other points which were raised and which I would like to address. Ms Anderson suggested that the Irish Presidency should work to identify clear milestones and targets. We will do that, but it is not just the Irish Presidency. It is important that we do this in a coherent fashion. It is the reason why we have trio Presidencies now. We are working very closely with the Lithuanian and the Greek Presidencies – the future Presidencies – in order to identify those milestones. We are doing that with the very important assistance of, and stimulation from, the European Commission. It is our common objective to get an agreement by 2015.

I agree with Mr Arsenis that we need to accelerate our work and develop clear targets and milestones, not just for the EU and its Member States but in partnership with our allies. It is very important that we build alliances and that we reach out to other groupings, regions and countries to build partnerships and to ensure that our position is most effective.

The Irish Presidency, and the entire Council, recognises that we cannot simply wait for a 2020 climate-effective world. Under the ADP we are prioritising actions to improve emissions mitigation now. A number of those steps have already been highlighted by the Commissioner, and I do not propose to go over them again.

I would simply say in conclusion that I understand that there are very strong feelings here in the Chamber and very strong views right across the European Parliament and in the other institutions urging us to drive forward with our climate negotiation process and do it by showing leadership, both within Council and within the other European institutions, and to make every effort to maintain positive dialogue between the institutions. This is why this process here in the European Parliament is so valuable and why we, as the Presidency and on behalf of the Council, will continue our positive engagement with you as we move forward over the weeks and months ahead.

3-719-000

**Connie Hedegaard,** *Member of the Commission* . – Mr President, first we should acknowledge the fact that since Doha the world has been negotiating on only one track; not in the old two-track system. That is a major accomplishment for the European Union, and we should acknowledge that. We should also realise that that is the first step, but to go where we need to go will be extremely challenging.

So that is why I greatly value both the discussion here today and the reflections and input from Parliament. Mr Florens, Mr Carvalho and Mr Seeber, and other Members have asked what is on the European to-do list. That is why we are preparing a paper to stimulate that discussion with Member States, with the European Parliament and with different stakeholders.

What should be the focus? What is the priority? This paper cannot exist in a vacuum. We have to define these things both in the light of where we ideally would like to go and, of course, in the light of to where it is possible to get our partners to move. It is a very much

on purpose that we want to start that discussion now, because if we do not start it by 2014 or 2015 very valuable time will be lost.

Dan Jørgensen asked me why the Commission does not tell the Council to use majority voting. One of the answers is that we know that many Member States are against such a thing. I would say to Mr Jørgensen – who has gone now – that more Member States are against that than one would think. So that is not an easy thing. In our discussions today it is very important to send a strong message from Parliament: the very strong wish that Europe can find its common denominator.

But that common denominator should not be a low one. Bas Eickhout was very right to emphasise the need for Europe to get its policies ready for 2030 very soon, because that will be part of discussions up to 2015. That is why the discussion has already started in the Commission. Our work programme for this year includes presenting what could be a way forward, moving beyond our 2020 targets to 2030. I really, really hope that we can have a strong cooperation with this Parliament. Mr Seeber implicitly asked me whether the European Union had delivered what we pledged in Kyoto and what we pledged financially. Yes we have; that should be said loud and clear: yes we have.

It is also clear that we have delivered more than most. But it is also clear, unfortunately, that we have not delivered enough, according to what science tells us. That is why we in Europe have to speed up efforts.

Many in this room today said that we should do more, and with urgency, on energy efficiency and with renewables. I would say, yes, of course. As you know, I agree with all of that. But therefore it is also essential to get the tools right. One of the key tools we have is the emissions trading scheme; the idea of putting a price on carbon.

One lesson learnt from Europe by Korea, China, California, Australia and many other parts of the world where they are starting to make climate policies concerns carbon and emissions trading, and I agree with what Mr Arsenis said. When they start to define their targets they ask how to do this in a cost-efficient way, and then they come to the solution of having some kind of pricing of carbon and emissions trading. That is why it is very important, not only that the Member States get their act together but – I very much hope – that this Parliament gets its act together on this very crucial thing.

Ms Wils, Mr Liese and others said it is very important to continue the work with developing countries, small island states, and the most vulnerable countries, and of course we are doing that. We are about to send out invitations for new consultations with them, continuing the good work. It is not a coalition, it is not an alliance. It is very important to understand that it is not something very formal because that would make a lot of people wonder whether a new group in the UN was being formed. It is not a formal group, but we are simply working with other ambitious countries. This is absolutely key to what we can achieve in 2015.

The final two points. Shale gas has been mentioned several times. I just want to make it clear that nobody at the European Union or the European Commission is preventing any Member State from going into shale gas. The energy mix in the future, as now, will be up to each individual Member State. So those who want to move forward on that can do so.

There is one thing we need to understand, and that is that everyone who knows this business, this area, tells us that you can make shale gas in Europe, but do not believe it will be as



cheap as the energy they have in the United States because, unfortunately, we do not have areas like North Dakota where there are almost no people living there.

We do have shale gas deposits in other kinds of geological formations and so on and so forth. No matter how we put it, shale gas and gas can be fine as a bridging technology, but it does not change the fact that if we want to go to a low-carbon society by 2050 and follow what science tells us is necessary in climate, then that will not be enough.

My last point: several Members have mentioned creating alliances. Mr Liese said that we should reach out to Mr Kerry; this is already being done. I will go to Washington later this month to meet with the new people in Washington. We should now listen to Present Obama, who in his inauguration speech claimed that he wants to do more in climate in his second term than in the first.

That sounds good to many of us, to Europeans it sounds very good, but we also have to make sure that that also means that we will see a stronger involvement from the US in the international negotiations. But I agree with those who say that if there is any American politician who really understands this, that is Mr Kerry.

Finally, there was the point that we should remember what others are doing. That is good advice. Almost 100 countries now have climate targets. Brazil, China, many big economies, many of our competitors are actually starting work. They are not doing enough, they should do even more, and that is what the difficult talks up to 2015 will be about for all of us. It would be a pity now to stand idly by when other big economies get the message and actually start to move forward, and when the World Bank, and the IMF leaders can stand in Davos and say you 'cannot address the economic challenges of this century unless you understand climate change and do something about it'.

We should take that message in Europe not as a bad sign but as a very good sign that some of the things we have been advocating are starting to be listened to in other headquarters. Therefore, we should not give in to short-term thinking. Our strength in Europe has normally been that we can think beyond the short term. If there is anything that we need in climate change it is the ability to do that, and to incorporate our economic issues, growth needs and our job needs into our intelligent climate policies. That is the trinity that we need to address in Europe and we need to be better at handling it so that we can improve in all three areas at once.

3-720-000

**Der Präsident.** – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

### ***Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149 GO)***

3-720-003

**Cristian Silviu Buşoi (ALDE), în scris.** – Când vine vorba de schimbarea climatică, statele membre trebuie să mențină și la Varșovia o poziție comună și o perspectivă pe termen lung, la fel cum s-a întâmplat și la ultima conferință UNFCCC care a avut loc la finele anului trecut în Doha. UE trebuie să-și asume rolul de lider global în combaterea efectelor schimbării climatice și să promoveze în continuare o agendă ambițioasă pe acest subiect. Europa trebuie să conducă prin exemplu și să își onoreze angajamentele luate privind reducerea emisiilor de CO<sub>2</sub> și a reducerii temperaturii globale. De aceea, UE trebuie să continue să investească în energiile alternative. În același timp, UE trebuie să aibă un rol

activ și hotărâtor în privința noilor politici climatice stabilite pentru perioada post 2020, iar acest lucru poate fi facilitat în special prin faptul că anul acesta și în 2015 conferințele UNFCC vor avea loc în Polonia și respectiv Franța.

## 16. Zusammensetzung der Ausschüsse und der Delegationen: siehe Protokoll

## 17. Juristische Aus- und Fortbildung - Gerichtskoordinatoren (Aussprache)

3-723-000

**Der Präsident.** – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Anfrage zur mündlichen Beantwortung an die Kommission über juristische Aus- und Fortbildung – Gerichtskoordinatoren von Klaus-Heiner Lehne, Luigi Berlinguer, Cecilia Wikström, Eva Lichtenberger, Francesco Enrico Speroni, Tadeusz Zwiefka im Namen des Rechtsausschusses (O-000186/2012 – B7-0112/2013) (2012/2864(RSP)).

3-724-000

**Tadeusz Zwiefka,** *autor*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Szanowny Panie Komisarzu! To już kolejny – powtarzam kolejny, niestety – raz, kiedy członkowie Komisji Prawnej nawołują Komisję Europejską i państwa członkowskie do zwrócenia należytej uwagi na problem szkolenia kadr wymiaru sprawiedliwości w kontekście lepszej znajomości, a co za tym idzie lepszego stosowania unijnego prawa. Jest to podstawa sprawnego funkcjonowania wymiaru sprawiedliwości w całej Unii Europejskiej, a nasze argumenty powtarzamy już od wielu lat i są one dobrze znane. Znajomość prawa unijnego, systemów prawa poszczególnych państw członkowskich oraz specjalistyczne kursy językowe to przede wszystkim zapewnienie obywatelom Unii Europejskiej dostępu do sprawiedliwie przebiegających procesów.

Słusznie podkreśla proponowana przez nas rezolucja, że sąd i sędzia krajowy to sąd i sędzia unijny, a prawo krajowe to już w zdecydowanej większości prawo unijne. Opieszałość w tym obszarze może tylko i wyłącznie odbijać się negatywnie na naszych obywatelach.

Bardzo prosiłbym zainteresowane strony o baczne przyjrzenie się naszym postulatam, utworzenie instytucji koordynatora sądowego ds. prawa unijnego. Sugerowałbym także lepsze wykorzystanie możliwości, jakie daje nam współczesna technologia komunikowania się i wymiany praktyk oraz doświadczeń między pracownikami wymiaru sprawiedliwości różnych sądów czy udostępnianie poprzez internet wiedzy prawniczej. Oszczędzi to zarówno czas, jak i koszty.

Chciałbym też zwrócić uwagę po raz kolejny na niezwykle ważny aspekt: dobrych unijnych sędziów, praktyków prawa, będziemy mieli wówczas, kiedy zadamy o właściwe ich przygotowanie już na pierwszym etapie szkolenia, czyli na uniwersyteckich studiach prawniczych, gdzie powinni się uczyć prawa krajowego, wspólnotowego, ale także języków obcych i kontaktów z innymi, by potem móc stosować te umiejętności w praktyce.

3-725-000

**Evelyn Regner,** *author*. – Mr President, Luigi Berlinguer from the Socialist Group is the co-author of this report. He is the heart and the engine of the whole topic and is extremely enthusiastic about it. Therefore I would like to thank him.

The creation of a true and effective area of freedom and justice in Europe cannot be completed without the introduction of a deep judicial culture based on mutual trust within the different national systems. There has been a fundamental change in Parliament's approach towards judicial training in this legislature. This is also due to Parliament's strong and forward-looking position and, in particular, to the reflections hosted by the Committee on Legal Affairs in this House.

The entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty and the objectives set down in the Stockholm Programme have paved the way for a substantial increase in the level of European Union activity in the field of judicial cooperation. The Stockholm Programme outlines in particular the importance of strengthening the establishment of a truly European judicial culture which fully respects the principles of subsidiarity and judicial independence. This is also one of the top priorities for policy in the area of freedom, security and justice and therefore for Parliament's Committee on Legal Affairs. This is a top priority of the Socialist Group in the area of freedom, security and justice.

Over the coming years, Member States will in fact be called upon to implement existing legislative and non-legislative instruments in this field, as well as to participate in the adoption of new instruments. However, this increased law-making activity must proceed in parallel with a harmonious and effective practical application of these tools. In this respect, the role of the members of the judiciary and judicial staff becomes crucial.

European judicial training should therefore take a new shape and dimension. The idea behind this, which Parliament has tried to promote during the last two years with its numerous resolutions, is to promote a bottom-up approach. This will involve Member States' national associations of legal professionals, such as lawyers, judges and universities, in compliance with the principle of subsidiarity. We therefore welcome the experience in the Netherlands with Eurinfra and its network of court coordinators for European law, which has been emulated by other Member States, in particular Italy, with its European Gaius Project, Denmark, Romania and Bulgaria.

Those experiences are designed around three pillars: improving the accessibility of European law information resources using web technology, improving knowledge of European law among the judiciary, and establishing and maintaining a network of court coordinators for European law. There is no excuse today for ignorance of European law. National judges are, and must be, European judges, called upon to play a fundamental role in a situation in which we will need more Europe.

This does not preclude fostering a European judicial culture in which diversity is celebrated as a common good. We should promote the idea of national court coordinators with European law and their interconnection at European level. In particular the main function of an interconnected network of court coordinators would be to enable judges to readily confer on their day-to-day work with their counterparts in other Member States on matters such as the interpretation of the applicable European law in a secure, digital environment. These circles of coherence would make for greater uniformity in the application of European Union law, while reducing the number of references for preliminary rulings, without detracting from the role of the Court of Justice.

In developing such search engines for searching judgments, opinions and European Union law in general, Member States should consider whether this technology might not benefit the judiciary in other Member States as well, in which case technology can be pooled, coordinated and developed in common.

Finally I would just like to thank Mr Zwiefka for his good cooperation and also for the support in the group in the Committee on Legal Affairs.

3-726-000

**Algirdas Šemeta**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the European legal culture is made up of a diversity of legal systems that are progressively brought closer to each other. Europe's legal diversity is a source of strength. Article 67 of the Treaty makes it clear that respect for the different legal systems and traditions of the Member States underpins the Union's area of justice.

Through more cooperation between legal practitioners in the different Member States, exchanges of experience and judicial training, we can promote the rule of law and strengthen the mutual trust between these different legal systems. We can indeed bring these different legal cultures together without eliminating the differences. European judicial training is a crucial tool to achieve that goal. Legal practitioners must have a good knowledge of EU law. They must have trust in the different national judicial systems in order to apply European law correctly all over the European Union. As the EU's legal order interacts with diverse national legal traditions and systems often built upon continual layers of history, this requires first of all well-informed and well-trained legal practitioners.

In September 2011, the Commission set out its objective to enable half of the legal practitioners in the European Union to participate in European judicial training activities by 2020. This involves the use of all available resources at local, national and European level. Since 2011 the Commission has been taking action with national authorities and with the support of the European networks such as the European Judicial Training Network, the European Law Academy and the European Law Institute. The Commission values the fact that Parliament shares the Commission's vision and ambition on this subject.

As regards the specific questions I would like to highlight the following. First, regarding the length of time taken to award contracts. There have not been any unusual delays in the implementation of the pilot project. The pilot project was published on time, applicants were given the usual deadlines and three out of the four contracts are in the process of being signed this month.

As regards the second question on how account is taken of the Conference of Coordinators of European Law, representatives of the Commission were present at the Conference in The Hague last September. We welcomed the debate on having EU law court coordinators within the national court structure. However, we need to keep in mind that organisation of the judiciaries is a matter for Member States alone. We should also avoid duplication of tasks with the established European judicial networks in civil and commercial as well as in criminal matters.

Regarding the third question about investment in modern tools, the Commission continues to develop the European e-Justice Portal to give citizens and legal practitioners access to information. The judicial training section of the portal is being developed. It will serve as a single entry point for trainers and legal practitioners looking for training content. The first training content will be available online in a matter of weeks.

The Commission is also willing to support financially the development of high quality e-learning. The development of two training models on EU cross-border family law including e-learning courses has been tendered as part of a pilot project in 2012. E-learning courses may be helpful in certain areas but they cannot replace personal contacts between

legal practitioners from different jurisdictions. Personal contact is necessary to build mutual trust and to exchange ideas.

Furthermore, e-learning tools are only one possible way of addressing the time restrictions preventing legal professionals from participating more often in exchanges and specific training. However, time restrictions would have less impact if continuous training were to be duly taken into account by the Member States when calculating the workload of judges and prosecutors.

Regarding the fourth question on broadening the scope, the Commission communication of September 2011 makes it clear that it intends to target training activities at all legal practitioners. This includes judges, prosecutors, court staff, lawyers and other legal professions. The Commission also supports future knowledge partnerships between universities, judicial schools and bar associations to develop innovative training solutions. However, the EU has no competence to regulate the curriculum and teaching of law at European universities.

3-727-000

**Erminia Mazzoni**, *a nome del gruppo PPE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, questa interrogazione trova la sua origine anche in un’iniziativa che ho avuto l’onore di promuovere insieme all’on. Berlinguer. Era l’iniziativa di un progetto pilota presentato nel 2011 e poi introitato al bilancio del 2012. Un progetto pilota sulla formazione giudiziaria europea che ha trovato l’accoglimento del Parlamento e della Commissione e che quindi ha seguito le fasi che poi il Commissario oggi ci ha raccontato.

In quel progetto c’era come elemento di novità, del quale vado fiera, il tentativo di trasformare e di introdurre il concetto di formazione giuridica, andando oltre l’impostazione di Leaken della formazione giudiziaria dedicata ai soli magistrati, per incominciare a parlare della categoria delle professioni giuridiche – quindi avvocati, magistrati, pubblici ministeri – insieme espressione di una filiera istituzionale del diritto che deve rimanere unita.

L’intenzione, quando abbiamo presentato quel progetto pilota, era di dare un avvio all’implementazione dello spazio comune di libertà, giustizia e sicurezza, che abbiamo interpretato, cercando di rimanere coerenti in quella nostra iniziativa, con gli obiettivi del Protocollo di Stoccolma. Abbiamo appunto immaginato che, se non si avviava un percorso formativo che superasse le distanze e le differenze tra i paesi, ma in maniera non invadente e non invasiva in modo da non toccare – come ha ricordato il Commissario – l’autonomia e la sovranità nazionale in questo settore, noi non avremmo dato un contributo reale a soddisfare le esigenze di un’implementazione della costruzione europea.

Oggi una sollecitazione, non solo perché credo che i tempi siano importanti in assoluto, ma anche perché in un momento di debolezza dell’Unione europea la garanzia dei diritti che solo la fiducia reciproca e l’uniformità ...

*(Il Presidente interrompe l’oratore)*

3-728-000

**Cecilia Wikström**, *för ALDE-gruppen*. – Herr talman! Jag är en person som tror att de utmaningar vi står inför i Europa bara kan lösas på område efter område, genom att vi arbetar så mycket vi kan för att lära oss mer om varandra och öka förståelsen för varandra

och på det sättet, när det gäller det juridiska området, lära oss förstå och bygga en gemensam rättskultur.

Jag är också övertygad om att vi måste se till att ha en välfungerande europeisk lagstiftningsprocess – ett maskineri om man så vill – om vi vill nå framgång på lång sikt. Jag tror att stärkt rättslig utbildning är ett ämne som sällan eller aldrig får utrymme i stats- och regeringschefernas högtidstal, men det är ett väldigt konkret och praktiskt område där vi med små insatser kan åstadkomma stora resultat för att stärka sammanhållningen och förståelsen för de olika rättsliga traditionerna på vår kontinent och i förlängningen få en fördjupad förståelse för de olika lagar som vi också fattar beslut om i denna kammare.

Jag, och hela den liberala gruppen med mig, är övertygad om att satsningar på rättslig utbildning av hög kvalitet skulle kunna fungera som olja i ett beslutsmaskineri som i dessa dagar tyvärr allt oftare skär sig och präglas av brist på tillit, stor osäkerhet och misstro mot varandra. För att råda bot mot detta behöver vi öka förståelsen. Jean Monnet sade en gång att den Europeiska unionen inte har kommit till för att föra samman nationer utan för att föra samman människor.

Jag tror personligen att utbildningen för Europas jurister från alla medlemsländer är ett lysande exempel på hur vi gestaltar detta i vår tid.

3-729-000

**Eva Lichtenberger**, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, werte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Aus- und Weiterbildung von Richtern und von Anwendern von Rechtsnormen ist heute leider noch immer viel zu sehr national fokussiert. Dazu kommt, dass fast jede nationale Gruppe der Ansicht ist, dass ausschließlich ihr Rechtssystem das beste aller denkbaren ist. Dabei könnten wir so viel voneinander lernen und dabei Vertrauen aufbauen. Auch wenn es um die Anwendung europäischen Rechts und um die unterschiedliche Auslegung geht.

Es gibt eine klare Erfordernis, weil grenzüberschreitende Problemstellungen ständig zunehmen und weil die Uniformität der Rechtsanwendung natürlich auch ein Anspruch von Bürgerinnen und Bürgern ist. Das erfordert Fortbildung, hochprofessionell organisiert. Dazu gehören die Rechtskoordinatoren, und dazu gehören auch elektronische Hilfsmittel, die in einer sicheren Umgebung entwickelt werden müssen. Die Auslegung geltenden Europarechts in verschiedenen Mitgliedstaaten wird zentral, auch für die Umsetzung. Dazu braucht es aber auch nicht nur Plattformen, nicht nur elektronische Hilfsmittel, sondern auch Begegnungen.

Wir merken heute, dass immer weniger Menschen im öffentlichen Dienst auf Fortbildungen geschickt werden, denn im Zuge der Finanzkrise wird das als Allererstes eingespart. Aber hier wird ganz klar am falschen Platz gespart. Bürgerinnen und Bürger haben einen Anspruch auf gute Rechtsanwendung.

3-730-000

*Catch-the-eye-Verfahren*

3-731-000

**Elena Băsescu (PPE)**. – Pentru definitivarea spațiului de libertate, securitate și justiție, ar trebui stabilite norme comune de pregătire și instruire a celor care își desfășoară activitatea în instanțe. De asemenea, persoanele care profesază dreptul în statele membre ar trebui

să aibă un set minim de cunoștințe de legislație europeană. Includerea dreptului european între materiile obligatorii care se studiază în facultățile de drept poate fi o soluție. De aceea, consider și eu că implementarea proiectului-pilot propus de Parlamentul European trebuie să aibă loc cât mai repede.

Astfel, s-ar putea realiza o coordonare între pregătirea oferită de școlile de formare judiciară din statele membre. În contextul reformei justiției din România, și magistrații din țara mea ar putea beneficia de un astfel de schimb de experiență. Astfel, s-ar putea continua îmbunătățirea activității instanțelor și reduce durata procedurilor judiciare.

3-732-000

**Jaroslav Paška (EFD).** - V otvorenom európskom priestore, kde garantujeme voľný pohyb občanov a jednotný trhový priestor, musíme počítať aj s tým, že tak v oblasti občianskych vzťahov, ako aj v obchodných veciach bude dochádzať k rôznym nedorozumeniam a sporom. Naše členské krajiny majú rôznorodé právne systémy historicky založené na rozdielnych tradíciách. Pre spravodlivé efektívne riešenie cezhraničných sporov v štruktúre rozdielnych právnych systémov zastrešených spoločným právom Únie je potrebné vytvoriť podmienky pre našich sudcov, aby si mohli rozšíriť svoje odborné spôsobilosti tak, aby sa vedeli efektívnejšie vysporiadať s rozhodovaním zložitých sporov, pri ktorých sa prelínajú pravidlá z viacerých právnych systémov. Nástrojom, ktorý mal napomôcť rozšírenie prístupu k odbornej príprave k právam Európskej únie v rámci systému súdnictva členských štátov, bol pilotný projekt, ktorý mal prebiehať od roku 2012. Preto Komisii pripomíname, že je našim spoločným záujmom, aby sme v tejto príprave sudcov čo najvýraznejšie pokročili.

3-733-000

*(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)*

3-734-000

**Algirdas Šemeta,** *Member of the Commission* . – Mr President, European Union law permeates a wide number and diverse range of activities at national level. Its impact on the daily life of citizens and businesses is high, as Union law creates rights and obligations which national courts must safeguard. And European law is not static, but results from a dynamic and open process of lawmaking and legal interpretation. This means that every national lawyer and every national judge must also be a European law expert. They must be capable of interpreting and effectively enforcing EU law alongside their own domestic law, and in the Union's decentralised legal system national judges must become true Union law judges to be able to comply with their responsibilities.

The national judge has therefore become the frontline judge of European Union law, and legal practitioners and authorities will be called upon increasingly in the European area of justice to understand and apply decisions made in other Member States. They will also be called upon to live up to common minimum standards so that authorities in other countries will be able to trust those decisions. Meeting these challenges requires, first of all, well-informed and well-trained legal practitioners.

The Commission also agrees that judicial training needs to be complemented by other means, such as easy access to judicial decisions. Networks of court coordinators on EU law could contribute to this aim. However, they need to complement existing judicial networks in order to avoid duplications.

The Commission will, in close cooperation with Parliament, continue working on the tracks laid down in the Communication of September 2011 to meet the objective of enabling half of the legal practitioners in the European Union to participate in European judicial training activities by 2020. This will be achieved through the use of all available resources at local, national and European level. The Commission thanks Parliament and appreciates its steadfast support on matters of judicial training.

3-735-000

**Der Präsident.** – Zum Abschluss der Aussprache wurde gemäß Artikel 115 Absatz 5 der Geschäftsordnung ein Entschließungsantrag <sup>(2)</sup> eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Donnerstag, 7. Februar 2013, um 12.00 Uhr statt.

Zwischendurch für alle, die es interessieren könnte: Es steht 0:0 beim Spiel Frankreich gegen Deutschland.

## **18. Verwendung traditioneller Bezeichnungen für Weine aus den Vereinigten Staaten (Aussprache)**

3-737-000

**Der Präsident.** – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Erklärung der Kommission zur Verwendung traditioneller Bezeichnungen für Weine aus den Vereinigten Staaten (2013/2519(RSP)).

3-738-000

**Algirdas Šemeta**, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the use of certain traditional terms to describe wine is a long-established practice in the European Union. Following the 2008 wine reform, a common framework laid down the rules concerning the recognition, protection and use of such traditional terms. It defined, in particular, a new procedure to confer protection. This procedure affects both EU and third-country wine marketed in the European Union.

The US has always been sceptical about the EU traditional terms policy and therefore took a very critical approach regarding this policy. The 2006 EU-US wine agreement constituted a first step in the discussion on traditional terms between the US and the EU as it provided for an exception for the use of the term 'château' for US wines imported into the EU which have a traditional presentation and a trademark registered in the EU before 10 March 2006. Moreover, a transitional period of three years was allowed for US wines bearing EU traditional terms, such as 'château', to be marketed on the EU market. This transitional period expired in March 2009.

In June 2010 the two most important US wine associations, Wine America and the Wine Institute, applied for the recognition of 'château' in the EU as a traditional term for US wines imported into the EU. The term 'château', besides French wines, is used by Luxembourg, Italian, Chilean and Canadian wines. The definition included in the application is close, but not identical, to the term already protected for EU Member States.

---

(2) Siehe Protokoll.



Following the examination in accordance with the new EU procedure, the application was published for the purpose of establishing whether there were any objections. In this context, France opposed this recognition, arguing that the proposed US conditions for the use of the term 'château' would mislead French consumers. The Commission is aware of the sensitivity of this issue. The Commission is still evaluating the case and will take the time needed to carry out an in-depth assessment of the situation.

3-739-000

**Astrid Lulling**, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, me voici à nouveau à cette tribune pour défendre la filière vitivinicole européenne, notre patrimoine, nos traditions, notre propriété intellectuelle, bref un secteur où l'Europe est encore un champion comme producteur et exportateur.

Après le vin rosé, les droits de plantation, il s'agit cette fois, comme vous l'avez dit, de faire comprendre à la Commission qu'il ne peut être question de laisser les États-Unis abuser ad vitam aeternam des mentions traditionnelles "Château" et "Clos" pour leurs vins commercialisés sur le territoire de l'Union européenne.

En aucun cas, Monsieur le Commissaire, pour quelque raison de politique de commerce extérieur que ce soit, vous ne pouvez faire de concessions aux États-Unis pour pérenniser l'utilisation abusive de nos appellations et créer ainsi des distorsions de concurrence aux dépens des vins de qualité européens. En plus, vous ignorez la condition sine qua non de définition juridique commune du terme "Château", qui n'est pas remplie. D'ailleurs, pourquoi la Commission a-t-elle publié au Journal officiel une définition qui ne correspond nullement à celle publiée en 2009 par la partie demanderesse américaine?

Je sais que le droit communautaire permet de reconnaître une réglementation d'une organisation professionnelle d'un pays tiers, mais encore doit-elle être cohérente et sérieuse, et ce n'est pas le cas ici. Je sais, Monsieur le Commissaire, qu'il n'est pas agréable de remplacer votre collègue ici, mais je dois dire ce si cette question est technique, elle est aussi hautement politique. Passez le message à M. Ciołoş: il faut cesser de récidiver dans ce cas.

3-740-000

**Paolo De Castro**, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, quella di oggi è un'occasione importante per affrontare con impegno e responsabilità un tema strategico nell'ambito della politica agricola quale è quello della tutela e della protezione delle produzioni agroalimentari europee.

In un periodo in cui si registrano sempre più diffusamente fenomeni di imitazione dei prodotti di qualità certificata, la notizia della proposta di regolamento per autorizzare i termini tradizionali "chateau" e "clos" per i vini prodotti negli Stati Uniti e commercializzati nel mercato comunitario desta particolare preoccupazione e stupore.

Signor Commissario, è fuor di dubbio che ci troviamo di fronte a pratiche commerciali che rischiano, da un lato, di indurre in errore i consumatori finali al momento del loro acquisto e, dall'altro, di determinare ricadute negative di carattere economico e sociale per gli operatori delle filiere produttive di qualità. Un rischio che oggi riguarda il vino "chateau" e "clos" ma che, come abbiamo più volte sottolineato negli ultimi anni, mette in pericolo l'intero patrimonio europeo dei prodotti di qualità certificata. Ricordo i falsi "prosecco", "riocha", "champagne". Abbiamo eccellenze alimentari che tutto il mondo ci invidia, che

hanno uno straordinario impatto economico e sociale e che quindi dobbiamo difendere con tutte le nostre forze.

Per quanto riguarda il vino, l'accordo commerciale tra Stati Uniti ed Europa del 2006 è stato disatteso tanto da determinare, nel 2009, la sospensione delle autorizzazioni per le esportazioni di vini statunitensi che utilizzavano le espressioni tradizionali prima richiamate. Eppure, la nostra è senza dubbio la legislazione più all'avanguardia che esiste al mondo in materia di tutela e trasparenza alimentare. Le disposizioni per il mercato vitivinicolo contenute nel regolamento comunitario (CE) n. 479/2008 e più in generale le regole del pacchetto qualità, per le quali ci siamo battuti recentemente qui in commissione e in quest'Aula, sono la testimonianza degli sforzi che abbiamo sostenuto contro le imitazioni e le usurpazioni dei prodotti europei certificati. Sforzi che rischiano di essere vanificati dalla possibilità che i produttori al di fuori del sistema delle regole comunitarie possano tradurre i minori vincoli a cui sono sottoposti in maggiori vantaggi competitivi.

Ecco perché, signor Presidente, oggi siamo qui per chiedere alla Commissione, ancora una volta, che sia garantito un mercato più trasparente, orientato al concetto della cosiddetta reciprocità delle regole commerciali, per favorire la prospettiva di una maggiore convergenza a livello internazionale degli standard qualitativi applicati dall'Unione europea.

3-741-000

**Nathalie Griesbeck,** *au nom du groupe ALDE* . – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, mes chers collègues, après la pomme de terre Amflora, après les OGM, après même, souvenez-vous, l'épisode de la fabrication du vin rosé à base de vin blanc coupé de vin rouge, que nous propose aujourd'hui la Commission? L'idée de relancer les discussions sur le fait d'autoriser certains producteurs, notamment les Américains, à utiliser les mentions "Château" et "Clos" pour identifier et commercialiser leur vin.

Je suis Française mais, mes collègues viennent de le rappeler, ce n'est pas une spécificité française. Nous avons en Europe des terres viticoles historiques et certains noms sont chargés d'une évocation toute particulière, parce qu'ils sont issus d'une longue tradition riche de savoir-faire. Plus particulièrement, le terme "Château", pour le Bordelais, le terme "Clos", pour la Bourgogne, sont connus à travers le monde entier et sont synonymes, non seulement de grands crus de qualité mais aussi, comme l'a dit Astrid Lulling à l'instant, de patrimoine et même de terroir européen.

Bien sûr, on comprend que les États-Unis souhaitent pouvoir utiliser ces mentions pour profiter de l'aura de ces vins qui les accompagne, de leur notoriété qui a été construite au fil des siècles par les viticulteurs. Mais, Monsieur le Commissaire, une telle autorisation serait très lourde de conséquences sans qu'il y ait des conditions identiques de réciprocité pour la production. Il y aurait là, comme cela a été dit, un risque de tromperie, une sorte de leurre pour le consommateur que nous ne pouvons pas accepter.

Bien sûr, nous ne pouvons pas interdire aux Américains ou aux Chiliens d'avoir des "Châteaux" et des "Clos" mais il faut que ce soit une réalité. Donc, ne bradons pas notre héritage, notre patrimoine, revenons à la raison.

3-742-000

**João Ferreira,** *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL* . – Senhor Presidente, Senhor Comissário, depois da machadada que foi a reforma da OCM do vinho no setor vitivinícola português, eis que novas ameaças se perfilam. Como se não bastasse a situação dramática que hoje se

vive na região demarcada do Douro, com milhares de pequenos vitivinicultores a verem os frutos do seu trabalho não pagarem sequer os custos da vindima, surge agora a possibilidade de usurpação de menções tradicionais como Vintage, Ruby, Tawny e outras, algumas há mais de um século associadas ao vinho do Porto. A acontecer esta usurpação, ao arrepio das leis que protegem as menções tradicionais, de decisões dos tribunais, dos direitos de propriedade industrial e dos próprios acordos entre a União Europeia e os Estados Unidos neste domínio, abrir-se-iam as portas à indústria norte-americana do vinho para parasitar o prestígio adquirido ao longo de muitos anos pelo vinho do Porto. Seria mais um intolerável ataque aos produtores portugueses, aos consumidores, assim ludibriados, e à mais antiga região demarcada do mundo, a região demarcada do Douro. Impõem-se esclarecimentos, Sr. Comissário, mas impõe-se acima de tudo arrear caminho.

3-743-000

**Michel Dantin (PPE).** - Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je voudrais compléter l'intervention qu'a faite Astrid Lulling il y a quelques instants en comparant trois définitions.

Sur le plan communautaire, le terme "Château" fait l'objet d'une protection au titre des mentions traditionnelles, en application des articles 118 duovicies et tervicies du règlement 1234/2007. L'article 57 du règlement 607/2009 donne une définition communautaire et un cadre d'utilisation harmonisé d'un certain nombre d'expressions traditionnelles se rapportant à une exploitation viticole.

En 2007 et en 2009, la Commission – nous étions avant la codécision, Monsieur le Commissaire – a sans doute trouvé que cela avait du sens. Dans le même temps, les États-Unis ont défini au titre 27, point 4.25, du code fédéral de régulation la mention "Château" comme étant un vin produit dans la région d'une appellation d'origine par un producteur ou un groupe de producteurs, à partir de raisins issus de vignes qui ont été traditionnellement exploitées par ces producteurs utilisant sur l'étiquette le terme "Château" comme partie intégrante du nom de la marque telle que définie au titre 27, point 4.33, du code fédéral de régulation. Il s'agit donc d'une marque commerciale.

Cette définition, qui tente d'imiter la définition communautaire, est malheureusement erronée et ne correspond à aucune réalité. Elle ne correspond même pas à la définition de l'association WineAmerica sur laquelle est fondée la demande du bénéfice des termes "Château" pour ses membres, qui expose une définition d'une tout autre nature dans sa résolution du 24 mars 2009, authentifiée par un huissier. Aucun des éléments indiqués par la Commission, dans sa publication au Journal officiel, ne figure dans cette définition publiée par WineAmerica. Dans ces conditions, il ne peut y avoir aucune équivalence des définitions et la demande américaine n'est pas acceptable. Si le droit communautaire ouvre la possibilité de reconnaître une ...

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

3-744-000

**Eric Andrieu (S&D).** - Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, il me semble aujourd'hui indispensable, Monsieur le Commissaire, que la Commission s'assure de la totale conformité de cette demande aux dispositions des règlements européens pour la protection des appellations d'origine, des indications géographiques et des mentions traditionnelles applicables aux pays tiers.

En effet, l'utilisation de ces mentions est autorisée pour autant qu'elles remplissent les mêmes conditions ou des conditions équivalentes à celles qui sont exigées de nos États membres. Si tel n'est pas le cas, cette autorisation illicite créerait une concurrence déloyale entre les vins américains et européens bénéficiant des mentions traditionnelles "Château" et "Clos".

Tout d'abord, parce que les vins américains, contrairement aux vins européens, ne sont pas élaborés exclusivement à partir de raisins récoltés d'une exploitation et dont la vinification est entièrement effectuée sur cette même exploitation. Ensuite, parce que cela constituerait une tromperie des consommateurs sur des produits de marque commerciale sans lien avec une exploitation agricole. Enfin, parce que cette autorisation serait constitutive d'un détournement de notoriété acquise par des décennies de travail et d'efforts d'identification.

Nous nous exposerions ainsi à ce que ces mentions traditionnelles ne soient plus protégées par rapport à la concurrence d'autres régions du monde. Ceci créerait un dangereux précédent qui, demain, pourrait concerner bien d'autres mentions traditionnelles européennes comme Abbazia, Casa, Torre et Burg.

Au regard de la situation économique et des enjeux culturels pour notre viticulture européenne, Monsieur le Commissaire, pouvez-vous sincèrement nous assurer que la demande américaine est recevable et surtout totalement conforme aux conditions de validité concernant la mention traditionnelle et, notamment, sa définition prévue par la législation communautaire?

3-745-000

**Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE).** - Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, contro l'importazione da paesi terzi di prodotti contraffatti la battaglia qui in Parlamento è aperta da tempo ma, fino ad ora, i risultati sono stati alquanto scadenti.

Io voglio rappresentarle un caso recente che è balzato agli onori della cronaca nel mio paese, in Italia. Sul web è possibile, per chi lo desiderasse, comprare un *kit* per produrre vino da polveri chimiche e additivi. Lo ha denunciato Jimmi Ghione nella trasmissione "Striscia la notizia", un programma d'inchiesta tra i più seguiti in Italia. Questi sono i *kit* che vengono venduti e che è possibile acquistare da Internet: sono delle scatole contenenti solfiti, additivi, lieviti e mosto da fermentare, tutti nei pacchetti. Chi compra questo tipo di prodotti si fa il vino a casa sua con queste porcherie, con tanto di etichetta che riporta marchi di famose denominazioni d'origine come Chianti, Barolo, Nero d'Avola, Sangiovese, Montepulciano ed altri. Guardi, i prodotti che vengono addizionati sono come delle bustine di zucchero e questa è la trasmissione "Striscia la notizia" che ha diffuso il programma, ma Le manderò il video domani, signor Commissario.

L'accordo sull'utilizzo di denominazioni tradizionali per i vini provenienti dagli Stati Uniti, tra le altre cose, prevede la limitazione dell'uso di alcuni nomi semigenerici. Voglio ricordare che tra questi ci sono il Chianti, il Primitivo di Manduria e il Marsala. Si tratta di un parametro inaccettabile, che ha condotto a falsificazioni dannose alla concorrenza, e ritengo che quest'accordo non abbia più ragioni di esistere. Anche questi vini, questi *kit* contraffatti, sono prodotti negli Stati Uniti. Signor Commissario, ci faccia una riflessione e si renda conto: se questo è vino, io sono Babbo Natale.

3-746-000

**Esther Herranz García (PPE).** - Señor Presidente, a pesar del acuerdo vitivinícola alcanzado en 2006 con los Estados Unidos, en el que la Unión Europea hizo, por cierto, importantes concesiones en materia de prácticas enológicas, este país no ha realizado ningún esfuerzo contra la usurpación de las denominaciones de calidad europeas que se consideran genéricas, entre las que se encuentran, por cierto, los vinos españoles de Jerez y Málaga.

Creo que va siendo hora de que la Comisión Europea tome cartas en este asunto, de que utilice los medios diplomáticos a su disposición para que los Estados Unidos acaben con el uso indebido de este tipo de denominaciones.

De cara a un futuro acuerdo en la Organización Mundial del Comercio, sería más que deseable la creación de un registro de denominaciones protegidas. En cuanto a una eventual autorización del uso por parte de los vinos estadounidenses de menciones tradicionales europeas como «Clos» y «Château», me gustaría saber cómo piensa la Comisión Europea garantizar que los productores estadounidenses respetarán las exigencias de la Unión Europea, cuando el mismo Gobierno estadounidense rechaza la política europea de protección de esas menciones, entre las que también se encuentra, dicho sea de paso, la española «Solera», utilizada en los vinos de Jerez.

La Comisión parece estar dispuesta a satisfacer las pretensiones de los productores estadounidenses, resolviendo de forma privada con asociaciones profesionales de ese país, lo que podría dar lugar al uso generalizado de las menciones tradicionales y la creación, con ello, de un precedente sin igual en el mercado.

Con todo esto la Comisión hace un flaco favor a las producciones europeas que han de cumplir requisitos muy estrictos para tener derecho a usar las menciones tradicionales y, además, desaprovecha una baza importante y muy interesante con vistas a la negociación de una solución global, en materia de denominaciones, en el marco de un futuro acuerdo de libre comercio con ese país.

Ese no es el camino, Comisión. Defender lo nuestro, apostar por la calidad y amparar a nuestros productores y a nuestros productos, ese es el camino.

3-747-000

**Herbert Dorfmann (PPE).** - Herr Präsident, geschätzter Herr Kommissar, geschätzte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Europäische Union hat ein hohes Interesse an einem funktionierenden Weinhandel in der Welt. Das gilt ganz besonders auch für den Wein. Ich möchte daran erinnern, dass 23 Millionen Hektoliter Wein aus Europa exportiert werden, während wir nur ungefähr die Hälfte, 13 Millionen Hektoliter, importieren. Aber Handel braucht Regeln, und Handel braucht vor allem auch Fairness. Fairness für die Handeltreibenden, aber auch Fairness für die Konsumenten.

Die Konsumenten haben ein Recht, zu wissen, was in einem Produkt drin ist, und sie haben ein Recht darauf, dass ein Begriff wie zum Beispiel „Château“ auch geschützt wird. Deswegen dürfen Zugeständnisse an die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika nur gemacht werden, wenn auch von den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika ihre Hausaufgaben gemacht werden. Ganz besonders im Bereich der semigenerischen Bezeichnungen, die heute schon erwähnt worden sind. Ganz gleich, ob das Prosecco, Champagner, Chianti ist: Wenn so ein Wein in Amerika

verkauft wird, dann sollte auch Prosecco, Chianti und Champagner drinnen sein und nicht irgendetwas anderes.

Wir exportieren in die Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika jährlich 5,2 Millionen Hektoliter Wein. Wir importieren aus den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika jährlich fast genau die Hälfte davon. Wir haben also ein großes Interesse, dass der Handel mit den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika funktioniert. Aber zu fairen und für alle nachvollziehbaren Konditionen.

3-748-000

**Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE).** - Qualquer autorização de menções tradicionais, como o *vintage* dos vinhos do Douro e do Porto, por outros que não os próprios constitui um atentado contra os produtores e contra os consumidores que merece da nossa parte uma reação veemente e um combate determinado. É um atentado contra os consumidores porque, de forma sub-reptícia e deliberada, os confunde e os engana, levando-os a comprar gato por lebre. É um atentado contra os produtores porque, usurpando a herança do seu trabalho e investimento, os atinge violentamente nos recursos que construíram ao longo do tempo para garantir a sua competitividade.

A mera hipótese de autorizar a utilização de menções tradicionais por outros contraria a política europeia da defesa dos direitos do consumidor e as políticas europeias de investimento na qualidade, de valorização das denominações de origem, de promoção dos produtos europeus. Acresce o facto de uma autorização temporária anterior, em 2006, não ter prevenido os abusos, o que levou a Comissão a notificar os Estados Unidos.

Com efeito, esperava-se que esta autorização temporária para a utilização de algumas marcas europeias pelos americanos prevenisse a utilização de muitas outras que se realizavam fora do acordo. A estratégia foi errada porque não só não resultou, uma vez que as usurpações de marcas persistem, mas criou um precedente que não pode, de maneira nenhuma, continuar a ser alargado como se previa. E o problema não é apenas com os Estados Unidos, mas ameaça alargar-se à América em geral e também a mercados terceiros com grande apetência por este tipo de designações, nomeadamente o mercado chinês, que poderá vir a preferir importar dos Estados Unidos e assim penalizar o mercado europeu.

Considero, pois, que este dossiê deve ser definitivamente encerrado e que sejam tomadas medidas eficazes contra a usurpação das nossas marcas e contra a importação de falsificações.

3-749-000

**Elisabeth Köstinger (PPE).** - Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Herr Kommissar! Wenn wir über Weinkennzeichnung sprechen, dann müssen wir uns auch vor Augen führen, was das eigentliche Grundproblem dieser Debatte ist. Während die Europäische Union auf ihre geografischen Ursprungsangaben vertraut und vor allem die Herkunftsgebiete sowie die Herstellung selbst zu schützen gedenkt, verfolgen die Amerikaner eine gänzlich andere Strategie. In den USA lassen sich per se keine Ortschaften oder Gebiete rechtlich schützen. Meiner Meinung nach muss das für uns in Europa erst recht ein Grund sein, in dieser Frage auch sehr selbstbewusst aufzutreten.

Seit 2006 ist das Abkommen zwischen der EU und den USA über den Handel mit Wein in Kraft, welches bis jetzt noch nicht zu einer Lösung beigetragen oder geführt hat. Zwar haben sich die USA dazu verpflichtet, semigenerische Weine und Perlweinbezeichnungen

zu unterbinden, und seit einigen Jahren dürfen auch keine traditionellen Bezeichnungen auf US-amerikanischen Produkten aufscheinen. Aber zu einer endgültigen und vor allem zufriedenstellenden Lösung hat dieses Abkommen nicht geführt.

Ich denke, die Kommission sollte Überlegungen zu einer erneuten Genehmigung für US-amerikanische Weine ruhen lassen und sich auf die möglichen Verhandlungen zu einem umfassenden Handelsabkommen zwischen der Europäischen Union und den USA konzentrieren. Hierzu hat das Parlament ja bereits eine sehr positive Position in einem Bericht dargelegt. Außerdem gibt es bereits auch ein sehr perfektes Vorbild: Die gegenseitige Anerkennung im Bereich der Biolebensmittel kann hier meiner Meinung nach doch auch sehr positiv erwähnt werden.

Mich würde von der Kommission konkret aber auch interessieren, wie sie es sich vorstellt, in Zukunft auch sicherzustellen, dass Regulierungen zum Schutze der Konsumentinnen und Konsumenten, aber auch der Produzentinnen und Produzenten auf beiden Seiten gewährleistet werden können.

3-750-000

**Christa Klaß (PPE).** - Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wein ist ein sehr sensibles Produkt. Wein ist Kultur und auch Wirtschaftsgut. Über die europäische Weinmarktordnung versuchen wir, den regionalen und auch den globalen Herausforderungen Rechnung zu tragen. Die gemeinsame Marktordnung für Wein geht hier wegen der sehr speziellen Herausforderungen auch oft sehr ins Detail. So auch bei den traditionellen Bezeichnungen. Diese Bezeichnungen stehen für Qualität, für Regionalität, und sie sind vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen mit einer klaren Aussage an den Verbraucher. Was den Franzosen und den Luxemburgern ihr Château oder Clos, das ist den Deutschen das Weingut. Begriffe wie Château, Clos und Weingut sind ganz bewusst mit der Auflage verbunden, dass diese Weine zu 100 % aus einem Betrieb stammen und ausschließlich auch in diesem Betrieb hergestellt wurden.

Die Verbraucher schätzen diese Bedingungen. Ein Château steht zum Beispiel für Weintradition und für die Region, aus der der Wein kommt. Diese Verbindung wird automatisch hergestellt. Nun ist der Begriff „Weingut“ im Moment nicht in der Diskussion. Vielleicht auch deshalb, weil die deutsche Sprache – leider – nicht so weinaffin ist. Es ist und es war richtig, den Begriff „Champagner“ damals in Deutschland zu verbieten. Auch hier wollte man von der Bekanntheit profitieren. Heute weiß jeder, dass der deutsche Sekt gleichrangig auf dem Markt rangiert. Die Begriffe der Weinmarktordnung dürfen, egal in welcher Sprache, nur unter den dort festgelegten Bedingungen verwendet werden. Wieso eigentlich sollen Weine aus Übersee, aus nicht französischsprachigen Ländern, dann unter französischen Bezeichnungen auf den Markt kommen? Hier ist die Kommission gefordert, für Klarheit und Wahrheit zu sorgen.

Unsere Regulierungen dürfen nicht von Drittstaaten aufgeweicht werden. Sie sind aussagekräftiger Bestandteil des Weinbezeichnungsrechts. Europäische Weintradition ist nicht verhandelbar.

3-751-000

*Catch-the-eye-Verfahren*

3-752-000

**Marie-Thérèse Sanchez-Schmid (PPE).**- Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, en 2012 déjà, nous nous étions inquiétés de la proposition de la Commission européenne d'autoriser la vente sur le territoire de l'Union de bouteilles de vins américains portant la mention "Château" et "Clos", mentions traditionnellement utilisées dans les régions viticoles françaises visant à garantir au consommateur la certitude d'un produit artisanal de qualité.

Les contraintes sont nombreuses pour obtenir cette mention, qui désigne un vin d'appellation d'origine contrôlée, issu à 100 % de raisins récoltés et vinifiés sur la propriété. Aux États-Unis, elle peut caractériser une simple marque commerciale, s'appuyant sur une démarche uniquement industrielle, sans aucune garantie d'origine.

Alors que nous nous sommes battus pour maintenir les droits de plantation, gage d'une viticulture régulée de qualité, l'Union européenne exposerait nos viticulteurs européens à une concurrence déloyale, engendrant un détournement de notoriété à grande échelle.

J'espère donc que la Commission reviendra à la raison et défendra, coûte que coûte, nos viticulteurs.

3-753-000

*(Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens)*

3-754-000

**Algirdas Šemeta,** *Member of the Commission* . – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank everyone for their contributions to this debate. I have carefully taken note of your concerns and will bring them to the attention of my colleague Commissioner Ciolos, who is responsible for this dossier, and in doing so I will also be complying with the request of Ms Lulling. Let me reiterate what I said in my opening statement, that the Commission is perfectly aware of the sensitivity of this dossier and of the political consequences both at internal and external level.

Regarding the US applications, the wine agreement between the EU and the US has been respected by both parties. The US applications have been applied for in conformity with EU legislation. Of course the EU fully promotes EU geographical indications. However, traditional terms are not intellectual property rights, but labelling particulars.

Having said that, the Commission is still examining the applications concerned, so no decision has been taken. We are continuing to examine those applications, and of course we will take into account the interests of EU wine producers and consumers when we make our decision.

3-755-000

**Der Präsident.** – Herzlichen Dank, Herr Kommissar. Nachdem so viel über Wein gesprochen worden ist, hoffe ich, dass Sie auch ein Glas desselbigen genießen können.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

**Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149 GO)**



3-755-500

**Dominique Vlasto (PPE)**, *par écrit*. – Les mentions viticoles européennes désignent des méthodes de production et de vinification précises et visent ainsi à donner une information claire aux consommateurs. Ce sont des gages de l'originalité de nos vins, et nombre de producteurs s'y plient au prix de lourds efforts. En Europe, l'appellation «Château» garantit notamment un vin issu à 100% de raisins récoltés et vinifiés sur une même propriété. Aux États-Unis, c'est une simple marque commerciale, que l'on peut utiliser pour des vins issus de raisins récoltés sur différentes propriétés et par différents producteurs. L'utilisation de la mention «Château» ne peut être octroyée à des vins provenant de pays tiers, tant que leurs viticulteurs ne tiendront pas compte des exigences européennes de production et de vinification. Le consommateur ne doit pas être trompé sur le produit, et la concurrence doit être loyale et basée sur le principe de réciprocité commerciale. Par conséquent, je vous appelle, Monsieur le Commissaire, à ne pas céder aux sirènes du marketing américain, et à n'autoriser, au sein de l'UE, que la vente de vins qui respectent scrupuleusement les critères européens de la mention «Château»!

### **19. Tagesordnung der nächsten Sitzung: siehe Protokoll**

### **20. Schluss der Sitzung**

3-758-000

*(Die Sitzung wird um 22.00 Uhr geschlossen.)*