

MIÉRCOLES 16 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 2005

STŘEDA, 16. LISTOPADU 2005

ONSDAG DEN 16. NOVEMBER 2005

MITTWOCH, 16. NOVEMBER 2005

KOLMAPÄEV, 16. NOVEMBER 2005

TETAPTH 16 NOEMBPIOY 2005

WEDNESDAY, 16 NOVEMBER 2005

MERCREDI 16 NOVEMBRE 2005

MERCOLEDÌ 16 NOVEMBRE 2005

TREŠDIENA, 2005. GADA 16. NOVEMBRIS

2005 M. LAPKRIČIO 16 D., TREČIADIENIS

2005. NOVEMBER 16., SZERDA

L-ERBGHA, 16 TA' NOVEMBRU 2005

WOENSDAG 16 NOVEMBER 2005

ŠRODA, 16 LISTOPADA 2005

QUARTA-FEIRA, 16 DE NOVEMBRO DE 2005

STREDA 16. NOVEMBRA 2005

SREDA, 16. NOVEMBER 2005

KESKIVIIKKO 16. MARRASKUUTA 2005

ONSDAGEN DEN 16 NOVEMBER 2005

3-002

PRÉSIDENCE DE M. ONESTA
Vice-président

3-003

1 - Ouverture de la séance

3-004

(*La séance est ouverte à 9 heures*)

3-005

Véronique De Keyser (PSE). – Monsieur le Président, permettez-moi de revenir un instant sur un incident déplorable qui s'est passé hier concernant l'exposition anti-avortement préparée par nos collègues polonais du groupe des indépendants. Mme Gomes et moi-même avons été non seulement bousculées, non seulement presque frappées, mais aussi traitées de "fascistes" et de "nazies" par ce groupe. C'est inacceptable. Je ne comptais pas me plaindre auprès du Président, puisque l'exposition a été annulée et que les images scandaleuses associant l'avortement à la Shoah – ce qui est tout de même un comble – retirées. Mais puisque mon collègue a eu l'audace de nous appeler, pour se plaindre d'avoir été taxé de "fasciste", je voudrais tout de même signaler que nous avons nous-mêmes été traitées de "nazies". Dans cette enceinte, voilà qui est particulièrement choquant.

3-006

Le Président. – Merci pour cette information chère collègue. Comme vous avez pu le constater, l'exposition a été retirée puisque la règle veut que la controverse ait lieu ici, dans cet hémicycle, et non pas par exposition interposée. Pour les faits que vous venez de rapporter, je vous propose de saisir le Bureau pour voir quelles suites utiles il faudra leur donner.

3-007

2 - Dépôt de documents: voir procès-verbal

3-008

3 - Situation en Irak après le référendum sur la constitution

3-009

Le Président. – L'ordre du jour appelle les déclarations du Conseil et de la Commission sur la situation en Irak après le référendum sur la constitution.

3-010

Lord Bach, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, this debate comes at a critical stage in Iraq's political transition. When this Parliament last discussed Iraq with the Commission and Council in July, Iraq's political leaders were in the process of negotiating a new constitution. One month ago, Iraqis voted to approve that constitution which would, for the first time ever, provide them with guarantees on their freedom, security and human rights. The constitutional referendum marks a further step by the Iraqi people on the road to democracy, freedom and peace.

In one month's time they will vote again, this time to elect a new government that will need quickly to tackle important tasks such as planning and delivering much-needed services that will provide hope for a brighter and better future for millions of Iraqis.

Last month's referendum was remarkable in many ways. Along with January's elections, it provided Iraqis with their first real taste of democracy. They participated, for the first time, in political decisions that will affect their own, and their country's, future. It was humbling, particularly for those of us who come from countries which often take our freedoms and democracy for granted, to see the courage and determination of those who exercised their democratic rights and took part in the voting, braving difficult conditions and the threat of violence.

European Union support for the constitutional referendum had a significant impact. The Commissioner will in a moment no doubt detail the valuable assistance which the Commission provided to the process in support of the Independent Electoral Commission for Iraq and of the UN.

The United Nations has played, and continues to play, a key and outstanding supporting role in the constitutional review and election processes. The United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq played a vital role in assisting the Iraqi Electoral Commission under the most difficult of circumstances.

The decision to approve the Constitution paved the way for December's general election. This should represent another major step in the political transition that will eventually lead to Iraq assuming its full role in the international community. Iraq is, of course, still some way from achieving that aspiration. Although a large majority of voters voted in favour of the constitution, the results of the referendum show there are still substantial divisions to be overcome between Iraq's ethnic communities. A review of the constitution will take place early in the new government's tenure. This offers an important opportunity for Iraqis to forge a broader consensus on the future of their country, and will assist the creation of an inclusive political system.

Iraq's political leaders will need to resolve key issues, including federalism, dealing with its political past, and the management of natural resources. Dissatisfaction also threatens the election process. It feeds the sense of frustration and disenfranchisement that some communities feel. It also breeds the sympathy which extremists and terrorists use to justify maintaining the cycle of violence and the insurgency. It is imperative, therefore, that Iraq's political, ethnic and religious leaders do all they can to address these issues. We hope that the new parliament and government is as representative and as inclusive as possible.

Turning now to international assistance to Iraq's process of political transition, the EU and the wider international community have already provided significant and valuable support. I look forward to the Commissioner describing the Commission's invaluable and ongoing assistance.

I would like to mention an important step taken towards closer partnership between the EU and Iraq through the signature of the Joint EU-Iraq Political Declaration on 21 September. This paves the way for regular political dialogue with Iraq on issues of mutual interest, such as promotion of good governance, protection of human rights and conflict prevention and resolution. During that visit, the Iraqi Government stressed how much it values the EU's assistance, particularly in supporting the constitutional and electoral processes and work to improve capacity in the rule of law sector, including through the EUJUST LEX mission.

Many neighbouring countries and other regional players are making concerted efforts to engage constructively. In particular we welcome the Arab League's suggestion to work with Iraq in holding a National Dialogue Conference early next year. A preparatory meeting is due to take place in Cairo in a few days' time, on 19 November. This meeting has the potential to lay the foundations for post-election international engagement and support for the new government.

The Council has strongly urged regional states, in particular Syria, to support the political process in Iraq. This includes cooperating with Iraq to prevent cross-border transit and support for terrorists and insurgents.

As we approach this landmark election we should consider what implications the formation of a new and long-term Iraqi Government might hold for our engagement with Iraq. Our first objective must be to continue to provide support for the election process. The Iraq Government has specifically requested this. The EU will provide support to the election monitoring process, including through supporting the work of domestic election observers. I know that some of you were present in Iraq for the January elections. I hope that it will again be possible for Members of this Parliament to show their support for Iraq's aspiring parliamentarians in December.

I have already said that the review of the constitution during the early part of the new government's tenure will be key. The EU stands ready to support actively these important efforts, and is well placed to provide expert advice and technical assistance.

In the longer term, we also need to continue support for the vital rule of law sector and consider its enhancement. The EU is playing a leading role by becoming a supporting donor of the rule of law sector working group, which aims to coordinate donor and government activity in this sector.

The EU's rule of law mission for Iraq, EUJUST LEX, is due to reach the end of its mandate at the end of June 2006. The Iraqi Government has asked for the programme to be extended and expanded to include wider training of judicial, police and prison officers. The Council is considering how to respond.

Strengthening respect for human rights is also key. Iraq has asked for help in developing its capacity to implement human rights principles and to accede to key human rights conventions. The European Union is uniquely placed to provide this support and advice, and the EU stands ready to offer further support in this area.

Both the EU and Iraq hope to broaden and enhance their partnership further, as the political process goes forward, through the establishment of contractual political dialogue and other appropriate contractual relations.

Let me say once again that as Iraq approaches this milestone in its political transition, now is the time for the international community to provide its full support to the Iraqi people. The European Union, along with others in the international community are, and should continue to be – as in so many other developing and recovering countries – at the forefront of reconstruction and development. I look forward to discussing this with Parliament and hearing honourable Members' views.

(Applause)

3-011

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, it is almost exactly four months since we first discussed Iraq, as Lord Bach has said. I remember saying then that for the Iraqis the hard work was only beginning. I truly meant it.

Today, the Iraqis have a constitution. They will soon elect a constitutional government. But today Iraqis are also aware of substantial divisions that still need to be overcome in the country. They are now facing two very critical challenges: on the one hand, ensuring inclusive electoral consultations in December and, on the other hand, after doing that, carrying out a comprehensive review of the constitution, which has to be more inclusive.

We stood by the Iraqis during the constitutional process and will also do so during the preparation of the election process and the elections. By providing another EUR 20 million in support, the Commission was the sole supporter of the United Nations and the UN-led constitutional support project. We feel part of a process that allowed the Iraqis to have their say on the constitution by casting their ballots on the referendum day.

With regard to the elections, you surely remember how hopeful I was in July that we could also dispatch an electoral observation mission. But today we must accept the evidence that the security conditions do not allow it. This does not, however, prevent us from assisting in other equally effective ways. We are providing EUR 30 million to the UN electoral support project. While I speak, several European electoral experts are working side-by-side with the Independent Electoral Commission for Iraq and with the UN to ensure proper preparation of the elections and also to set up a transparent domestic monitoring system.

But the road leading to democracy and peace in Iraq does not end with elections. Inevitably, it crosses the path of regional cooperation. Iraq, its neighbours and the other states in the region are called upon to play a key role by strengthening good neighbourly relations and by cooperating to improve regional security. I am very happy to say that the Secretary-General of the Arab League, Mr Amre Moussa, has also gone there now and that there will be a conference next year, together with the Arabs, in order to enhance this relationship that has been hampered in the last few years.

Iraq will be a federal Iraq. Functional central institutions will be set up to support the state structure that the Iraqis themselves have chosen. To that end, suitable legislative and institutional frameworks need to be established. Viable solutions will have to be identified rapidly to ensure continued progress towards stability and democracy.

Inclusiveness is absolutely the only way forward. We shall also consider how best we, the European Union, can help the building-up of institutions that favour an inclusive approach. We shall also encourage the efforts of the Arab League and others in the region – such as Jordan, for instance – to promote inclusiveness and national reconciliation. I am convinced that the recent visit of Kofi Annan has had a positive effect in advancing that understanding among different parties.

The political process and stability in Iraq is important for all of us and for its neighbours. The recent events in Jordan very clearly remind us of the importance of succeeding in this inclusive approach, which is crucial for the whole political stabilisation of the region. For the Iraqi citizens, it is very important that they really have the feeling of freedom and can exercise their freedom. In this regard, we shall not forget that most Iraqis are still struggling for their children to go to school, for their hospitals to be opened in order to fight the most ordinary diseases, for access to water, jobs – the basics – and for their livelihood. It is an unsustainable situation for any people in any country, and therefore also for the people of Iraq. Their needs will continue to be at the core of our assistance to Iraq in 2006.

I should like to elaborate on what we have been doing. We have supported the political process. In addition, we, together with the United States, have co-hosted a very important conference – the Iraq International Conference – in Brussels on 22 June. That was instrumental in mobilising international support from over 80 countries and organisations for the Iraqi transitional government and for the institutions for the transitional period before the December elections. We have also always assisted in reconstruction: we delivered an assistance package of EUR 580 million through the International Reconstruction Fund for Iraq. We have always tried to work towards meeting the basic needs of the population such as water, sanitation, healthcare and job creation. We are also working together with two ministries – the energy and trade ministries – on institution-building.

For the future, we want to support the political process for the election. We also want to set up joint working groups in areas of common interest such as trade and energy. We want to support the WTO accession request, initiate negotiations for an EU-Iraq agreement on trade and cooperation and progress on the opening of the Commission delegation in Baghdad in 2006.

The Union has much to offer beyond supporting the reconstruction process. We want to be a meaningful partner for Iraq. The Iraqis are looking forward to that. We shall meet their expectations.

³⁻⁰¹²

Γιώργος Δημητρακόπουλος, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας *PPE-DE*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε προεδρεύοντα του Συμβουλίου, κυρία Επίτροπε, μετά τις πολύ ενδιαφέρουσες παρεμβάσεις σας θα ήθελα να κάνω τις εξής παρατηρήσεις:

Η πρώτη παρατήρηση αφορά την τελευταία φράση της Επιτρόπου. Πράγματι, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχει να παίξει ακόμα πολύ σημαντικό ρόλο πέρα από την ανοικοδόμηση. Και το ζήτημά μας είναι πώς θα διαμορφώσουμε αυτήν την πολύ ενδιαφέρουσα ιδέα σε συγκεκριμένη πολιτική.

Η δεύτερη παρατήρηση αφορά την ψήφιση του Συντάγματος. Θα συμφωνήσω κι εγώ στο ότι η ψήφιση του Συντάγματος, παρά το γεγονός ότι μία σημαντική ομάδα δεν ανταποκρίθηκε, είναι ένα σημαντικό γεγονός. Ένα σημαντικό γεγονός, που όμως αφήνει ακόμη ανοικτά ορισμένα πολύ σημαντικά προβλήματα. Όπως για παράδειγμα, το θέμα και ο ρόλος της θρησκείας, το ομοσπονδιακό μοντέλο, η εθνική ταυτότητα και η πρόσβαση στους φυσικούς πόρους και ιδιαίτερα στο πετρέλαιο.

Η τρίτη παρατήρηση αφορά τις εκλογές. Πράγματι, οι εκλογές είναι πάρα πολύ σημαντικές. Ιδιαίτερα μάλιστα αφού το νέο Κοινοβούλιο θα ασχοληθεί -όπως το αναφέρει το Σύνταγμα- όχι μόνο με την αναθεώρηση του Συντάγματος, αλλά με τον τρόπο εφαρμογής ορισμένων διατάξεων του.

Η τέταρτη παρατήρηση αφορά ένα ζήτημα το οποίο, δυστυχώς ακόμα, παρά τις προσπάθειες, παρά τη διαδικασία εκδημοκρατικοποίησης, παραμένει ανοικτό. Είναι το ζήτημα της ασφάλειας. Εγώ δεν θέλω ξανανοίξω μια συζήτηση που έχει γίνει και στο Κοινοβούλιο και στο Συμβούλιο και σε κάθε χώρα μέλος. Θέλω όμως να πω το εξής: Υπάρχουν πάρα πολλές έρευνες -πολλές έχουν δημοσιευθεί, κύριε Προεδρεύοντα του Συμβουλίου, και σε εφημερίδες της χώρας σας- οι οποίες θέτουν ζήτημα σε ό,τι αφορά τη συνεχιζόμενη παραμονή των ξένων στρατιωτικών δυνάμεων στο Ιράκ. Εγώ θα επαναφέρω εδώ, και με το σημείο αυτό τελειώνω, την πρόταση που συζητήσαμε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο: ήρθε νομίζω η στιγμή για την αντικατάσταση των ξένων στρατιωτικών δυνάμεων που βρίσκονται στο Ιράκ με μία ειρηνευτική δύναμη των Ηνωμένων Εθνών.

³⁻⁰¹³

Véronique De Keyser, au nom du groupe PSE. – Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, je voudrais d'abord vous féliciter et vous apporter tout le soutien du Parlement pour les efforts que vous consentez aujourd'hui afin que l'Union européenne pèse dans la reconstruction de l'Irak. Mais permettez-moi de revenir sur un point désagréable.

Peu avant le déclenchement de la guerre en Irak, le général Morillon mettait en garde le Parlement européen en disant "il n'y a pas de guerre propre". On pouvait espérer cependant qu'une guerre de libération soit moins sale que les autres. Il n'en est rien! Après les images terribles de l'invasion et le scandale de la prison d'Abou Graïb, il y a aujourd'hui la question controversée des bombes au phosphore blanc qui auraient été employées au siège de Falloudja, ville rebelle, ville martyre aussi.

Notre histoire nous a appris qu'aucune paix ne se bâtissait dans un pays sur l'occultation des atrocités qui s'y sont commises. Il y a là un nécessaire travail d'enquête et recherche de la vérité. La démocratie formelle qui tente de s'installer en Irak et les relations avec ce pays que nous tentons de reconstruire se heurtent à cette évidence: "pas de démocratie sans vérité"!

Saddam Hussein va être jugé pour les crimes qu'il a commis et, probablement, pour l'utilisation d'armes chimiques contre les Kurdes en 1991. Ce n'est que justice. La vérité sur le siège de Falloudja, sur ses martyrs calcinés, sur les responsabilités quant à l'utilisation d'armes prohibées par la Convention de Genève de 1980, font partie aussi de ce que nous devons apporter aux Irakiens en plus de notre aide matérielle. Nous allons les aider à former leur justice, c'est ce qu'on appelle du *capacity building*. Mais pouvons-nous réellement réussir dans cette entreprise si nous ne leur donnons pas aussi le sentiment que la justice, et spécialement la justice internationale, existent? Je vous demande donc, Monsieur le Président, Madame la Commissaire, d'exiger des forces coalisées qu'une enquête soit menée en toute indépendance et que justice soit rendue.

Nous avons demandé en son temps un Tribunal pénal international pour Saddam Hussein. Le crime contre l'humanité que constituerait, éventuellement, l'emploi d'armes chimiques à Falloudja, le mériterait amplement. Mais si nous pensons dans cette Assemblée que tout cela n'est qu'une utopie, quel message d'espoir pouvons-nous apporter aujourd'hui au peuple irakien?

3-014

Graham Watson, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, when Saddam Hussein ran Iraq it was well described as a mass grave below ground and a torture chamber above. Yet after two years and eight months of war, the deaths of countless Iraqis and over 2 000 coalition troops, it is clear that life in Iraq is little better than before. Baghdad was statistically the world's worst place to live even before the security situation deteriorated. How much worse now that civilian casualties run at more than 60 a day and insurgent attacks have almost trebled in 18 months. It is difficult to know whether the persistent presence of coalition troops under these conditions is a help or a hindrance in the restoration of normality.

I fear I detect an air of complacency in the Council's statement today and surprising optimism from the Commission. There have been notable successes on the road to democracy. Iraqis now have their own constitution; they have their own security forces, and in December they will have a democratically elected government. There are even signs that Sunni Arabs are moving into politics and preparing to contest the election, such as the formation last week of the National Public Democratic Movement in the province of Anbar.

Nonetheless, Europeans have a number of serious concerns. There are signs of widening instability in the region. Evidence of gross human rights violations, including torture and the systematic use of arbitrary arrest, has badly damaged the coalition's standing. That has helped recruit many to the insurgents' cause.

I have three specific concerns. First, the Pentagon's acknowledgement a few hours ago that the US used phosphorous incendiary devices in Fallujah. The European Union must demand a UN inquiry into the use of these banned weapons.

Second, yesterday's revelation in sections of the media that of the more than 35 000 Iraqi civilians detained by the coalition, only 5% have ever been brought to trial and many have been denied legal counsel. What kind of example are we setting?

Third, the European Union Member States need a clear exit strategy. If we want to stop violent insurgents continuing to gain at the expense of moderate Iraqis, what is needed – and what the Blair-Bush alliance has always lacked – is a clear end-game.

Europeans disagreed on the rationale for going into Iraq. We must not be divided on the conditions for leaving. We must talk to the Arab League, the Iraqi authorities and other Middle Eastern governments with a view to establishing the terms and timing of our departure that will leave Iraq a more stable and secure place.

President Talabani has already made it clear that the Iraqi people are, and I quote, ‘looking forward to the day when we can say goodbye to the forces of the coalition’. Europe must work towards that goal.

3-015

Angelika Beer, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Auch meine Fraktion wird die Maßnahmen, die hier von Rat und Kommission vorgestellt worden sind, unterstützen, um den Irakern eine Chance auf eine friedliche und demokratische Zukunft zu geben.

Ich möchte aber einen Satz von Lord Bach gezielt ansprechen. Lord Bach hat gesagt: „Wir als Europäer wollen eine Vorreiterrolle in der Frage Demokratie und Menschenrechte im Irak übernehmen.“ Lord Bach, wir müssen dann aber auch den Mut und die Kraft haben, dafür zu sorgen und uns dafür einzusetzen, dass unsere Nato-Partner internationales Recht nicht immer wieder verletzen, und müssen diesbezüglich eine Zusicherung geben.

Was ist die Lehre aus Abu Ghraib und aus Guantánamo? Die Häftlinge in Guantánamo haben bis heute kein Recht, keinen Rechtsschutz. Die Zustände sind dramatisch. Können wir dann wirklich erschüttert sein über die Tatsache, dass auch irakische Verantwortliche Geheimgefängnisse errichten? Wo ist das demokratische Beispiel der internationalen Gemeinschaft und der EU? Es ist doch nur noch zynisch, wenn von Rumsfeld eine neue Verordnung über Foltervorschriften erlassen wird, in der steht, dass zukünftig Hunde nicht mehr als Mittel der Folter und des Verhörs eingesetzt werden dürfen. Von der Achtung der Genfer Konvention ist nicht die Rede. Das sind die Punkte, zu denen ich Erklärungen erwarte.

Wissen Sie, was weißer Phosphor ist? Wissen Sie, wie weißer Phosphor wirkt, der von den Amerikanern – wie inzwischen zugegeben –, in Falluja eingesetzt wurde? Es ist eine Brandstiftung, es ist eine Feuerlegung gegen Menschen, und es gibt kein Mittel, auch kein Wasser, um diesen Brand wieder zu löschen. Das ist eine Vernichtung, die gegen Völkerrecht verstößt. Diese Mittel sind eingesetzt worden.

Lord Bach, wenn Sie hier neuneinhalb Minuten lang die positiven Seiten ausführen, so werden Sie doch keine Überzeugungskraft haben, solange Sie nicht fordern, dass sich die EU, der Rat – gerade unter britischer Führung – dafür einsetzen, dass die Amerikaner endlich die internationale Konvention unterzeichnen, damit wir international wieder Glaubwürdigkeit erlangen. Sonst werden all die Instrumente, die wir mit ganzer Kraft unterstützen möchten, nicht wirken. Deshalb fordere ich Sie auf: Sorgen Sie dafür, dass nicht nur untersucht wird, sondern dass die Amerikaner die internationale Konvention, die den Einsatz von weißem Phosphor völkerrechtlich eindeutig verbietet, unterzeichnen. Sonst werden wir keinen Frieden im Irak aktiv unterstützen können.

3-016

Erik Meijer, namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie. – Voorzitter, jarenlang is door Europa en Amerika niets ondernomen tegen de verschrikkelijke dictatuur in Irak, want Irak leverde olie. In plaats van op tijd het binnenlandse verzet te steunen is uiteindelijk een interventie van buitenaf doorgezet met onware argumenten en buiten de goedkeuring van de Verenigde Naties om. Dit gewelddadige en eenzijdige doorzetten van de opvattingen en de belangen van een grootmacht provoceert delen van de Sji'itische meerderheid om uit afkeer van de westerse bezetters te kiezen voor een theocratische dictatuur naar het model van Iran.

Positief is dat het inmiddels mogelijk is gebleken om een eind te maken aan de situatie waarin het Koerdische noorden en het Sji'itische zuiden onderdrukte wingewesten waren van het middengebied rond Bagdad. Door middel van federalisme beschermt de nieuwe grondwet die achtergestelde gebieden tegen onderdrukking en uitbuiting en dat is in het voordeel van 80% van de bevolking. Een democratie in de nieuwe deelstaten heeft alleen kans van slagen als er snel een eind komt aan de buitenlandse militaire aanwezigheid en aan de overheersing door buitenlandse bedrijven.

Blijven betekent een nieuwe provocatie die verzet blijft oproepen. Op welke termijn komt er een eind aan de militaire aanwezigheid van de lidstaten van de Europese Unie en wat draagt de Europese Unie bij aan het vervangen van het falende Amerikaanse bedrijf Halliburton dat de nutsvoorzieningen niet kan herstellen, door steun voor binnenlandse Iraakse oplossingen.

3-017

Bastiaan Belder, namens de IND/DEM-Fractie. – Voorzitter, dit jaar, 2005, zal de geschiedenis ingaan als het jaar van de meest vrije verkiezingen in Irak tot dusverre. Vergelijk deze drievoudige stembusgang eens met de nationale ervaring onder het Ba'ath-regime gedurende 35 jaar. Eerst 12 jaar helemaal geen verkiezingen en daarna slechts schijnvertoningen. Wat een contrast en wat een politieke vooruitgang! Daarover horen we in dit huis niets.

Zeker, de interne en externe bedreiging van de wederopbouw van het Tweestromenland duurt onverminderd voort. De toekomst van een federaal Irak oogt derhalve zeer fragiel. En dat raakt evengoed Europa, zo verzekerde mij een prominent Iraaks politicus begin deze week. Overwinnen de destructieve krachten, dan blijft ons continent allesbehalve buiten schot.

Raad en Commissie, wat kan de Europese Unie in deze precaire situatie voor de Iraakse staat en bevolking concreet uitrichten? Ten eerste, forse druk uitoefenen op Bagdads buren om het terroristische vuur over de grens niet aan te wakkeren. Ten tweede het fundament van de democratische rechtsstaat te helpen leggen aan de boorden van de Tigris. "Wij moeten en willen leren van de Europeanen", zei mijn Iraakse vriend hoopvol. Laten wij die hoop vooral niet beschamen!

3-018

Alessandro Battilocchio (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, parlo a nome del nuovo PSI. L'Iraq sta faticosamente, ma con determinazione, rialzando la testa dopo la sanguinosa e per molti aspetti folle dittatura di Saddam Hussein e dopo gli eventi di questi anni, che hanno senza dubbio aperto la strada al cambiamento, ma hanno anche causato ferite profonde al popolo iracheno.

Il passo successivo, sempre sotto l'egida della Comunità internazionale, dovrebbe essere quello di un coinvolgimento progressivo di tutti gli Stati arabi della regione nell'intero processo di democratizzazione e di lotta al terrorismo. Lo straordinario successo di partecipazione nella recente tornata elettorale è un evento storico, ma è nostro preciso dovere continuare a stare a fianco degli iracheni e delle autorità libere che stanno amministrando il paese. Dobbiamo aiutare concretamente i tanti giovani che, con grande coraggio e spesso rischiando personalmente, vogliono lottare per fare dell'Iraq un paese finalmente libero, democratico e giusto.

3-019

Antonio Tajani (PPE-DE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le elezioni, il referendum e il nuovo voto previsto per il 15 dicembre dimostrano che in Iraq, dopo decenni di sanguinosa dittatura, sta nascendo una vera democrazia.

Ciò rappresenta un successo per il popolo iracheno che, con la sua partecipazione al voto, ha dimostrato di voler dare un forte contributo alla costruzione della pace in Medio Oriente. A costo di grandi sacrifici e di centinaia di vittime innocenti, i sostenitori della democrazia stanno sconfiggendo la piccola minoranza che, in nome del fondamentalismo, pratica il terrorismo. Tuttavia, l'obiettivo finale non è stato ancora raggiunto e c'è ancora molto da fare per sconfiggere Al Qaeda e i suoi alleati e per dare una stabilità definitiva all'Iraq.

L'Unione europea, anche se in ritardo e dopo aver superato molte divisioni, ha iniziato a dare un contributo importante. Condivido le parole pronunciate dal rappresentante del Consiglio e dal Commissario signora Ferrero-Waldner. Tuttavia, dovremo fare ancora di più per quel popolo, naturalmente insieme all'ONU che, con la risoluzione 1546, ha permesso a trentacinque paesi di dare un contributo importante alla nascita di questa nuova democrazia. Si tratta di un contributo economico, come quello raccolto dal Fondo per la democrazia istituito presso le Nazioni Unite, ma anche di un contributo politico e militare.

Molti cittadini europei stanno partecipando alla missione di pace ed è a loro che dobbiamo essere grati per quanto hanno fatto e continuano a fare, offrendo anche la loro vita, al fine di dare un contributo fondamentale alla risurrezione dell'Iraq. Quei militari e quei civili, tra cui vi sono moltissimi italiani, hanno dato vita a migliaia di progetti per la realizzazione di infrastrutture nel settore dell'agricoltura, dei trasporti, dell'educazione e della cultura.

La strategia del successo sta portando a una riduzione dei contingenti militari, che lasceranno l'Iraq in accordo fra loro e con il governo legittimo di Baghdad. Oggi molti critici di questo intervento di pace si stanno ricredendo e si stanno rendendo conto dell'importanza della missione.

Signor Presidente, concludo ricordando che sarebbe tuttavia un errore pensare che la soluzione della crisi irachena sarà sufficiente per portare la pace in Medio Oriente. Dobbiamo risolvere, mediante un contributo importante dell'Unione europea, la crisi israelo-palestinese, creando sicurezza per Israele e uno Stato palestinese.

3-020

Lilli Gruber (PSE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la democrazia non è un mero esercizio di stile, ma ha bisogno di radici che in Iraq non sono ancora state piantate. Guardiamo finalmente in faccia la realtà. I curdi sono andati a votare perché vedono profilarsi all'orizzonte l'indipendenza delle loro province, gli sciiti per rispettare l'ordine dei loro capi religiosi e i pochi sunniti per evitare di essere completamente dimenticati nel nuovo riassetto del paese.

Le condizioni primarie affinché la democrazia possa mettere radici sono la sicurezza la sicurezza economica, l'esistenza di un apparato statale funzionante e l'uguaglianza di tutti i cittadini davanti alla legge. La realtà è che il progetto di esportare la democrazia sulle ali dei cacciabombardieri è fallito e che l'occupazione militare del paese da parte di potenze occidentali impedisce oggi qualsiasi progresso solido e tangibile.

Dall'altro canto, l'Iraq è diventato un paese esportatore, e non soltanto di petrolio. Gli attentanti in Giordania lo hanno dimostrato: l'Iraq esporta oggi il suo terrorismo. I kamikaze che si sono fatti esplodere erano infatti iracheni. Una donna che doveva partecipare agli attentati, ma che è sopravvissuta, ha spiegato che la sua famiglia è stata decimata durante le

offensive americane nel triangolo sunnita. Anch'io chiedo pertanto con forza un'inchiesta dell'ONU sull'uso, da parte delle forze americane, delle bombe proibite al fosforo bianco.

L'Iraq assomiglia quindi pericolosamente a un nuovo Afghanistan. Bush voleva combattere i terroristi in Afghanistan per non doverlo fare altrove, ma oggi i terroristi sono già altrove e ci chiediamo fino a dove arriveranno. L'Europa si trova quindi a dover affrontare due sfide, vale a dire l'ottusità di chi continua ad affermare che la campagna irachena è un successo e la determinazione omicida di chi dimostra ogni giorno che è invece un drammatico fallimento.

Per uscire da questo pantano non abbiamo bisogno né di propaganda né di storie rassicuranti, ma di lucidità e di uomini di Stato coraggiosi, capaci di riconoscere i loro errori e di disegnare una nuova strategia, una strategia di pace.

3-021

James Hugh Allister (NI). – Mr President, sadly the anti-Americanism of some in Europe is so great that I sense that some even take a perverse satisfaction from the turmoil prevailing in Iraq. These same people, of course, are those who would have been quite content to allow Saddam's tyranny to continue undisturbed.

Of course it was wrong of Blair and Bush to rely on and peddle false information to justify the invasion of Iraq, but the removal of Saddam was right and necessary. The situation as it is must now be faced. The core issue is to ensure the triumph of order over terror so that democratic stability may indeed be established.

A heavy price is being paid and I would wish to acknowledge the sacrifice of the American, British and other troops seeking to bring order to this strife-torn land. I regret that in their contributions neither the Council nor the Commission saw fit to make an acknowledgement of that sacrifice.

It must be said that it is typical of its grandstanding that the EU now wants to pontificate on the future of Iraq. It has little that is credible to contribute, for, when it mattered, the EU as an organisation and most EU Member States left the heavy lifting to others.

3-022

Béatrice Patrie (PSE). – Monsieur le Président, chers Collègues, l'adoption d'une constitution provisoire par le peuple irakien est pour nous une avancée majeure. La forte participation des citoyens au processus électoral constitue un facteur d'optimisme pour la démocratie naissante. L'évolution du pays ouvre bien sûr la voie à un futur partenariat entre l'Irak et l'Union européenne, notamment dans le cadre de sa politique de voisinage et d'un Mashrek pacifié et, à cet égard, je remercie Mme Ferrero-Waldner pour les engagements pris au nom de la Commission.

Les enjeux de ce partenariat sont nombreux: stabilisation démocratique du pays, construction d'un État de droit réel et non plus formel, respect des libertés fondamentales et des droits des minorités, mais encore passage d'une économie de guerre à une économie de paix, d'une économie dirigée à une économie de marché, affectation des ressources pétrolières à la diversification en faveur de l'agriculture, de l'industrie, des services, et enfin reconstruction des systèmes d'éducation et de santé détruits par tant d'années de pouvoir autoritaire, d'embargo et de guerre.

Mais à ce partenariat, il y a quelques préalables. L'évolution encore incertaine de l'Irak mérite notre plus grande vigilance. Nous ne pouvons pas passer par pertes et profits l'emploi de bombes à phosphore blanc – si l'information se révèle exacte – par les Américains à Falloudja. Une enquête doit être menée. Le remplacement des forces étrangères par un dispositif de maintien de la paix placé sous l'égide des Nations unies figure parmi nos objectifs.

Les élections du mois de décembre doivent permettre aux Irakiens d'élire un gouvernement et un parlement à l'image des équilibres humains et politiques du pays. À cet égard, le cadre institutionnel fédéral semble particulièrement adapté. Faire reculer les intégrismes, combattre la thèse du prétendu choc des civilisations, construire cet ensemble du Mashrek fondé sur des valeurs partagées, tels sont les objectifs qui doivent être assignés à l'Union européenne.

3-023

Józef Pinior (PSE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Od rozpoczęcia działań militarnych przeciwko reżimowi Saddama Husseina w Iraku zginęło ponad 2 000 żołnierzy amerykańskich a 15 000 zostało rannych. Brytyjska grupa badawcza *Iraq Body Count* szacuje na podstawie doniesień agencyjnych i prasowych straty po stronie irackiej na ponad 30 000 zabitych. Inne szacunki mówią o 100 000 ofiar.

Ratyfikacja konstytucji jest poważnym osiągnięciem w procesie odbudowy Iraku. 15 grudnia odbywają się wybory parlamentarne, w których zarejestrowało się 225 ugrupowań politycznych i koalicji. Do 31 grudnia br. parlament wybierze nowy rząd. Parlament pochodzący z demokratycznych wyborów, w którym sunnici będą posiadali swoją reprezentację, będzie mógł przez następne pół roku dokonać zmian w konstytucji.

Referendum konstytucyjne w Iraku podtrzymuje nadzieję na ugruntowywanie się na Bliskim Wschodzie i w Azji Centralnej zjawiska pogodzenia islamu z demokracją liberalną, które określa się jako demokrację muzułmańską. W Iraku

kończy się okres rządów tymczasowych i następuje - w warunkach nieustannych akcji terrorystycznych, w sytuacji, która ciągle może doprowadzić do wybuchu wojny domowej - formowanie polityki demokratycznej.

3-024

Παναγιώτης Μπεγλίτης (PSE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η διεθνής κοινότητα χαιρέτισε τα αποτελέσματα του δημοψηφίσματος ως ένα σημαντικό στάδιο στην πορεία για τον εκδημοκρατισμό του Ιράκ. Πράγματι έτσι είναι, αν παραμείνει κανείς προσκολλημένος στα ποσοστά συμμετοχής και στα αριθμητικά στοιχεία του αποτελέσματος. Φοβάμαι, όμως κύριε Πρόεδρε, ότι ο καθένας διαμορφώνει τη δική του εικονική πραγματικότητα για το Ιράκ. Δεν μπορούμε όμως να αγνοήσουμε την ίδια την πραγματικότητα διότι το σοβαρό κενό ασφαλείας συνεχίζει να υπάρχει. Αντί να αμβλύνονται προοδευτικά οι φυγόκεντρες τάσεις των εθνικών και θρησκευτικών κοινοτήτων, ενισχύονται και υπονομεύονται τον στόχο της εθνικής ενότητας, της ταυτότητας και της κυριαρχίας του Ιράκ.

Η πλειοψηφία των Σουνιτών βρίσκεται συνειδητά εκτός πολιτικών διαδικασιών. Η διαδικασία της πολιτικής ανασυγκρότησης οδηγεί στη δημιουργία ενός χαλαρού κράτους τριών, τουλάχιστον, ταχυτήτων. Από τη μια πλευρά χαιρετίζουμε την πορεία προς ένα δημοκρατικό Ιράκ, και από την άλλη εμπεδώνεται ένα θεοκρατικό σιτικό καθεστώς στον Νότο και μια οινοεί ανεξαρτησία των Κούρδων στον Βορρά.

Οι συνέπειες για την ειρήνη και τη σταθερότητα είναι προφανείς. Μέσα σ' αυτές τις συνθήκες προγραμματίζονται οι εκλογές για την ανάδειξη της νέας τραπεζικής βουλής. Φοβάμαι όμως ότι οι ευχές και οι ελπίδες που εκφράστηκαν σήμερα εδώ δεν ανταποκρίνονται στη σκληρή πραγματικότητα της στρατιωτικής κατοχής και τα σοβαρά στρατηγικά λάθη που συνεχίζουν να κάνουν οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες.

Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ένα παλιό αραβικό ρητό λέει: "Καλύτερα 100 χρόνια τυραννίας παρά ένας χρόνος χάους". Και ενώ τη τυραννία του καθεστώτος Χουσεΐν ανατράπηκε, οι συνθήκες που δημιουργούνται καθημερινά σπρώχνουν το Ιράκ σε ένα μακροχρόνιο χάος.

3-025

Lord Bach, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I thank all those who have taken part in this debate. This is an issue that raises passions and strong views and we have heard them expressed around the Chamber this morning.

However, I hope we can agree on two aspects at least. Firstly, on how excellent and what a good thing it is that Saddam Hussein is no longer in power in Iraq. Secondly, we can agree that any human rights abuses that have been shown to have been committed since he fell from power should be investigated and dealt with in a proper and sensible way.

I am very grateful for what the Commissioner had to say and for the excellent work of the Commission. It is right to point out that the EU has contributed to the UN Office of Constitutional Support both financially and through the provision of experts. The Iraqi Government has requested that the EU provide election monitors and, whilst the full election observation mission would, as the Commissioner said, not be possible at the moment, the Council will look closely at what we can do to monitor and support the elections.

As far as human rights are concerned, the Council's conclusions following the external relations meeting on 7 November emphasised the importance of full respect for human rights in Iraq. The Council underlined the EU's strong opposition to the use of the death penalty. It noted with concern recent reports – including by the United Nations – of human rights violations by the Iraqi security forces and urged the Iraqi Government to address these allegations. The EU stands ready to offer further support.

At the same time, the Council welcomed the improvement in the human rights situation since the fall of Saddam Hussein and condemned, as we all should, the atrocities of terrorists since then.

The issue of coalition troops has been raised during the debate and it is certainly an important issue. However, honourable Members will forgive me if I mention what President Talabani, the Kurdish leader whose people suffered so appallingly under Saddam Hussein, said only last weekend: 'Immediate withdrawal would be a catastrophe and lead to a kind of civil war. We will lose what we have done for liberating Iraq from the worst kind of dictatorship ... Instead of having a democratic, stable Iraq, we will have a civil war in Iraq, we will have troubles in Iraq and they will affect all the Middle East'. That seems to me an important statement by the President of Iraq at the present time.

The people of Iraq have demonstrated great commitment to democracy. They turned out in their millions and in the most difficult of circumstances to approve a new Constitution that will guide their country and protect their rights. If this momentum can be carried through to the December elections, then I believe Iraq could be on the verge of a major turning point and, with the election of a new government, Iraq enters a new phase.

The leaders of Iraq's first constitutionally elected government will owe a huge debt of responsibility to its people. They will place their trust and their future in the hands of those leaders and those leaders must respect that trust. That means

putting the nation's interests above political and personal ambition or ethnic or religious interests. The new government has to be truly representative if it is to survive.

It also must waste no time in getting down to business. That means ensuring security, health, education, employment and, of course, human rights. Terrorism and insecurity remain the biggest obstacles to political progress and reconstruction.

We should not underestimate the challenges that lie ahead, and I do not think this Parliament does. There is still a lot to be done and huge dangers that we all know about still threaten these processes. This fledgling democracy will require support for some time to come. The international community has done a lot already and the EU has a proud record: it has joined with the UN and others in committing significant resources to supporting the political transition and reconstruction.

We all have valuable expertise and experience of democracy-building to share. The Iraqi Government has expressed its appreciation for the significant contribution of the EU and it has asked for more. We should not let Iraq down.

3-026

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, it is true that the European Union has been divided over Iraq in the past, but it is also true that we are now united in building a new Iraq, and that is the most important thing now. We cannot continue looking backwards. We have to build a stable Iraq now and, although Mr Watson is correct in saying I emphasised the positive things we have been doing, it is also absolutely clear that the underlying situation is very difficult. That is why I said we cannot send to Iraq an election observation mission which otherwise I would have provided. It is too dangerous for our people and they would not be able to do their job properly.

What would the alternative be? In fact we have no alternative other than to try to work together. Of course, the challenge is absolutely enormous, and I consider that the Iraqi Government and its people have shown great courage in this. What my colleague has just said is true. The outcome of the election was quite encouraging and really astonishing under these difficult circumstances. This shows that the average Iraqi wants stability and peace, but there is also a minority, a very strong minority, which is of course extremist and radical, that is trying to undermine all the efforts made by the international community and the Iraqi Government. I did not mean to be one-sided and perhaps I could have made myself clearer.

On the question of torture and recent events, we will have to see whether all the allegations are true. If they are, we must make it clear that human rights, just as Lord Bach has already said, are part of our very strong values and the ones we want to export to Iraq and to be taken into consideration there.

I learned today that the Prime Minister of Iraq has already said he would himself set up a committee to investigate all instances of torture perpetrated by Iraqis themselves. We can contribute to that through EUJUST LEX and by building up a police corps that does not torture, but which knows what the limits are and tries to help restore order. We are therefore in this for the long run and will have to remain in Iraq for a long time in order to restore stability to that country. This is something that is also very important for the region as a whole. Indeed, I am working with regard to the whole region as part of the broader Middle East initiative, and we will cooperate with the Americans on this issue too.

3-027

Le Président. – Le débat est clos.

(*La séance, suspendue à 10 heures dans l'attente de Margaret Beckett, Présidente en exercice du Conseil, est reprise à 10h10*)

3-028

VORSITZ: DAGMAR ROTH-BEHRENDT
Vizepräsidentin

3-029

4 - Bewältigung des globalen Klimawandels

3-030

Die Präsidentin. – Als nächster Punkt folgt die Gemeinsame Aussprache über

1. die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zum Klimawandel
2. den Bericht von Anders Wijkman im Namen des Ausschusses für Umweltfragen, Volksgesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit über die Strategie für eine erfolgreiche Bekämpfung der globalen Klimaänderung [2005/2049(INI)] (A6-0312/2005).

3-031

Margaret Beckett, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, there is now almost universal acceptance that climate change is a serious and an urgent problem. The IPCC predicts that global temperatures may rise by as much as 5.8°C by the year 2100. According to one insurance company, the estimated economic costs of global warming could double to USD 150 billion each year in the next 10 years, hitting insurers with USD 30-40 billion worth of claims. There is good evidence that the 2003 European heatwave was influenced by global warming and that, as Members will recall, resulted in 26 000 premature deaths, as well as costing USD 13.5 billion.

Those events and their associated price tags bring very close to home the reality of what unchecked climate change would mean for us. It is clear that the scale of a climate change problem is enormous and that it is pressing, and that is why the UK decided to make climate change a priority for our presidencies of both the G8 and the EU.

2005 has been a critical year for international climate change policy. The Kyoto Protocol has entered into force. The EU Emissions Trading Scheme is up and running and we are due, at the end of the year, to begin discussions on further action beyond 2012, something to which I will return.

The G8 represents only a small – albeit key – group of countries, but the progress we have made there will, I hope, have a major impact. The G8 summit discussions in July concluded with an ambitious communiqué. It included agreement from all members, including the United States, on the role of human activity in global warming and on the need for urgent action. There was also consensus on a package of actions to combat climate change through a diverse range of avenues: energy efficiency, cleaner power generation, research and development, financing of cleaner energy, managing the impacts of climate change, as well as combating illegal logging.

The G8 countries have engaged with the World Bank and other development banks to improve the harnessing of funding for clean technology and, crucially, they also agreed to begin a new dialogue between the G8 and other countries with significant energy needs on climate change, clean energy and sustainable development. The first meeting of that dialogue took place in London on 1 November. Mexico has offered to host a second meeting next year.

The Member States of the European Union were some of the first in the 1990s to recognise the dangers of global warming, the link to human activity and the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As long ago as 1991 the Commission issued the first Community strategy aimed at limiting CO₂ emissions and improving energy efficiency. In the light of the EU's commitments under the Kyoto Protocol, it soon became clear that more needed to be done. So, in 2000 came the launch of the European climate change programme. Today the EU is taking the lead, for example in focusing on emissions from aviation, and we warmly welcome the Commission's recent communication on reducing the climate change impacts of aviation. Its announcement of support for the inclusion of aviation emissions in the EU Emissions Trading Scheme is highly encouraging and we look forward to fostering progress in that area as a priority for our Presidency of the European Union.

Within Europe there is a clear recognition of the importance of energy efficiency in meeting the challenge posed by climate change and work is already under way to deliver energy efficiency savings throughout the Community. The energy services directive which we hope to agree by the end of the year is expected to provide a challenging first step, while the Commission's Green Paper on energy efficiency published at the end of June should set the future blueprint for Europe's energy efficiency strategy to 2020.

But despite all this work and effort, it is clear that emissions in the EU are not being reduced as quickly as we want and that urgent action is needed in all sectors, at both national and EU level. So I applaud the Commission's decision to launch a new phase of the European climate change programme to look at what more can be done.

Alongside this, the Commission and Council are developing an EU medium- and long-term strategy for tackling climate change and will report on progress so far to the December European Council. Parliament's input in this will be crucial, so the resolution that you have recently produced is an extremely valuable contribution to this process.

The UK Presidency has set out to create a fresh momentum in the wider international process in which the EU plays such a crucial role. That is why we put climate change on the agenda of our EU summits with China and India. These two countries are particularly important partners for the EU in tackling climate change. Both summits included useful bilateral discussions on energy security and efficiency.

A key element of the partnership with China is a new initiative on near-zero emissions for coal, with carbon capture and storage, to address the vital challenge of tackling the increasing greenhouse gas emissions from coal. We also agreed a new partnership with India. The EU-Russia summit too was an excellent chance to consider what experiences we can share with regard to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, to ensure its mechanisms are up and running as soon as possible.

In September, for the first time, Ministers from the Agriculture Council met Environment Ministers to discuss the impacts of climate change on agriculture in the EU. We also put climate change on the agenda of the Energy, Transport and Competitiveness Councils.

All this activity is leading to the first meeting in December of the parties to the Kyoto Protocol in Montreal, where, under the Protocol, parties will begin discussions on the next period after 2012. Let me make it quite clear that the EU and the UK remain absolutely committed both to the Kyoto Protocol itself and to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. As our Prime Minister Tony Blair said this week at the Lord Mayor's banquet in London, the world needs a framework with the necessary targets, sensitively and intelligently applied over the right timeframe, that takes us beyond 2012. Perhaps I could ask colleagues to take particular note of the use of the word 'targets', because the UK has repeatedly stated that formal agreements with targets are absolutely essential in any international climate change regime, not least because they give incentive and certainty to the business community.

The informal G8 process is also hugely important, but it is complementary. It is not, and was never intended to be, a substitute for the Kyoto Protocol or for the United Nations Convention. I hope the work we have done this year through both presidencies will in fact be built on at Montreal.

Montreal will primarily be the celebration of a massive achievement: the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol. There were times when it looked as though that might never happen, but the EU continued doggedly to work for such an outcome, and now here we are, with the world's only credible, binding international agreement on controlling greenhouse gas emissions.

The EU set out our negotiating position for Montreal at the October Environment Council. First, we want to agree the Marrakesh Accords – the decisions that will form the rulebook of the Protocol. Secondly, we want to agree a compliance mechanism to ensure that parties to the Protocol keep to its rules. Thirdly, we want to seek to improve the way the Kyoto mechanisms – and here I am talking mainly about the clean development mechanism – work. Emissions trading, the CDM and joint implementation are all crucial elements to the Protocol and will remain essential in the years to come.

Finally, the Montreal Conference will look to the future and begin to discuss what happens when the first Kyoto commitment period ends in 2012. This last issue is likely to be by far the most delicate, as well as the most important, element. There is no question but that we want to build on the Kyoto Protocol post-2012 and that we have to launch a discussion under Article 3(9) of that Protocol to consider future commitments of the EU along with other Kyoto parties. However, it is also quite clear that for a global climate change regime to be truly effective, we need broader participation than the Protocol currently offers. At Montreal we will be looking for pathways towards a framework post-2012 which builds on and learns from the Kyoto Protocol as it stands and can include as many countries as possible.

The EU will clearly have to back our political ambition for the Montreal Conference of the Parties with real evidence that we are taking a lead in tackling climate change. The Kyoto Protocol also stipulates that, by the end of 2005, parties must demonstrate their progress in meeting their Kyoto commitments. This will be the ideal time for the EU to reaffirm our commitment to Kyoto, to meeting our emission reduction targets and to our obligations to assist developing countries. In preparing for the conference, we are assembling data, facts and figures to show the practical application of our political commitment. We know that we need to do more and we all stand ready to do more.

Today's debate here in Strasbourg will allow us to take stock of the current situation and offer us a further opportunity to demonstrate to the rest of the world that the EU takes this problem very seriously and is committed to delivering results. Together we have already achieved a great deal; we have shown leadership and made a real difference. We need to continue to do that and not falter as the environmental stakes get higher.

We will not see a resolution to the problem at Montreal, nor under the current UK Presidency of the EU. We need future presidencies – both of the EU and of the G8 – to carry on this work, keeping climate change high on their agendas and tackling the major threats it poses to our economies, our society and our environment. There are encouraging signs that the next G8 presidencies – Russia and Japan – fully intend to do so and I have every confidence in the EU's continued determination to tackle this vital issue.

(Applause)

3-032

Σταύρος Δήμας, Μέλος της Επιτροπής. – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, χαίρομαι ιδιαίτερα που μου δίδεται η ευκαιρία να συζητήσω μαζί σας τις πρόσφατες εξελίξεις γύρω από τις κλιματικές αλλαγές, καθώς και τον τρόπο με τον οποίο θα ενισχυθεί η σχετική πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και θα επιτευχθεί η ενεργός εμπλοκή όλων των εταίρων σε μια αποδοτική διεθνή συνεργασία στο πεδίο αυτό.

Η σημερινή συζήτηση έχει ιδιαίτερη σημασία εν όψει της επικείμενης συνάντησης των συμβαλλομένων μερών στο Μόντρεαλ η οποία σηματοδοτείται από την έναρξη ισχύος του Πρωτοκόλλου του Κιότο και των συζητήσεων για το καθεστώς αντιμετώπισης των καιρικών αλλαγών μετά το 2012.

Όλοι έχουμε ανησυχήσει από τις πρόσφατες αλλεπάλληλες θεομηνίες. Είχαμε φέτος σοβαρή ξηρασία στην Ιβηρική Χερσόνησο, είχαμε πλημμύρες κατά τη διάρκεια του καλοκαιριού στην Κεντρική Ευρώπη, είχαμε μια σειρά από τυφώνες - Κατρίνα, Ρίτα, Βίλμα - αλλά και άλλες θεομηνίες μικρότερης σημασίας.

Το 2005 σημειώθηκε ήδη ένα ρεκόρ άνευ προηγουμένου, καθώς το 2005 ήταν το έτος με τους περισσότερους επώνυμους τροπικούς κυκλώνες από τότε που άρχισαν να καταγράφονται αυτά τα φαινόμενα. Παρ' όλο που συγκεκριμένα καιρικά φαινόμενα δεν μπορούν να συνδεθούν ευθέως με τις κλιματικές αλλαγές, εν τούτοις τα αυξανόμενα φαινόμενα ξηρασίας και πλημμυρών, καθώς και οι σοβαρότεροι και συχνότεροι τυφώνες ή οι τροπικές καταιγίδες αποτελούν επιβεβαίωση των επιστημονικών προειδοποίησεων σχετικά με την αλλαγή του κλίματος.

Η γη πιθανότατα ποτέ στην ιστορία της δεν θερμάνθηκε με τόση ταχύτητα ώστε κατά τα τελευταία 30 χρόνια. Η δεκαετία του '90 ήταν η θερμότερη, εννέα δε από τα 10 θερμότερα χρόνια στην ιστορία περιλαμβάνονται στο διάστημα μεταξύ 1995 και 2004 με θερμότερο το 1998. Οι επιστήμονες εκφράζουν φόβους ότι ίσως το 2005 να είναι τελικά το θερμότερο έτος στην ιστορία.

Είναι γνωστό ότι όταν θερμαίνεται ο πλανήτης θερμαίνεται και η θάλασσα και όταν η θερμοκρασία της θάλασσας υπερβεί τους 26°C, τότε είναι πιθανός ο σχηματισμός τροπικού κυκλώνα. Η θερμοκρασία στην επιφάνεια της θάλασσας έχει αυξηθεί σε παγκόσμιο επίπεδο τα τελευταία 100 χρόνια σε 0,6%, πράγμα το οποίο σημαίνει ότι στο μέλλον πιθανότατα θα έχουμε πολύ συχνότερους και εντονότερους κυκλώνες.

Ωστόσο, από το να προσδιορίσουμε κατά πόσον ο τυφώνας Κατρίνα ή άλλα καιρικά φαινόμενα προκλήθηκαν από ανθρώπινες δραστηριότητες είναι πιο σημαντικό να αντλήσουμε μαθήματα από αυτά τα καιρικά φαινόμενα, ώστε να κερδίσουμε τη μάχη κατά των κλιματικών αλλαγών.

Θα ήθελα να αναφερθώ ειδικότερα στο ψήφισμα του Κοινοβουλίου σχετικά με την ανακοίνωση "Επιτυχής καταπολέμηση της αλλαγής του κλίματος του πλανήτη" και θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω ιδιαίτερα τον εισηγητή κ. Wijkman, καθώς και τα μέλη της Επιτροπής Περιβάλλοντος, της Επιτροπής Ανάπτυξης και της Επιτροπής Βιομηχανίας, Έρευνας και Ενέργειας για τις πολύτιμες και συγκεκριμένες υποδείξεις τους.

Στο σχέδιο ψηφίσματος τονίζεται ότι η κοινοτική στρατηγική για τον περιορισμό της αλλαγής του κλίματος, πρέπει να βασιστεί σε μια προσέγγιση που περιλαμβάνει τα εξής: την αξιοποίηση των βασικών στοιχείων του Πρωτοκόλλου του Κιότο, τη δραστική μείωση των εκπομπών αερίων του θερμοκηπίου στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, τη συμμετοχή άλλων βασικών χωρών, -όπως οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες- την ανάπτυξη στρατηγικής συνεργασίας με καίριας σημασίας αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες, την ενεργό προώθηση της έρευνας και της καινοτομίας και τη βελτίωση της ενεργειακής απόδοσης στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Συμφωνώ και στηρίζω την προσέγγιση αυτή, οι δε πρωτοβουλίες που ανέλαβε η Επιτροπή φέτος στο πεδίο της κλιματικής αλλαγής συμβαδίζουν, ως επί το πλείστον, με την πρόταση του Κοινοβουλίου.

Επιτρέψτε μου να κάνω μία σύντομη γενική αναφορά: Τον Οκτώβριο, η Επιτροπή σήμανε την αρχή μιας νέας εποχής του ευρωπαϊκού προγράμματος για την αλλαγή του κλίματος μέσα από ένα μεγάλο συνέδριο στις Βρυξέλλες στο οποίο έλαβαν μέρος οι κύριοι πρωταγωνιστές του κλάδου. Το νέο ευρωπαϊκό πρόγραμμα για την αλλαγή του κλίματος θα αποτελέσει ένα νέο πλαίσιο για την πολιτική που ασκούμε σχετικά με τις κλιματικές αλλαγές με αντικείμενο και προοπτική πέραν του 2012.

Αντιμετωπίζουμε μια σειρά νέων θεμάτων, όπως είναι, π.χ., οι αερομεταφορές, και ασχολούμαστε επίσης με νέες τεχνολογίες - όπως π.χ. η δέσμευση του άνθρακα - που προσφέρουν ευκαιρίες για τη λήψη οικονομικώς αποδοτικών μέτρων μείωσης των εκπομπών αερίων του θερμοκηπίου.

Ως πρώτο βήμα, η Επιτροπή συγκροτεί ορισμένες ομάδες εργασίας. Μεταξύ αυτών είναι: η ομάδα εργασίας που θα προβεί σε ανασκόπηση της έως σήμερα συντελεσθείσας προόδου στην υλοποίηση των πολιτικών για την αλλαγή του κλίματος, η ομάδα που θα διερευνήσει τη δέσμευση και την αποθήκευση του άνθρακα σε γεωλογικούς σχηματισμούς ως ένα μέτρο για τον μετριασμό της αλλαγής του κλίματος, η ομάδα που θα αξιολογήσει την ένταξη των αεροπορικών μεταφορών στον κοινοτικό μηχανισμό εμπορίας δικαιωμάτων εκπομπών αερίων του θερμοκηπίου, η ομάδα που θα προετοιμάσει την επανεξέταση της κοινοτικής στρατηγικής για τη μείωση των εκπομπών διοξειδίου του άνθρακα από ελαιφρά επαγγελματικά οχήματα και η ομάδα που θα προσδιορίσει τις αναγκαίες πολιτικές προσαρμογές που πρέπει να ακολουθήσει η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

Κάθε μια από τις προαναφερθείσες ομάδες θα προσδιορίσει συγκεκριμένα νέα πεδία, όπου η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα μπορέσει να ενισχύσει τις δράσεις της για την αντιμετώπιση των κλιματικών αλλαγών. Αναμένεται ότι η πρώτη από τις παραπάνω ομάδες θα αρχίσει να υποβάλλει τις τελικές εκθέσεις της κατά το πρώτο εξάμηνο του επόμενου έτους.

Η Επιτροπή επίσης υιοθέτησε, όπως είπε και η κ. Beckett, μια Πράσινη Βίβλο σχετικά με την ενεργειακή απόδοση. Επίσης, θα ήθελα να αναφερθώ στην ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής με τον τίτλο "Περιορισμός του αντικτύπου των αερομεταφορών στην αλλαγή του κλίματος". Οι αεροπορικές μεταφορές συμβάλλουν σε αυξανόμενο βαθμό στις εκπομπές αερίων του θερμοκηπίου. Η ανακοίνωση καταλήγει στο συμπέρασμα ότι για να περιοριστούν αυτές οι εκπομπές, ο καλύτερος τρόπος είναι η ένταξη του τομέα αερομεταφορών στον κοινοτικό μηχανισμό εμπορίας δικαιωμάτων εκπομπών. Ύστερα από διαβούλευση με τους ενδιαφερόμενους παράγοντες, η Επιτροπή σκοπεύει να υποβάλει σχετική νομοθετική πρόταση έως τα τέλη του 2006.

Φυσικά οι πρωτοβουλίες της Επιτροπής δεν περιορίζονται μόνο στην ανάπτυξη δράσεων εντός τη Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Συμμετέχουμε ενεργώς σε συζητήσεις με τρίτες χώρες ζητώντας τη γνώμη τους σχετικά με τα επόμενα βήματα που πρέπει να γίνουν κατά τις μελλοντικές διαπραγματεύσεις για το κλίμα και για τη δημιουργία νέων δομών ενίσχυσης του πολιτικού διαλόγου και της τεχνολογικής συνεργασίας μας.

Η αλλαγή του κλίματος και, ιδιαίτερα, οι σχέσεις της με την ενέργεια και την ασφάλεια του εφοδιασμού με ενέργεια είναι στις προτεραιότητες των διμερών και πολυμερών επαφών μας. Στον τομέα αυτό συνεργαζόμαστε στενά με τη Βρετανική Προεδρία η οποία μάλιστα έθεσε, όπως είπε και η κ. Beckett προηγουμένως, τις κλιματικές αλλαγές πολύ υψηλά στην Ατζέντα στη Διάσκεψη Κορυφής των 8 στο Gleneagles, και η οποία συνεχώς θέτει το θέμα των κλιματικών αλλαγών ως ένα από τα θέματα προτεραιοτήτων.

Τα αποτελέσματα είναι ενθαρρυντικά. Η συμφωνία για την εταιρική σύμπραξη Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Κίνας σχετικά με την αλλαγή του κλίματος και την ενέργεια, προσφέρει το πολιτικό πλαίσιο για πιο στενή συνεργασία και διάλογο για τα θέματα αυτά. Η εταιρική σύμπραξη Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Κίνας έχει ως κύριο στόχο την ανάπτυξη προηγμένης, σχεδόν μηδενικών εκπομπών, τεχνολογίας άνθρακα με βάση τη δέσμευση του διοξειδίου του άνθρακα και την αποθήκευσή του σε βιολογικούς σχηματισμούς. Σκοπεύει παράλληλα να προωθήσει άλλες καθαρές πηγές ενέργειας, καθώς και την ενεργειακή απόδοση, την εξοικονόμηση ενέργειας και τις ανανεώσιμες πηγές ενέργειας.

Η πρωτοβουλία Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης-Ινδίας για την καθαρή ανάπτυξη και τις κλιματικές αλλαγές, προβλέπει διάφορες πρωτοβουλίες ούτως ώστε να αναπτυχθεί ο διάλογος. Δίνει έμφαση στη συνεργασία για την ανάπτυξη και αξιολόγηση καθαρών τεχνολογιών στις αναγκαίες προσαρμογές στη θέρμανση του πλανήτη και στον μηχανισμό καθαρής ανάπτυξης του Πρωτοκόλλου του Κιότο.

Στα τέλη του μήνα, στο Μόντρεαλ του Καναδά, θα ξεκινήσει η Διάσκεψη των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τις κλιματικές αλλαγές που θα διαρκέσει 2 εβδομάδες. Η Επιτροπή έχει συμμετάσχει ενεργά σε μια σειρά ανεπίσημων συναντήσεων προετοιμασίας της Διάσκεψης στο Μόντρεαλ. Οι δραστηριότητές μας, τόσο στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση όσο και στη διεθνή σκηνή, έχουν διαδραματίσει σοβαρό ρόλο ώστε να διαμορφωθούν οι συνθήκες για να επιτύχει αυτή η Διάσκεψη. Ποιοι είναι οι στόχοι μας στο Μόντρεαλ:

Πρώτον, η συνάντηση θα σηματοδοτήσει την έναρξη ισχύος του Πρωτοκόλλου του Κιότο με τη θέσπιση των κανόνων και των διαδικασιών που απαιτούνται για την εφαρμογή του. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, είναι σημαντικό να αποδείξουμε ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση ανταποκρίνεται στις δεσμεύσεις της.

Δεύτερον, ο εντατικός διάλογος που έχει διεξαχθεί τους τελευταίους μήνες, έχει δημιουργήσει μια σημαντική δυναμική, ώστε στη Διάσκεψη του Μόντρεαλ να ξεκινήσει η συζήτηση σε διεθνές επίπεδο, σχετικά με τη μορφή του μελλοντικού διεθνούς καθεστώτος για την αλλαγή του κλίματος.

Η επίτευξη των ανωτέρω στόχων δεν είναι, ωστόσο, δεδομένη. Ένας μικρός αριθμός χωρών, με επικεφαλής τις Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες, εξακολουθούν να είναι απρόθυμες να μετάσχουν στο διάλογο για το μελλοντικό παγκόσμιο καθεστώς σχετικά με την αλλαγή του κλίματος. Τις επόμενες εβδομάδες θα χρειασθεί να εντείνουμε τις προσπάθειες, ώστε να συνεργαστούν και αυτές οι χώρες στην έναρξη του διαλόγου.

Είναι επίσης σημαντικό να αντιληφθούμε ότι η συνάντηση του Μόντρεαλ δεν είναι το τέλος της διαδικασίας: θα σημάνει την έναρξη του διαλόγου αλλά δεν θα δώσει τη λύση. Η λύση μπορεί να βρεθεί μόνο μέσα από ένα εντατικό διεθνή διάλογο στα επόμενα χρόνια. Μέσα από αυτόν το διάλογο οφείλουμε να βρούμε τις λύσεις που θα ανταποκρίνονται στα βασικά στοιχεία του μελλοντικού καθεστώτος για το κλίμα, όπως προσδιορίστηκε στην ανακοίνωση της Επιτροπής, νωρίτερα, φέτος. Τα στοιχεία αυτά αντικατοπτρίζονται στο σχέδιο ψηφίσματος του Κοινοβουλίου. Ευρύτερη συμμετοχή, κάλυψη όλων των τομέων και όλων των αερίων, τόνωση της ανάπτυξης και χρησιμοποίησης νέων τεχνολογιών, χρήση μέσων που βασίζονται στους μηχανισμούς της αγοράς και τέλος, πολιτικές προσαρμογής στις συνέπειες της αύξησης της θέρμανσης του πλανήτη.

Τελειώνοντας, για να οδηγηθούμε σε θετική έκβαση του διαλόγου, πρέπει να εξακολουθήσει να υπάρχει ενεργό πολιτικό ενδιαφέρον για το θέμα των κλιματικών αλλαγών και να ενισχυθεί ο ηγετικός ρόλος της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης. Πρέπει να δείξουμε ότι μπορούμε να μειώσουμε τις εκπομπές μας και ότι αυτό συμβάλλει στην οικονομική μας ανάπτυξη. Το σχέδιο ψηφίσματος αποστέλλει ένα σαφές μήνυμα: ότι στην αντιμετώπιση της πρόκλησης αυτής, η Επιτροπή μπορεί πάντοτε να υπολογίζει στη στήριξη του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου.

3-033

Anders Wijkman (PPE-DE), föredragande. – Fru talman, herr kommissionsedamot! Jag vill rikta ett särskilt tack till minister Beckett som har kommit hit idag. Klimatförändringen är ett av de allvarligaste hoten som vi står inför. Jag vill understryka att det inte längre kan ses som ett miljöproblem. Ett varmare klimat är ett instabilare klimat, och det innebär ett hot mot i stort sett varje sektor i vårt samhälle, ett hot som måste betecknas som en del av vår säkerhetsproblematik. Det är ett säkerhetshot mot EU och dess medlemsstater men naturligtvis också mot många fattiga länder i tropikerna.

Samtidigt som jag säger detta vill jag understryka att det är viktigt att inte se klimatfrågan enbart som ett problem och en börsa. Om vi gör rätt saker, kan vi minska riskerna för samhället i framtiden. Om vi gör rätt saker, kan vi också öppna upp möjligheter för företag och teknik på en rad områden. Det finns en samarbetssgrupp som heter *Climate Group* i världen, där en rad stora företag ingår som visar att det på ganska kort tid går att både minska utsläppen och tjäna en mängd pengar. Jag anser att den nödvändiga omställningen av energi- och transportsystemen i vår del av världen borde bli en viktig hävstång i Lissabonprocessen och kunna driva på för att skapa nya arbetstillfällen och exportmöjligheter.

Parlamentets betänkande ger en rad förslag till åtgärder för strategin efter 2012. Vi menar att EU skall fortsätta spela en ledande roll i klimatarbetet på internationell nivå. Minister Becketts inlägg nyss bekräftade att denna syn delas inom rådet. Vi måste göra mer på kort sikt, så att vi verkligen lever upp till Kyotoprotokollets krav. Vi står dock bara för en del av utsläppen, ungefär 14 procent, idag. Vi måste alltså få med andra aktörer. Det är mycket brådskande att vi på sikt får med USA i ett konstruktivt samarbete. Vi måste ställa upp långsiktiga mål. Vi kräver, eller önskar oss, minskningar på 30 procent till 2020 och 60–80 procent till 2050. Det är för övrigt ett krav som ständigt kommer från företagsamheten som säger att den behöver långsiktiga spelregler.

Utvecklingsländernas situation är naturligtvis oerhört viktig. För dem är energi först och främst en fråga om tillväxt och utveckling, men de behöver inte repetera våra misstag. Vi behöver strategiska partnerskap, inte minst med de stora utvecklingsländerna, för att stimulera till tekniksprång och till investeringar i bästa möjliga teknologi. Det som har inletts på detta område genom kommissionens avtal med Kina är naturligtvis väldigt bra, men det måste skalas upp och bli mycket, mycket större. Betänk att Kina varje månad sätter igång två nya koleldade kraftverk!

Vi måste satsa mer på forskning och utveckling. Det är ett faktum idag att regeringarna världen över satsar mindre som en andel av BNP på energiforskning än vad de gjorde för 30 år sedan. Det är helt obegripligt för mig. Jag brukar jämföra detta med Apolloprojektet. Om amerikanerna inom tio år kunde placera en människa på månen, borde vi med massiva insatser på forskning och utveckling kunna göra något liknande när det gäller ett genombrott för nya teknologier. Vi måste för att bli trovärdiga i politiken vidta kraftfulla åtgärder på hemmaplan. Vi måste stimulera energisparandet, vilket redan har understrukits flera gånger. Det innebär att t.ex. byggnadsdirektivet bör utvidgas och bli mera ambitiöst.

Transportområdet är ett mycket kritisit område. Vi välkomnar att sjöfarten och flyget skall inkluderas i klimatpolitiken. Vi förordar snabba åtgärder för att effektivisera järnvägstransporterna. Vi menar att vi måste dra rätt slutsatser av svårigheterna att minska utsläppen inom vägtrafiken. Vi behöver och föreslår därför ambitiösa och bindande regler för utsläpp av koldioxid från nya fordon. Vi behöver hjälpa nya teknologier – och de finns – att komma till marknaden. Det finns dock rader av hinder. Ett av dem är naturligtvis att vi fortfarande subventionerar konventionell, dvs. fossileldad, teknologi. Vi behöver bygga ut handeln med utsläppsrätter, men vi måste naturligtvis se till att tilldelningen inte blir lika ambitiös som den blev förra året. I stället måste vi steg för steg sänka taket. Vi måste inbjuda andra aktörer att delta i detta, så att inte vi blir den enda marknaden i Europa.

Flertalet av de åtgärder som föreslås i betänkandet riktar sig mot företag och producenter. Vi menar också att vi måste involvera medborgarna mer aktivt. Allas vår livsstil påverkar utvecklingen. Vi har en idé om att på sikt överväga någon form av utsläppshandel på individnivå. Kanske är detta inte möjligt att genomföra i praktiken, men ett första steg borde vara att öka kunskapen om kolinnehållet i allt som vi handlar och i samband med våra transporter.

Vi i parlamentet och i de europeiska institutionerna bör naturligtvis leva som vi lär. Vi bör se till att t.ex. våra byggnader och våra transporter är så kolsnåla som möjligt. Det finns mycket att göra på detta område. Avslutningsvis vill jag önska både kommissionen och rådet lycka till i Montreal. Se till att EU kan fortsätta spela en ledande roll och driva på det internationella klimatarbetet mot positiva resultat.

3-034

Paul Verges (GUE/NGL), rapporteur pour avis de la commission du développement. – Monsieur le Président, mes chers collègues, je voudrais, au nom de la commission du développement, féliciter d'abord notre collègue Anders Wijkman pour son excellent rapport sur le changement climatique.

En tant que rapporteur de cette commission, je voudrais formuler quelques brèves observations d'ordre général. Notre collègue a raison de souligner que, si le réchauffement planétaire représente un défi environnemental, il est surtout un défi pour le développement.

En fait, les changements climatiques constituent à nos yeux un véritable enjeu de civilisation. C'est pourquoi notre commission a tenu à souligner que la combinaison des conséquences du changement climatique, de l'évolution démographique mondiale et de la mondialisation économique ouvrent une période d'instabilité sans précédent dans l'histoire de l'humanité. Il est en effet à craindre que, dans ce contexte, le réchauffement planétaire n'aggrave la fracture entre le monde développé et les pays en retard de développement. Il est malheureusement certain que ces pays seront les plus touchés par les impacts du changement climatique. Cela est particulièrement vrai pour les petits États insulaires, vulnérables à plus d'un titre, notamment face aux cyclones et à la montée du niveau des océans.

C'est la raison pour laquelle nous considérons que l'aide à l'adaptation de ces pays face aux impacts du changement climatique doit constituer une priorité dans la politique d'aide au développement de l'Union européenne. Nous recommandons que l'Union européenne développe une politique de coopération spécifique pour les pays en voie de développement. Vous l'aurez compris, pour la commission du développement, la lutte contre le changement climatique est donc inseparable de la lutte contre la pauvreté et de la réalisation des objectifs du Millénaire.

Le rapport a également raison d'insister sur les efforts restant à réaliser en matière d'atténuation pour atteindre les objectifs du protocole de Kyoto. Une question pour terminer, Madame la Présidente. Alors qu'aujourd'hui, 20 % de la population de la planète consomme 80 % de l'énergie mondiale, qu'en sera-t-il vers 2050 de la pollution de l'atmosphère, et ce alors même qu'il faudra répondre aux besoins d'énergie de 9 à 10 milliards d'habitants?

3-035

Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines, en nombre del Grupo PPE-DE. – Señora Presidenta, evidentemente el cambio climático es tan intenso y tan cercano a nosotros que ya ha dejado de ser un problema intelectual y un problema de determinados grupos más sensibles, que lo habían puesto sobre la mesa.

Es una oportunidad para cambiar nuestros hábitos y costumbres, es una oportunidad para reducir emisiones y conseguir un aire más limpio, es una oportunidad para el desarrollo de energías renovables y alternativas y, también, es una oportunidad para que Europa se plantea su dependencia de las energías fósiles, muchas veces en territorios con una inestabilidad política grande y sometidos a fuertes cambios de precios. Por tanto, creo que abre también la puerta a la oportunidad de revisar y plantearnos la energía nuclear como una de las muchas soluciones, además de otras alternativas.

Todavía hemos de mejorar mucho la investigación y el conocimiento de las causas del cambio climático. Se ha investigado muy poco, por ejemplo, sobre la relación entre agricultura y cambio climático. Hay recientes investigaciones que han encendido una luz roja y abierto otro camino; estamos culpando únicamente a la industria del problema. Creo que tendríamos que hacer una agricultura inteligente y orientada hacia esas estrategias; eso sería científicamente mucho más seguro.

Por otra parte, creo que hay que mejorar también el tema de las cuotas, los modelos matemáticos para la fijación de cuotas; todavía hay muchos países que lo están haciendo de una manera poco correcta, cuando otros han llegado a buenas soluciones, como los británicos.

También creo que es preciso buscar estrategias para compensar el cambio climático y determinar en qué medida se puede paliar. Considero que ha de revisarse la política sobre la sequía y la desertificación en el Mediterráneo y atender el sufrimiento y el deterioro ocasionados al sistema ecológico e, incluso, al sistema de nuestros recursos animales y a la fauna.

3-036

Gyula Hegyi, on behalf of the PSE Group. – Madam President, we have seen the faces of the victims of the New Orleans hurricane and flood. Global warming does not mean actual warming in every single part of the world. It means a growing number of disasters, for instance weather irregularities, huge losses of lives and valuables. We simply use too much fossil energy. If the developing nations, including almost three billion people in China and India, follow the American way of consumption then we will burn up our planet. That is why on behalf of the Socialist Group I welcome Mr Wijkman's brave report.

Nice words are not enough, however. We have to urge our partners to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. We have to find allies for this goal among broadminded politicians and citizens in the US who understand the importance of sustainable development.

In order to reduce emissions we need a strong shift to public transport. Rail is five times more efficient than road transport. Furthermore, it is environmentally friendly. But the European Union still lacks the proper tools to encourage it. The EU

does not have any projects to improve urban public transport, and the growing number of cars in our cities means that urban life is becoming more and more chaotic and unhealthy. Our urban population deserves more care from us as politicians as regards clean air and good public transport.

Renewable energies are developing in some countries, but in other Member States only a few steps have been taken. We need binding targets if not for 2010 then at least for 2020.

There is one point on which I would contradict Mrs Beckett. I think that semi-solutions such as carbon storage cannot be a solution for the future. Instead of hiding our growing emissions temporarily, we have to reduce them. If a nuclear power station is to be closed down for any reason it should be replaced only by renewable energies. Closing nuclear power stations and using more fossil energy would be a kind of collective suicide.

3-037

Caroline Lucas, on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group. – Madam President, I should like to thank the Commission and Council for their statements. I have to say though that I do not share Mrs Beckett's upbeat assessment of how the European Union is doing, despite the British Government's pledge to make climate change a priority for its Presidency. Progress on the ground has been very disappointing. Hearing the G8 communiqué on climate change being called ambitious stretches the English language almost to breaking point. If the British Presidency is genuinely going to show international leadership on this subject, then it has to get its own house in order first.

Earlier this year, we commissioned a report from the Association for the Conservation of Energy to assess how well this government has been implementing existing European laws on reducing fossil-fuel use. Their findings made clear that this is a government which has delayed implementation of the directive on the energy performance of buildings, demanded an increase in the UK's level of CO₂ emissions permitted under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme, failed to set binding targets for energy-demand reduction under the energy services directive, and failed to promote small-scale combined heat and power plants in line with the cogeneration directive.

This is why the Council should take particular notice of the European Parliament's report on climate change, which has been expertly drafted by Anders Wijkman. There they will find a genuinely bold and ambitious call to action. In particular, the report demands strong emission reductions at home, starting with 20% to 30% domestic reductions in the EU by 2020, increasing to between 60% and 80% by 2050. It calls for the goal to make Europe the most energy-efficient economy in the world by setting targets for annual reduction in energy of the order of 2.5% to 3% and for a robust strategy for Montreal. And, in our amendment, the Greens are calling on the EU to ensure a formal mandate and timetable for negotiating future climate commitments with a time limit for achieving agreement at the end of 2008.

I want to end with two quick questions for the Council. First, what is its view on contraction and convergence as a framework for future action? Second, alongside the inclusion of aviation in the emissions trading scheme, will the Council propose instruments in parallel to tackle the full climate impact of aviation since, as we know, the Emissions Trading Scheme will not cover emissions that are not CO₂ related?

3-038

Kartika Tamara Liotard, namens de GUE/NGL-Fractie. – Voorzitter, om maar met de deur in huis te vallen, marktwerking is niet dé oplossing voor het probleem van klimaatverandering. Een ongebreidelde vrijmarkteconomie zonder beperking van overmatige consumptie en productie leidt tot steeds meer uitstoot van broeikasgassen en derhalve tot verergering van het probleem. De groei van de economie is als een heilige koe, onaantastbaar. Elk consumptieproduct moet overal ter wereld tegelijk op de markt beschikbaar zijn, maar we moeten bedenken dat ook heilige koeien vieze gassen kunnen verspreiden. Dat bedoel ik niet alleen figuurlijk, maar ook letterlijk, als je kijkt naar het aandeel van de intensieve veehouderij in de CO₂-uitstoot.

De kernenergielobby maakt gebruik van de problematiek rond klimaatverandering om zichzelf weer op de kaart te zetten. Gek genoeg vertellen ze niets over de enorme afvalbergen die ze ons opleveren en die voor ons de komende tienduizend jaar een groot probleem geven. Laten we niet de ene milieucrisis oplossen met de andere. De miljarden die nog steeds naar de ontwikkeling en promotie van kernenergie gaan, kunnen beter aan wind-, zonne- en waterenergie worden besteed.

De uitstoot in de transportsector zal in 2030 nog 28% boven het niveau van 1990 liggen. Het is een moeilijke sector om maatregelen te nemen, want deze sector staat symbool voor een internationale vrijmarkteconomie. Ik pleit daarom voor belasting op vlieg- en maritiem verkeer. In tegenstelling tot handel in emissierechten kan belasting het probleem niet afschuiven op ontwikkelingslanden.

3-039

Johannes Blokland, namens de IND/DEM-Fractie. – Voorzitter, ik ben ingenomen met het werkprogramma dat Commissievoorzitter Barroso gisteren in dit Parlement presenteerde. Ook voor bestrijding van klimaatverandering staat er veel goeds in. Bijvoorbeeld de onderbrenging van het vliegverkeer in het emissiehandelssysteem en de herziening van de richtlijn over nationale emissieplafonds uit 2001 steun ik van harte. Toch vind ik de Europese Commissie in dit dossier

niet erg ambitieus. We praten al jaren over drastische reducties van emissies van broeikasgassen, maar ondertussen groeit de uitstoot elk jaar weer. Niet alleen wereldwijd maar ook binnen diverse lidstaten.

Voorzitter, als we in Montreal serieus genomen willen worden, dan moeten we niet alleen durven praten over reducties, maar ook harde afspraken maken om nu eens echt maatregelen te nemen, desnoods met een kleiner aantal landen. Commissaris Dimas, ik roep u op om met een strategie te komen, waarin u maatregelen voorstelt waardoor onze langetermijndoel haalbaar wordt, want ondanks de goede invloed van de voorstellen die deze week zijn gepresenteerd, zijn die slechts geïnspireerd door een kortetermijnvisie.

3-040

Liam Aylward, on behalf of the UEN Group. – Madam President, a decade ago there was much speculation about climate change, but today it is very much a reality as we see the future unfolding before our eyes. The Arctic people see it in disappearing Arctic ice; the shantytown dwellers of Latin America and southern Asia see it in lethal storms and floods; Europeans see it in disappearing glaciers, forest fires and fatal heatwaves. In Brazil this year, for example, while hurricanes thousands of miles away battered the United States and the Caribbean with water and wind, residents of a small fishing town deep in the Amazon region watched the lake on which they depend for food and transportation shrivel away in a year which saw the region's worst drought in four decades: the result of warmer ocean water, which has also been blamed for one of the most violent hurricane seasons on record in the Gulf of Mexico.

The signing of the ratification protocol for Kyoto by some of the major players has been a much-welcomed event. The Kyoto Protocol is off life support because the Russian Federation ratified it. However, major players now need to be more proactive in convincing countries with the highest levels of pollution: the United States and developing countries.

I remain deeply concerned that the United States continues to choose to tackle the climate change issue through unilateral activities. Climate change needs to be dealt with as a global problem. If carbon dioxide is not reduced, the Arctic ice cover will disappear. That will affect the quality of life in particular of those living in coastal regions and island communities. That is a scientific fact, not a passionate policy comment on my part.

Ireland is much more energy efficient than it was a decade ago. I encourage other Member States to follow suit. Tackling climate change was never labelled as being easy, but complacency in dealing with it is far worse.

What is a fact, and what surprises many people, is that because of the level of greenhouse gases already in the atmosphere, we are already committed to a significant amount of global warming and rising sea levels. If we became a perfect pupil now in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, we would still suffer from past pollution, but the longer we wait to tackle greenhouse gas emissions in a serious manner, the more entrenched the commitment is.

Temperature rises have already been noted. The half-a-degree temperature rise is similar to that observed at the end of the twentieth century. However, what is more alarming is the projected sea-level rise, which is more than twice the three-inch rise that occurred during the latter part of the previous century. Those numbers do not take into account the fresh water from melting ice sheets and glaciers, which could at least double the sea-level rise caused by thermal expansion alone.

Scientists have claimed that water temperatures in the North Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico have been as much as 3.6 degrees higher than normal this year. That has helped to feed the hurricanes that have devastated the US Gulf coast and the Caribbean. It has also helped to generate the warmer-than-normal air currents that have poured into the Amazon basin and prevented rain clouds from forming. Greenpeace has warned that this year's experience could be a sign of things to come if practices such as deforestation and emissions of heat-trapping gases into the atmosphere do not stop.

By tackling climate change in a serious manner, we not only help to preserve our planet for our grandchildren and future generations, but we would also save them and ourselves monetary cost, given that the climate change costs incurred as we aim to protect disappearing species and habitats are very high.

Evolving players such as South Asia, Latin America and Africa require emission reduction policies that will not harm their economic development. Climate change policies thus need to be designed to contribute to economic growth in the developing countries.

As I travel to Montreal next month as part of the European delegation, I look forward to seeing the global players face the reality of this year and work together as partners in tackling this extremely important global problem.

3-041

PRZEWODNICZY: J. ONYSZKIEWICZ

Wiceprzewodniczący

3-042

Irena Belohorská (NI). – Európa bola medzi prvými, ktorí zaznamenali klimatické zmeny z nebezpečenstva premenlivosti klímy. Letá sú teplejšie, zimy sú daždivé, výrazne poklesli prietoky v rieka, poklesla vlhkosť pôdy, zaznamenali sme zvýšený výskyt povodní, ako aj extrémne suchá a hurikány.

Je nepochybne, že tieto zmeny majú priamy súvis s ľudskou aktivitou, hlavne v rozvinutých krajinách, ktoré sú najväčšou časťou zodpovedné za vysoké emisie skleníkových plynov. Jeden z najväčších znečisťovateľov je aj Európska únia. Tieto katastrofy každoročne znamenajú veľké ekonomicke škody, straty na životoch a zvýšený počet chorôb rôzneho druhu, ktoré vznikajú ako následok znečisteného životného prostredia. Spoločný postup najväčších znečisťovateľov - Číny, USA, Európskej únie alebo Indie - v boji proti klimatickým zmenám je nevyhnutný.

Je asi dosť nepravdepodobné, že sa ľudstvo vzdá vymoženosť ako áut alebo iných dopravných prostriedkov a začne sa prepravovať bicyklami. Je teda nevyhnutná inovácia existujúcich technológií a rozvoj environmentálne priateľnejších foriem energií. Je potrebné väčšie využitie slnečnej, vodnej a veternej energie, ako aj podpora zvýšeného výskumu týchto nových foriem energie.

V Európe sme svedkami toho, že veľa mladých vedcov odchádza do Spojených štátov, keďže v Európe im nie sú poskytnuté adekvátné podmienky na kvalitný a efektívny výskum v tejto oblasti. Naviac, Európa niektoré časti výskumu dosiaľ ani nepokryva. Klimatické zmeny budú mať za následok aj zdravie ľudí v Európe. V Európe sa začnú v rámci klimatických zmien objavovať ochorenia, ktoré nie sú typické pre Európu, ale pre južnejšie zemepisné pásmo. V dôsledku otepľovania je možný zvýšený výskyt infekčných chorôb, ktoré sú prenášané článkonožcami, napríklad komáre prenášajúce maláriu alebo niektoré vírusové zápaly mozgu.

3-043

Peter Liese (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst eine Vorbemerkung: Die Ratspräsidentschaft hat uns zu Beginn der Debatte etwa 10 bis 15 Minuten warten lassen. Ich hätte mir gewünscht, dass dann zumindest eine Erklärung und eine Entschuldigung erfolgt. Vielleicht kann das noch nachgeholt werden.

Ich bedanke mich bei Anders Wijkman für seine engagierte Arbeit. Er hatte keine einfache Aufgabe, und es ist sicher kein Geheimnis, dass es auch in der EVP-Fraktion Diskussionen gab, die wir aber zufrieden stellend gelöst haben. Es ist ein guter Bericht, der uns hier vorliegt, und ich möchte auf einen besonderen Aspekt hinweisen. Wir haben seit Montag in Deutschland den Beschluss über eine neue, große Koalition. Die Koalitionsvereinbarung ist zu Recht an vielen Stellen kritisiert worden: Da gibt es manche Kompromisse, die nicht jeder mittragen kann.

Die Kapitel Umwelt, Energie und Klimaschutz können sich jedoch durchaus sehen lassen. Ich glaube, das bringt uns auch in Europa weiter. Viele Punkte in der Koalitionsvereinbarung sind identisch mit dem, was der Umweltausschuss im Wijkman-Bericht vorschlägt, und das ist eine Ermutigung für die Kommission, z.B. beim Flugverkehr und bei den Zielen ihren Weg ganz engagiert weiterzuverfolgen.

Bei den erneuerbaren Energien wollen wir in Deutschland in der großen Koalition und auch in den uns hier vorliegenden Anträgen zum Wijkman-Bericht eine neue Priorität im Bereich Wärme setzen. Hier können wir mit wenig Geld sehr viel CO₂ einsparen, und deswegen wollte die Kommission einen entsprechenden Richtlinienvorschlag vorlegen.

Ein Thema hat weder die große Koalition in Deutschland noch der Umweltausschuss aus meiner Sicht zufrieden stellend gelöst: das Thema Kernenergie. Ich teile die Meinung von Cristina Gutiérrez, dass das Klimaproblem ganz ohne Kernenergie nicht gelöst werden kann.

Trotzdem wünsche ich mir für den Bericht eine große, überzeugende Mehrheit, und ich möchte zum Schluss das unterstreichen, was Anders Wijkman gesagt hat, nämlich dass es auch um ein sicherheitspolitisches Problem geht. Es gibt eine Studie des Pentagon, die besagt, dass auf Dauer der Klimawandel eine größere Gefahr für die Menschheit darstellt als der internationale Terrorismus. Das sollte jedem deutlich machen: Es ist Zeit zu handeln!

3-044

Dorette Corbey (PSE). – Voorzitter, allereerst dank aan collega Wijkman voor zijn uitstekende en krachtige verslag. Ik wil ook mijn complimenten overbrengen aan mevrouw Beckett voor haar commitment bij het klimaatbeleid. Collega's, het Parlement pleit vandaag opnieuw voor een ambitieus klimaatbeleid en daar is alle reden voor, zoals commissaris Dimas heeft uiteengezet.

In Montreal moeten we de eerste stenen leggen voor een nieuw klimaatbeleid. We staan voor een enorme uitdaging: schone energie en schoner transport, maar ook minder energiegebruik.

Europa heeft tot nu toe een leidende rol gehad en dat heeft veel opgeleverd. Er is inderdaad wat te vieren in Montreal.

De belangrijkste opgave voor Europa is nu ervoor te zorgen dat de grootste CO₂-uitstoter, de Verenigde Staten, ook verplichtingen aanvaardt en dat landen als China en India op een eerlijke manier betrokken worden bij het hele proces. Dat

kan alleen door zelf de problemen aan te pakken en te laten zien dat de Europese economie juist een enorme impuls krijgt door innovatie, door zuiniger met energie om te gaan, door efficiëntere productie en door duurzame producten op de markt te brengen. Maar helaas, behalve het Verenigd Koninkrijk voldoen de meeste landen tot nu toe zelf niet aan de verplichtingen en helaas komen de schoonste en zuinigste auto's niet uit Europa maar uit Japan. We moeten het beter doen en we moeten meer doen! Dat kan alleen als de Europese Unie ook de samenleving bij het klimaatbeleid betrekt.

(Applaus)

3-045

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I heartily endorse the comments of my group colleague, Dr Lucas, on the UK Government's fairly patchy record on seriously tackling climate change. However, if the Council is looking for some ambition, then it could do worse than to carefully examine and adopt Mr Wijkman's report.

The fact is that we need a step change in the way we debate climate change, particularly among the public. We must start with our own actions, because those are the actions we can control best. We need to realise that if we embrace the challenge, we can profit by our own example. Renewable energy is the key plank of the solution. My own country, Scotland, could lead the world in clean, green renewable energy. We have waves, a long coastline, windswept hills, biomass and geothermal power, and the raw material for hydroelectric power falls from the sky on a regular basis, and yet we are not nearly investing sufficiently in renewable technologies in Scotland or in Europe. In the case of Scotland, this is because the United Kingdom controls energy policy and remains wedded to a nuclear agenda, which I believe offers no long-term solution.

We in this House can play our part in this step change on renewable energy and the debate on climate change, and we must unite around Mr Wijkman's report. The Commission can play its part by prioritising renewable energy in the FP7 Programmes.

3-046

Roberto Musacchio (GUE/NGL). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'effetto serra è il più grande problema che dobbiamo affrontare, perché riguarda una modificazione strutturale delle condizioni necessarie all'esistenza. La capacità di affrontare tale problema deve costituire un elemento primario del nostro agire. A tal fine, è necessario assumere la strategia di Kyoto e la sua implementazione come elementi sovraordinati a tutte le nostre scelte, quale base giuridica e progettuale nonché quale elemento chiave della politica interna e internazionale dell'Europa, a partire da Montreal.

Gli assi del protocollo di Kyoto, ovvero la convergenza e la riduzione, ci indicano che i modelli di sviluppo e di economia devono cambiare radicalmente ed essere orientati verso una gestione più razionale e più equa delle risorse. Penso che si possa arrivare alla cifra di un TEP per essere umano. Questo impegno che ci deve portare verso il risparmio e l'uso di fonti alternative rinnovabili, gestite democraticamente.

Rispetto a questo obiettivo e a questa necessità, ogni idea di ricorso al nucleare, che rappresenta una fonte finita ad altissimo rischio, con problemi irrisolvibili come le scorie, e una fonte non democratica, è veramente inaccettabile.

3-047

Urszula Krupa (IND/DEM). – Panie Przewodniczący! Trudno zaakceptować sprawozdanie tak mało konstruktywne pod względem wskazania konkretnych rozwiązań w sprawie przeciwdziałania zmianom klimatycznym, do tego bez analizy finansowej. Nie wystarczą także milenijne cele rozwoju, czy przestrzeganie zaleceń protokołu z Kioto, który zobowiązuje poszczególne rządy i firmy do wdrażania polityki programów mających na celu redukcje emisji gazów cieplarnianych, wprowadzenie systemów handlu emisjami, przepisami dotyczącymi oszczędności energii.

Odpowiedzialność za zniszczenia ponoszą szczególnie kraje uprzemysłowione, których liberalny styl życia i propagowanie zachowań konsumpcyjnych skutkuje tak niewyobrażalną katastrofą dla zdrowia i w ogóle przetrwania ziemi. Dlatego poza wymienionymi środkami równie ważna powinna być zmiana mentalności i rozwój osobowy każdego człowieka, co określone jest trafnie dążeniem do cywilizacji nasycenia, z zatrzymaniem pędu do posiadania za wszelką cenę i niepohamowanego gromadzenia dóbr.

3-048

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Monsieur le Président, si le réchauffement climatique paraît aujourd'hui une évidence, il convient encore de vérifier les analyses qui l'attribuent presque exclusivement aux gaz à effet de serre, ce que contestent certains scientifiques, du fait que d'autres causes sont possibles. Cela dit, en cas de réponse affirmative, les défenseurs de l'environnement devraient se demander s'ils n'ont pas été excessifs dans leur combat acharné contre toute forme d'énergie nucléaire, laquelle présente certes des risques mais ne rejette aucun gaz à effet de serre.

Comme le propose le rapport Wijkman, les énergies alternatives doivent être encouragées, notamment l'énergie solaire et la géothermie. Mais on ne saurait imposer des restrictions aussi considérables aux seuls pays européens quand la Chine, les États-Unis et bien d'autres augmentent massivement leurs rejets de CO₂. Quant au stockage des gaz carboniques,

permettez-moi de préconiser une méthode naturelle, efficace et bénéfique, à savoir la reforestation, d'autant qu'une reforestation systématique pourrait faire l'objet d'un vaste programme de coopération internationale.

3-049

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Mr President, the debate is just about over and the scientific jury is largely agreed on the impact of greenhouse gases on our climate. Economic losses due to weather-related natural catastrophes have increased six-fold since the 1960s. The earth's temperature is rising at an alarming rate. The EU 15 will not meet their current Kyoto targets on CO₂ emissions reduction and nothing will be done about that.

At the COP 11/MOP 1 meeting in Montreal next month, the focus will be on post-Kyoto and on what happens beyond 2012. Without genuine global cooperation, particularly from the world's largest producer of greenhouse gases, the US, any agreement will be meaningless. It is a huge challenge. We await the Commission's review of the operation of the emissions trading regime next June to keep the cynics and the 'I told you so's' at bay and to maintain the credibility of the emissions trading scheme. It is essential that we broaden its scope and set horizontal sectoral targets. Too many sectors are excluded, which creates gaps and inefficiencies in the market, which risk pushing up the cost of doing business. We are still only paying lip service to the whole area of energy efficiency, which has an enormous contribution to make. We also need to focus on the development of substitute fuels and alternative technologies. Public transport vehicles and captive fleets should use clean and alternative fuels to provide a stimulus for the market, for the private sector, and to kick start the process of installing a network of forecourt outlets.

We need excise regimes that favour bio-fuels and bio-flexi-fuels. Why not legislate for all motor fuels to include a blend of fuel from renewable sources, for example 5% bio-ethanol mix in petrol, 2% bio-diesel mix in diesel vehicles, without any alteration necessary to the vehicles? We need some radical thinking and radical action. If we are convinced that CO₂ emissions need to be reduced dramatically, then we have to stop tinkering at the margins of renewable energy and to achieve genuine liberalisation for electricity markets. Let us put our money where our mouth is, look at FP7 and invest in this area.

3-050

Anne Ferreira (PSE). – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs, le rapport de M. Wijkman mérite toute notre attention. Ce texte doit être considéré comme notre feuille de route pour mieux lutter contre les changements climatiques dans les années à venir. Les pistes sont现实的, à nous de les décliner le plus rigoureusement possible en nous appuyant sur tous les partenaires de sa mise en œuvre, de l'État au citoyen, et en faisant évoluer nos modes de production et de consommation.

Mais s'il est un domaine essentiel dans lequel nous devons nous engager bien plus fortement en nous dotant de moyens financiers à la hauteur de l'enjeu, c'est celui de la politique de la recherche, car il n'est pas de nouvelles technologies ni d'innovations sans recherche. La matière grise de nos chercheurs constitue pour l'Union européenne une ressource que nous devons valoriser pour relever le défi du développement durable et du changement climatique, sans oublier, bien sûr, notre responsabilité à l'égard des pays les plus pauvres. Alors demain, nous devrons disposer d'un budget de la recherche à la hauteur de nos ambitions.

3-051

Lena Ek (ALDE). – Herr talman! Det var glädjande att höra att kommissionsledamot Dimas på den internationella energikonferensen i Peking häromdagen uttryckte sitt stöd för parlamentets ambition om 25 procent förnybar energi till 2020, liksom att kommissionsledamot Dimas också sade att förnybar energi är en grundbult för att få bukt med problem som klimatförändring, fattigdom och allmän ekonomisk utveckling.

Om vi skall kunna skapa en marknad för förnybar energi måste emellertid kostnaderna för dagens ohållbara beroende av fossila energikällor visas tydligt. Det handlar inte bara om att visa de enorma utsläppens effekter på miljön och folkhälsan, utan de måste även uttryckas i termer av euro och cent. Europa har redan inlett ett marknadsstyrta system med utsläppsrädder. Visserligen diskuteras flygfartens del i systemet, men jag vill även se sjöfart och framför allt den landburna trafiken. Det är först när vi tydligt ser vilka kostnader utsläpp av koldioxid från denna sektor för med sig som vi på allvar kommer att sätta fart på såväl efterfråga som på utbud av förnybara energikällor.

Min första fråga är således om och när kommissionen avser att inkludera transportsektorn i den europeiska utsläppsättshandeln. Min andra fråga handlar om andelen förnybara energikällor. Vi vill öka dem, men de måste ju också få användas. När tänker kommissionen föreslå att det s.k. Auto-oil-direktivet ersätts med en minimigräns på 10 procents inblandning av etanol i fordonsbränsle?

3-052

Bairbre de Brún (GUE/NGL). – (*The speaker spoke Irish*)

Mr Wijkman's report makes it clear that living up to the Kyoto requirements is the first priority of the EU. Whilst Kyoto is only a small step in the fight against climate change, we must throw our support behind it and urge those who have not signed up to do so immediately.

This morning I was glad to hear the Commission and the Council stress the importance of the next phase, because the real challenge is to set ambitious targets for the post-2012 period and to get all the major world actors involved. I also want to support the amendments made by my colleagues in the GUE/NGL Group, particularly the assertion that the promotion of an unbridled free market has led to excess consumption, which in turn leads to increased emissions of greenhouse gases.

(*The speaker spoke Irish*)

3-053

Γεώργιος Καρατζαφέρης (IND/DEM). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, ήθελα να μιλήσουμε για ένα πολύ σοβαρό θέμα. Διερωτώμαται ποια κυρία σήμερα το πρώι δεν έβαλε λακ στο μαλλί της. Και ποιος από εμάς δεν έβαλε σπρέι στη μασχάλη του. Έτσι λοιπόν, μ' αυτόν τον τρόπο βοηθάμε στη δημιουργία του θερμοκηπίου. Είναι απλά πράγματα τα οποία και εμείς οι ίδιοι δεν τα τηρούμε.

Ματαιοπονείτε κύριε Δήμα με την προσπάθειά σας, εάν δεν βάλετε μέσα στους κανόνες τους Αμερικανούς. Θα σας πω δύο νούμερα: οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες εκπέμπουν περισσότερους ρύπους απ' ό,τι τα $\frac{3}{4}$ των κρατών του ΟΗΕ· η πολιτεία της Νέας Υόρκης εκπέμπει ίσους ρύπους όσους όλη η Αφρική. Επομένως, ό,τι και να κάνουμε εμείς στην Ευρώπη, εάν δεν πείσουμε τον συνήθη δύστροπο, τον Αμερικανό, να αναλάβει τις ευθύνες του, ματαιοπονούμε. Αυτή είναι μια τραγική πραγματικότητα.

Οπως επίσης, πρέπει να δούμε τί θα κάνει η πολυπληθέστερη χώρα του κόσμου, η Κίνα, η οποία μόνη της έχει το $\frac{1}{4}$ του πληθυσμού της γης. Εμείς ό,τι και να κάνουμε στην Ευρώπη δεν μπορούμε να έχουμε αποτέλεσμα. Έχουμε το τεράστιο πρόβλημα του κλίματος, το οποίο δεν περιορίζεται με σύνορα. Δεν μπορούμε να σηκώσουμε συρματόσχοινα. Πρέπει λοιπόν να πείσουμε τους Αμερικανούς για να μην έχουμε ολέθρια αποτελέσματα. Η πορεία που διαγράφεται με μαθηματική ακρίβεια είναι ότι θα έχουμε την τύχη που είχαν οι δεινόσαυροι. Πρέπει να καταλάβουμε όλοι ότι η απειλή του Μπτν Λάντεν για την τρομοκρατία είναι πολύ μικρότερη από την απειλή του περιβάλλοντος όπως αυτή υφίσταται από τους Αμερικανούς. Επομένως, εάν θέλουμε να πετύχουμε αποτελέσματα, πρέπει να βάλουμε τους Αμερικανούς μέσα στους κανόνες.

3-054

Françoise Grossetête (PPE-DE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, Madame le Ministre, il y a encore quelques années, quand on parlait de changement du climat, certains souriaient d'un air dubitatif. Aujourd'hui, personne ne remet en cause l'évidence de ces changements. Il y a même urgence. Il faut agir tout de suite pour répondre à cette menace. Certainement l'une des plus graves de l'histoire de l'humanité, avec un nombre croissant d'inondations, de sécheresses, d'ouragans, la fonte de la banquise, la fonte de nos glaciers, peut-être un jour le développement de certaines maladies.

Alors, face à cette menace, nous avons une chance inouïe de lancer un vrai programme technologique, permettant de susciter l'innovation dont nous avons tant besoin pour la création de nouveaux emplois en Europe. L'Europe, le monde, ont tenu beaucoup de discours, mais les actes ne sont pas suffisants. Alors le temps est venu d'avoir le courage politique de remettre en œuvre le protocole de Kyoto. Biocarburant, énergie solaire, énergie éolienne, hydroélectrique, hydrogène, efforts en matière d'efficacité énergétique, ces technologies existent. Il nous appartient d'accélérer leur utilisation dans nos politiques d'urbanisme, dans nos modes de construction.

Il faut utiliser toutes les possibilités qui s'offrent à nous. Il n'y a pas une solution unique et idéale, mais nous devons combiner l'utilisation de ces différentes sources. Il existe encore trop de freins à la mise en œuvre et à la commercialisation des innovations technologiques telles que les véhicules hybrides ou les véhicules électriques. Nos concitoyens sont prêts à prendre leur part de responsabilité dans cette maîtrise de l'énergie. États-Unis, Inde, Chine, prennent déjà des initiatives, notamment dans le domaine du nucléaire. Nous ne pourrons pas nous passer de l'énergie nucléaire qui ne rejette aucun gaz à effet de serre. Qu'attend d'ailleurs l'Europe pour vraiment ouvrir de débat sur le nucléaire. Un débat sérieux, dénué de passion. Je vous demande de ne pas le retarder.

3-055

Marie-Noëlle Lienemann (PSE). – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, pour être crédible aux yeux des citoyens, l'Union européenne doit sortir des bonnes intentions et agir concrètement en se donnant des ambitions liées à des investissements. Quel argent pour le ferroutage? À quand des grands réseaux transeuropéens, que l'on attend toujours? À quand des crédits de la PAC pour les biocarburants? À quand une hausse des budgets de la recherche au service des grands défis énergétiques, comme la filière de l'hydrogène? À quand une orientation des Fonds structurels, des subventions, subordonnée à l'efficacité énergétique et l'économie d'énergie? Je pense au milieu urbain, au logement et au logement social. À quand des écotaxes sur les transports de marchandises, en particulier les transports maritimes? À quand une régulation des échanges au regard de la lutte contre l'effet de serre? Nous attendons des réponses concrètes, opérationnelles, prévoyant des actions immédiates. L'Union européenne doit agir ici et maintenant pour convaincre, servir de modèle, nouer de nouveaux partenariats avec les pays du Sud. Nous n'en sommes encore qu'aux intentions. Passons aux actes.

3-056

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE-DE). – Herr talman! Jag vill tacka Anders Wijkman för ett balanserat betänkande om en viktig fråga. Jag skulle vilja understryka att det idag är svårt att se att Europa kommer att uppnå Kyotomålen. De är nämligen mycket krävande, och den politik som idag förs ser inte ut att leda till att vi kan uppfylla dessa mål i ett första steg. Ett skäl till detta är att man till stor del bortser från de krav som en modern miljöpolitik ställer på energipolitiken.

Om vi ser på de förutsättningar som vi har, kommer vi inte att kunna uppfylla Kyotomålen genom förhoppningar om förnybara bränslen. De kommer att växa fram och spela en större roll, men de kommer inte att lösa problemen. Vi kan inte uppnå Kyotomålen genom regleringar av ekonomin eller genom besparingar, eftersom det kommer att motverka syftet att skapa förutsättningar för en bättre ekonomi som bättre tar tillvara på miljöns krav. Vi kan inte lösa problemen genom att bromsa ekonomins utveckling, utan vi måste föra en miljöpolitik som är förenlig med en konsekvent och trovärdig energipolitik. Då måste vi också se på basen för vår energiförsörjning.

Olja och gas är inte en framtida väg. Ändå ser vi att det framför allt är användningen av olja och gas som ökar när kärnkraften avvecklas – med växande koldioxidutsläpp som följd. Kärnkraftsproduktionen i Europa motsvarar med nuvarande energimix 50 procent av koldioxidutsläppen. Kärnkraftsproduktionen i Europa leder till minskade koldioxidutsläpp motsvarande utsläppen från personbilstrafiken. De visar vilka storlekstal vi talar om. Man kan inte bortse från kärnkraften i detta fall. Kärnkraften löser inte miljöproblemen, men man kan inte lösa problemen med vår miljö och Kyotomålen genom att bortse från kärnkraften. Det är därför en viktig uppgift för detta parlament och även för medlemsstaterna att föra en trovärdig energipolitik som inte syftar till att avveckla kärnkraften och ersätta den med olja och gas, utan att se till att kärnkraft kan spela en betydelsefull roll i den balans av energipolitiken som behövs.

3-057

Justas Vincas Paleckis (PSE). – Norėčiau pasveikinti Anders Wijkman ir kitus bendraminčius, įsitikinusius, kad planetos gelbėjimas yra ne kažkieno kito, o mūsų pačių reikalas.

Europos Sajunga turi panaudoti visą savo įtaką, kad darytų dar didesnį spaudimą toms šalims, net ir labai galingoms ir didelėms, kurios dar neprisijungė prie Kioto protokolo. Naivu būtų tvirtinti, kad jeigu JAV būtų vykdžiusi Kioto protokolo reikalavimus, jų nebūtų nusiaubę uraganai „Katrina“ ir „Vilma“. Bet žiaurų atsakomajį smūgį niokojama gamta smogė kaip tik tai valstybei, kuri ją skriaudžia labiausiai. Jeigu pasaulio bendrija nesiūms skubių ir griežčiausių priemonių klimato šiltėjimui sustabdyti, planeta taps uraganus gimdanti, ugnį ir vandenį spjaudanti pabaisa.

Pranešime teisingai siūloma paversti ES dar aiškesniu lyderiu pagal atsinaujinančią energijos šaltinių naudojimą. Labai palaikau pasiūlymą daugiau informuoti ES piliečius, ištraukti juos į gamtą tausojančią veiklą. Reikia energingiau kurti tokia mokesčių, baudų ir skatinimų sistemą, kuri verstų dirbtį įmones ir firmas taupiai bei tausojančiai. Dar svarbiau – gyvenimo būdas. Kiekvienas ES valstybių pilietis turėtų jausti, kad gyventi kuo mažiau teršiant ir kaitinant planetą ne tik gražu ir kilnu, bet ir apsimoka.

3-058

Bogusław Sonik (PPE-DE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Na przełomie listopada i grudnia Parlament Europejski po raz kolejny przedstawi swoje stanowisko w sprawie zmian klimatycznych na forum ONZ. Zanim zostanie ono poddane pod obrady na arenie międzynarodowej ważne jest, by jak najkorzystniej odzwierciedlało interesy wszystkich Państw Członkowskich Unii, w tym także rolę energii jądrowej, o czym słusznie mówiła pani Françoise Grossêté i pan Hökmark.

Mając na uwadze fakt, że w wielu Państwach Członkowskich emisja gazów cieplarnianych nadal wzrasta, pełne wdrożenie konwencji ONZ oraz protokołu z Kioto wymagać będzie większego udziału pojedynczych obywateli w ogólnych wysiłkach zmierzających do ograniczenia emisji i wypracowania bardziej zrównoważonego stylu życia. W tym kontekście ważnym aspektem w walce o zmniejszenie emisji CO₂ jest tzw. zintegrowane podejście z udziałem polityków, przemysłu oraz społeczeństwa.

Zintegrowane podejście jest skuteczniejszym i mniej kosztownym działaniem na rzecz zmniejszenia emisji CO₂. Zakłada ono, że odpowiedzialność za redukcję spoczywa zarówno na producentach samochodów, paliwa, jak i użytkownikach pojazdów. Nie bez znaczenia jest również stan infrastruktury drogowej oraz systemy zarządzania ruchem drogowym. Pozostaje to w zgodzie z ogłoszonym w październiku 2005 programem *European Climate Change Programme II*.

Jakkolwiek wyjście poza gospodarkę opartą na paliwach kopalnych stanowi historyczną możliwość dla przedsiębiorczości, należy pamiętać o tym, że wiele państw – szczególnie rozwijających się – jest zasobnych w odnawialne źródła energii, lecz nie posiada obecnie technologii umożliwiających ich wykorzystanie. W negocjacjach w sprawie redukcji gazów cieplarnianych w znacznej mierze porusza się także kwestię subsydiów energetycznych.

Istnieje już wiele sposobów redukcji emisji gazów cieplarnianych. Technologie energooszczędné i niskoemisyjne są skutecznym środkiem walki z zanieczyszczeniem środowiska, nie należy ich jednak łączyć z proponowaną przez sprawozdawcę redukcją dopłat do paliw kopalnianych jako warunkiem *sine qua non* wprowadzenia nowoczesnych rozwiązań w zakresie ochrony środowiska.

3-059

Edita Estrela (PSE). – Senhor Presidente, Senhora Ministra, Senhor Comissário, a terra não nos pertence, tomámo-la de empréstimo aos nossos filhos, afirmou o grande chefe índio.

Se não ganharmos a batalha contra as alterações climáticas, que terra vamos deixar aos nossos filhos? O diagnóstico está feito. Só falta coragem para pôr em prática políticas mais ambiciosas e eficazes. O relatório do Deputado Wijkman dá um bom contributo. É preciso passar das palavras aos actos e, em coerência com a Estratégia de Lisboa, ir mais longe na adopção de novas tecnologias e no esforço internacional de cumprir a Convenção de Quioto.

Os Estados Unidos têm de assumir as suas responsabilidades. Saúdo o diálogo da União Europeia com a China e com a Índia, mas é também necessário envolver países como o Brasil, a África do Sul, a Rússia, o Japão e a Indonésia e acabar com contradições como os subsídios aos combustíveis fósseis. O Comissário Dimas disse que a Conferência de Montreal não vai trazer todas as soluções para o problema. Mas espera-se que traga algumas soluções. É uma exigência dos nossos filhos e das futuras gerações!

3-060

Richard Seeber (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrte Frau Ministerin Beckett! Es freut mich, dass die Ratspräsidenschaft unsere Debatte verfolgt, und ich möchte vorab sowohl der Kommission als auch meinem Freund Anders Wijkman für den sehr ambitionierten Bericht danken, den er zu diesem Thema ausgearbeitet hat.

Dass Aktionen notwendig sind, zeigen einfach die Naturereignisse um uns herum, seien es die Feuersbrünste im Süden Europas, die Hurricanes in Amerika oder auch die Überflutungen in meiner Heimat, in Österreich, in Tirol. Einen Fehler dürfen wir jedoch nicht machen: Wir müssen aufpassen, dass wir nicht alles diesem globalen Klimawandel zuschreiben und dass wir sagen, dieser sei nur durch die menschenbedingten CO₂-Emissionen sozusagen hausgemacht. Leider erfolgt derzeit eine Überlagerung der natürlichen Effekte mit diesen menschengemachten Effekten; hier müssen mehr Forschungsanstrengungen unternommen werden, um in Zukunft sichere Klimaprognosen abgeben zu können und um vor allem auch den menschlichen Effekt herausrechnen zu können.

Wichtig ist aber auch, dass wir langfristige Strategien haben, um darauf reagieren zu können, um eben Planungssicherheit zu gewährleisten. Der Industrie und der Wirtschaft muss einfach klar gemacht werden, wohin der Weg führt und welche Möglichkeiten sie in Zukunft haben werden. Das ist für den Standort Europa immens wichtig. Bedenken wir auch, dass die Gemeinschaft derzeit nur für 14 % der CO₂-Emissionen verantwortlich ist; aus diesem Grund ist die Einbindung insbesondere von Entwicklungsländern, aber natürlich auch des größten Emittenten – der USA – enorm wichtig. Dieser Teil des Berichts gehört besonders unterstrichen: Wir brauchen eine globale Strategie.

Nicht einer Meinung bin ich mit meinen Kollegen, was die Kernenergie betrifft. Ich glaube, die Kernenergie ist keine Alternative für diese Technologien, die CO₂ produzieren, weil sie langfristig insgesamt zu negativen Auswirkungen hat. Vor allem dürfen wir nicht den Fehler machen, den Entwicklungsländern die Kernenergie als Alternative anzubieten, weil sie in diesen Ländern einfach nicht sicher gehandhabt werden kann.

Wichtig ist auch noch, dass wir den Verkehr verstärkt einbinden und hier einfach versuchen, das CO₂-Reduktionspotenzial voll auszuschöpfen.

3-061

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE), Verfasserin der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Industrie, Forschung und Energie. – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich nutze die Gelegenheit, da anzuknüpfen, wo mein Vorrredner aufgehört hat. Nachdem ich in der letzten Woche das Vereinigte Königreich besucht habe, muss ich sagen, dass mich sehr irritiert, dass die Klimaschutzdebatte von Tony Blair und anderen dahin gehend geführt wird, dass es durch den verstärkten Einsatz der Atomenergie, durch die angeblich saubere Atomenergie besser möglich sein soll, Klimaschutzziele zu erreichen.

Ich möchte hier einmal mit einem Irrglauben aufräumen. Ich möchte wissen, was Sie in England mit sauberer Atomenergie derzeit meinen. Sprechen Sie über den besonders dreckigen Uranabbau? Sprechen Sie über die besonders schmutzige Anreicherung von Brennstoff? Sprechen Sie über die sehr schwierige und mit hohen Umweltbelastungen verbundene Konversion von Uranhexafluorid? Meinen Sie die Brennelementherstellung in Russland, wenn Sie von sauberer Atomenergie sprechen? Haben Sie in England einmal diskutiert, wie viel Müll Sie wann, wo und zu welchen Kosten entsorgen werden? Wie bewerten Sie die Gefahren und Risiken der Wiederaufarbeitung? In Windscale haben Sie ja große Erfahrung damit, wie die Wiederaufarbeitung tatsächlich Umwelt und Menschen belastet. Ich bin sehr erstaunt, dass gerade die Engländer, die eigentlich aus wirtschaftlichen Gründen aus der Atomenergie ausgestiegen sind, diese verrückte Diskussion „Klimaschutz durch vermehrten Einsatz der Atomenergie“ vorantreiben.

Schauen wir uns das einmal weltweit an: Wir müssten Hunderte, Tausende von Atomreaktoren zubauen, wollten wir wirklich effizient durch Atomenergie zum Klimaschutz beitragen. Dazu würde dann tatsächlich der massive Ausbau auch einer neuen Generation von schnellen Brütern gehören, damit ist Europa schon einmal phänomenal gescheitert. Es würde

dazugehören, dass überall auf der Welt Wiederaufarbeitungsanlagen betrieben werden, weil die Uranvorkommen für eine solche Dimension des Ausbaus der Atomenergie überhaupt nicht ausreichen würden.

Ein solcher Ausbau im Zusammenhang mit der Diskussion über Terrorismus, über Proliferationsgefahren ist unverantwortlich. Es ist viel schwieriger, durch Energieeffizienz, durch Einsparung, durch einen anderen Ansatz die Energieprobleme in den Griff zu bekommen. Lassen Sie uns aber jetzt trotzdem endlich konsequent damit anfangen und nicht in eine Technologie zurückkehren, die eigentlich schon die Technologie des vergangenen Jahrhunderts ist und deren Altlasten wir bis heute nicht einmal ansatzweise im Griff haben.

3-062

Margaret Beckett, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, this has been an interesting and stimulating debate, marked by almost total welcome – quite correctly – for Mr Wijkman's report and for its contents, and by very real agreement on the nature and scale of the challenge. It has also been marked by a strong emphasis from many speakers on renewable resources, with various examples of this being cited, and also by strong differences of opinion over nuclear power. I would say to the last speaker, Mrs Harms, that if the only aspect of the climate change debate she heard in the UK was that of nuclear power, then she must have moved in very restricted circles, because there is a great deal being discussed in the UK, which has not actually made a fresh commitment to nuclear power, despite a commitment to discussing it. In fact, energy efficiency is top of the UK's list of policies for tackling climate change, just as she would wish.

There has been much emphasis on what are usually known in the jargon as 'co-benefits'. Some speakers emphasised the damage caused by air pollution by the same gases that are contributing to climate change, while others emphasised that, as we tackle climate change, we will derive other potential health benefits from the reduction in the use of those gases.

Mrs Gutiérrez-Cortines asked about the role of agriculture. As she may know, in countries such as New Zealand, livestock are the source of almost all greenhouse gas emissions, making this a particularly difficult problem to solve. There is therefore no doubt that agriculture can, in certain circumstances, be part of the problem. However, as a number of speakers mentioned with regard to biomass and biofuels, it also could also be part of the solution. That is an issue that will come under increasing scrutiny.

I am sorry Mr Hegyi is opposed to carbon capture and storage. The sad and blunt fact is that countries like India and China, which need to grow and develop in order to tackle poverty – and this was another issue referred to, again quite correctly, in the debate – have huge coal reserves and will use them, because they feel they have no choice. It is surely better for us to try to find ways of helping them to do that sustainably, through technologies like carbon capture and storage, rather than simply telling them not to use those power sources, which I fear would be fruitless.

All the references made to the most vulnerable states and to the most vulnerable within other countries heighten the need for the actions the EU must take on adaptation, and support for adaptation, to impacts that we cannot avoid. Strong emphasis has been placed on the role of the many other countries involved and on the need for a global dialogue – with which the Council wholeheartedly agrees – and there is clear agreement both that the EU should continue to take the lead internationally and that we should continue to place strong emphasis on delivering on our own programmes.

Mrs Doyle and Mr Hökmark both suggested that the EU is unlikely to meet its Kyoto targets. That is not my understanding of the latest position as assessed by the Commission. However, that is a report that we will be publishing as we approach Montreal, and it certainly remains the case that we must continue to maintain and indeed step up our own activity.

That brings me to the comments by both Mrs Lucas and Mr Smith, who quite rightly praised the ambition of the Wijkman report in setting a target of a 60% reduction in emissions by 2050, without apparently being aware that this is the target the UK Government set in its own Energy White Paper in 2003. Perhaps, though, this should come as no a surprise, since Mrs Lucas had nothing good to say about the UK's approach. However, I must put it firmly on the record for her and on behalf of this Council that it is a waste of everybody's time to demand that the EU deliver a formal mandate and a formal timetable in Montreal. This body above all should recognise that the world of imperialism is at an end. We cannot just march into Montreal and dictate to the rest of the world how they should conduct themselves and go about their business, not least when we are talking to some of the poorest and most vulnerable countries in the world whose priority, quite rightly, is development and feeding their populations. We will not act in this manner. If we are able to kindle a dialogue and spark a process in Montreal, it will be a real and substantial achievement, just as it was a real and substantial achievement to elicit the language and secure the programme of action agreed at Gleneagles. We all agree that we ought to be moving faster, but let us at least recognise the fact that we are making some progress.

(Applause)

3-063

Stavros Dimas, Member of the Commission. – I should like to thank everyone who has participated in this rich and important debate.

The need to act urgently to tackle climate change was underlined by Mr Wijkman and others. I believe that the action taken and the series of new initiatives put forward by the Commission since the adoption of its communication in February clearly demonstrate its determination to act in this area.

The European Union's first priority in Montreal is to build broad international support for further action and obtain agreement on starting a formal process to discuss the shape of a future multilateral climate change regime. Once the discussions get going, the European Union will need to consider the right moment for putting forward its views on targets under such a future regime. Targets have proven to be a very useful tool in environmental policy making. They provide our guidance to decision-makers in society. They are particularly useful for industry and the private sector when they have to take long-term investment decisions. Targets will therefore remain a core element of any future climate change architecture. We need targets.

As you will be aware, the European Council of last March set down a pathway target of 15% to 30% of emissions reductions by 2020. However, the Commission believes that the time has not yet come to set concrete targets for developed countries in Montreal in December. That would only be done when we have more clarity on the progress of the negotiations on the post-2012 period.

Mr Seeber has underlined that any future climate change regime will have to build on broad participation on all major emitters and that is of key importance if our cooperation is to be truly efficient.

The Commission and Member States are working hard to promote deeper dialogue with the United States and developing countries. We have engaged in policy dialogue with the United States administration within the United Nations Framework Agreement on Climate Change and within other fora and meetings, such as the Joint Climate Change Science and Technology Workshop. That covers concrete topics such as renewable energy, energy efficiency and carbon sequestration.

The United States claims that it has a different approach to fighting climate change, based mainly on the research and development of new technologies. The difference between their approach and our approach is that they have seen an approximate 15% increase in carbon dioxide emissions while the European Union of 25 has seen a considerable reduction compared with 1990 levels, and the 15 member countries under the Kyoto regime obligations are 1.7% under the 1990 level. That is not enough, but we are sure that, by the end of our commitment period, we will be in compliance with our Kyoto target. This is the difference between the two approaches.

As regards developing countries, the European Union has an open mind on how they should participate in future multilateral climate cooperation. It is clear that we cannot expect the same mandatory requirements as we do from developed countries. Any commitment they take on will be based on the principle of common, but differentiated, responsibilities.

China and other developing countries have contributed to the formation of the greenhouse phenomenon by a much smaller percentage than the developed countries, and per capita emissions in China are currently less than one tenth of the levels in the developed world, so we should follow that example. Where capita income is much lower and development needs greater we have to follow what the United Nations Convention wisely prescribes as a common but differentiated policy.

Mr Verges mentioned that we should take particular care of developing countries and their increasing needs arising from global warming. We really should prepare for that impact. The Commission is already providing funding and welcomes Canada's intention to prepare a five-year work programme on adaptation at the Conference in Montreal.

In addition, the European Union is the major contributor to the 2001 Bonn Political Declaration which pledges USD 410 million per year in climate change funding for developing countries, starting this year.

At the October Environment Council, Ministers committed themselves to communicating at Montreal the progress being made towards delivery on this target. Also, to support developing countries, we have to make sure that the clean development mechanisms actually work. The key issue is the efficiency of the executive board in Bonn, and the European Union is already providing funding, but more support is clearly necessary. The European Union is still the main contributor of funds to the executive board.

There have been certain concerns about bilateral cooperation outside the United Nations context, and especially in the Asia-Pacific Partnership. Let me stress that this can in no way be viewed as an alternative to the United Nations process. However, this Partnership can support our efforts under the Climate Change Convention and the Kyoto Protocol through closer bilateral cooperation that includes both a stronger political dialogue and a focus on technology. This is also how one should see the European Union-China and European Union-India partnerships. This translates into very concrete actions: we have recently held two workshops in India and China on the Clean Development Mechanism and market-based mechanisms. In relation to China, we also see an important focus on the development and demonstration of near-zero

emissions power generation, and I agree with Mrs Beckett that carbon capture and storage is one of the means of tackling the problem of climate change. It is not a cure-all, but it is one of the many means that we can use. These partnerships will have the positive and immediate effect of supporting the discussions on a multilateral climate change regime post-2012.

Mr Blokland asked about the efficiency of the European Union's current measures. If we implement all the measures in full, this will lead to a 4% reduction compared with 1990, which obviously is not sufficient to meet the target of -8% that we have set for ourselves. That is why we included additional measures in the climate change programme that we launched a month ago. This implies that we should make greater emission cuts, allowing us to reach the Kyoto target and make further progress for the period after 2012. It is important to know that, for the European Union of 25, the result with the existing measures will be -7%.

Mrs Doyle, Mrs Grossetête and others asked about emissions from cars. I fully agree that this is a vital issue and that is why, in 2006, the Commission will review the agreement with the car industry in order to assess the possibility of reaching the Community objective of 120 g/km by a certain point, having made sure, of course, that we reach the target, voluntarily agreed with the car industry in Europe, Japan and Korea, of 140 mg.

Mrs Ek referred to the inclusion of transport in European Union emissions trading. The Commission has already made a proposal with regard to aviation, as you know. The Commission will assess this for the other transport sectors as part of the 2006 review.

On renewable energy, the Commission will put forward, in the weeks to come, a new report assessing a target for renewable energy by 2020. Regarding nuclear energy and the remarks made by Mr Hökmark, some Member States expect nuclear energy to be a part of their future energy. However, we have to ensure that we have a broad range of energy sources that are low in carbon. Nuclear power will not be able to meet the increased energy demands and we should also be aware that nuclear power faces problems concerning nuclear waste and public opinion.

With regard to what Mrs Gutiérrez-Cortines said about agriculture, the Commission agrees that synergies can be found between climate change and agriculture. We had an extremely interesting meeting in London, organised by Mrs Beckett and the UK Presidency, on climate change and agriculture and very important conclusions were reached there. The Commission will be putting forward a plan in support of biofuels.

Finally, winning the battle against climate change requires determined action, starting now. It requires action, as Mr Smith said, from all actors and sectors of society. We should not underestimate the size of the challenge. Winning the battle against climate change will take time, of which we have precious little, and efforts that some will argue we cannot afford. With your continued support, we are determined to reassert the European Union's leadership in this key challenge for mankind. Thank you very much.

3-064

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się dzisiaj o godz. 12.00.

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszone o godz. 11.55 i wznowione o godz. 12.05)

3-065

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ του κ. ΤΡΑΚΑΤΕΛΛΗ Αντιπροέδρου

3-066

5 - Ωρα των ψηφοφοριών

3-067

Πρόεδρος. – Η ημερήσια διάταξη προβλέπει την Ωρα των Ψηφοφοριών.

(Αποτελέσματα και λοιπές λεπτομέρειες ψηφοφοριών: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά)

- Πριν από τις ψηφοφορίες:

3-068

Hannes Swoboda (PSE). – Herr Präsident! Wir stimmen jetzt über den Bericht zu Irak ab. Das ist ein Bericht, der vielleicht sonst unter "ferner liegen" aufscheinen würde. Es ist aber ein wichtiger Bericht, bei dem dieses Parlament gemeinsam mit dem Rat und der Kommission gezeigt hat, dass die europäischen Institutionen rasch und im Interesse der Bürgerinnen und Bürger reagieren können.

Dieser Bericht wurde gestern Abend knapp vor Mitternacht diskutiert. Nun ist jeder Zeitpunkt in diesem Parlament ein wichtiger Zeitpunkt. Ich glaube, wir alle – die Dienste und wir als Abgeordnete – sollten dafür Sorge tragen, dass so wichtige Legislativberichte, die im Interesse unserer Bürgerinnen und Bürger beschlossen werden, zu besseren Zeiten diskutiert werden, damit wir auch ein klares Signal nach außen geben können.

(*Beifall*)

3-069

Philip Bushill-Matthews (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I rise on a point of order under Rule 132 about Commission Question Time last night.

Last night we had 90 minutes of questions but only 11 questions were answered, mainly because all the Commissioners gave long, rambling replies. That was started by Commissioner Mandelson, who then overran, so that in the end there was only the opportunity for Commissioner Špidla to answer two questions.

When I raised this before, President Borrell wrote a letter to the Commission asking Commissioners to be crisper in their answers. Nothing so far has happened. I should like to ask you to send a further letter, with much more ferocity, saying that what we look for as Members are short answers, not long rambling speeches.

(*Applause*)

3-070

Edith Mastenbroek (PSE). – Mr President, I want to raise the fact that this House is set to debate the World Summit on the Information Society in Tunis only next month. It is a UN summit on the freedom of information.

The delegations attending that summit have had their internet access and e-mail filtered in their hotels. They see demonstrators being arrested and journalists being harassed and beaten. Tapes on human rights infringements have been confiscated by the Tunisian police. There is no freedom of information in Tunisia. European Union delegations are in Tunis right now. I do not think we can wait another month to condemn these events.

(*Applause*)

3-071

5.1 - Ενημέρωση των επιβατών για την ταυτότητα του πραγματικού αερομεταφορέα

3-072

5.2 - Πυρηνικός σταθμός του Bohunice V1 στη Σλοβακία

3-073

– *Επί της τροπολογίας 12:*

3-074

Herbert Bösch (PSE). – Herr Präsident! Es ist nun ein bisschen spät, ich habe schon früher aufgezeigt. Es ist augenscheinlich, dass dieser Antrag bereits durch die Annahme des Änderungsantrags Nr. 5 gedeckt ist. Hierzu hätte ich aber gerne die Meinung der Berichterstatterin gewusst. Aber ich gehe davon aus, dass diese Abstimmung überflüssig war.

3-075

– *Πριν από την ψηφοφορία επί της τροποποιημένης πρότασης:*

3-076

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE), Berichterstatterin. – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte zu dieser Abstimmung Stellung nehmen. Nachdem das Parlament hier mit großer Mehrheit einen ungedeckten Scheck über 400 Millionen Euro unterschrieben hat, die ohne belastbare Kalkulationen möglicherweise in die Kasse der italienischen Energiekonzerne fließen sollen, möchte ich Sie ausdrücklich auffordern, gegen meinen Bericht zu stimmen. Ich halte die Entscheidung, die hier getroffen wird, für komplett unverantwortlich. Ich denke, dass es richtiger ist, sich der Kommission anzuschließen, und bitte Sie, gegen meinen eigenen Bericht zu stimmen. Ich werde in jedem Fall meine Unterschrift von diesem Bericht zurückziehen, weil ich glaube, dass man mit ungedeckten Schecks weder Akzeptanz für europäische Politik noch Sicherheit in der Atomenergie kaufen kann.

Meine Damen und Herren! Es tut mir leid, aber ich halte Sie für ausgesprochen schlecht beraten, indem Sie mehrheitlich für diese falschen Versprechungen gestimmt haben.

(*Beifall*)

3-077

5.3 - Βόρεια διάσταση

3-078

– Πριν από την ψηφοφορία επί της αιτιολογικής σκέψης Η:

3-079

Henrik Lax (ALDE). – Mr President, I should like to add ‘eutrophication’ – probably the most serious ecological problem in the Baltic Sea – to the text distributed to you. The text should be amended to read: ‘Stressing the further need to enhance cooperation between EU Member States and in particular to reduce eutrophication’.

3-080

(Η προφορική τροπολογία κρατείται)

3-081

5.4 - Η μετάβαση στο ψηφιακό σύστημα

3-082

5.5 - Οικονομικοί πόροι που προορίζονται για τον παροπλισμό των πυρηνικών σταθμών ηλεκτροπαραγωγής

3-083

5.6 - Η μάχη κατά της αλλαγής του κλίματος στον πλανήτη και πως μπορεί να κερδηθεί

3-084

– Πριν από την ψηφοφορία επί της παραγράφου 24:

3-085

Anders Wijkman (PPE-DE), rapporteur. – Mr President, I wish to add the following text to the end of paragraph 24 after the words ‘blending ratios’: ‘examining the environmental effectiveness of requiring 10% biofuel blends in transport fuels’.

3-086

– Πριν από την ψηφοφορία επί της τροπολογίας 9:

3-087

Bernd Posselt (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident! Ich habe ein Problem mit den Sprachfassungen. In der deutschen Sprachfassung heißt es "zwei Sitze". Das ist aber Unsinn. Das Parlament hat laut Vertrag nur einen Sitz, nämlich Straßburg. Das ist längst entschieden. In der englischen Fassung heißt es "double location". Da ist als zweite location Brüssel gemeint; die können wir ruhig abschaffen, aber dann muss die Sprachfassung stimmen. Ich bitte Sie also, die beiden Sprachfassungen miteinander zu vergleichen.

3-088

Πρόεδρος. – Η Ωρα των ψηφοφιριών έληξε.

3-089

6 - Αιτιολογήσεις ψήφου

3-090

– Έκθεση: De Veyrac (A6-0310/2005)

3-091

Hélène Goudin, Nils Lundgren och Lars Wohlin (IND/DEM), skriftlig. – Vi har röstat nej till betänkandet i sin helhet då vi anser att kommissionens förslag är bättre. Det är rimligt att flygpassagerare informeras om vilket lufttrafikföretag som utför en viss flygnings för att de ska kunna fatta välvägda beslut ur bland annat ett säkerhetsperspektiv. Vi stödjer kommissionens förslag om att medlemsstaterna samlar in säkerhetsinformation för att delge kommissionen och övriga medlemsstater denna men vändar oss emot parlamentets förslag att istället införa en gemenskapsförteckning och på så sett centralisera administrationen.

3-092

Sérgio Marques (PPE-DE), por escrito. – Felicito a colega Christine De Veyrac pelo importante e oportuno Relatório produzido sobre a proposta de regulamento do Parlamento Europeu e do Conselho relativo à informação dos passageiros do transporte aéreo sobre a identidade da transportadora operadora e à comunicação de informações de segurança pelos Estados-membros, ao qual dou o meu apoio, em especial no que se refere à necessidade de alargar as competências da Agência Europeia para a Segurança da Aviação (AES) e de lhe delegar um papel primordial para a publicação das medidas de segurança das aeronaves das transportadoras dos países terceiros.

A publicitação da “lista negra” deveria ser efectuada não só pela Comissão Europeia, mas também por todos os Estados-membros, os vendedores de bilhetes, das autoridades nacionais da aviação civil e dos aeroportos dos Estados-membros como forma de garantir uma comunicação útil aos passageiros e a boa prossecução dos objectivos desta proposta.

3-093

David Martin (PSE), *in writing.* – This is a very timely proposal initially in reaction to concerns raised after the Sharm-el-Sheikh air accident (which killed 148 people) and after the spate of air disasters in August this year. Many of the passengers who died at Sharm-el-Sheikh did not know they were going to be flying an Egyptian airline called Flash Air nor that this carrier had temporarily, in 2002, been subject to restrictions by Switzerland because of safety concerns.

Passengers have a right to be informed of the airline operating their flight regardless of where in the Community the service starts. Air travellers should be well informed prior to travel about their prospective flight, particularly if the actual carrier is not the one originally indicated at the time of reservation. This proposal takes us in that direction.

3-094

Seán Ó Neachtain (UEN), *in writing.* – I fully support the De Veyrac report calling for an EU-wide blacklist of air carriers which do not meet international aircraft safety standards. These carriers should be named and shamed under the principle of zero tolerance throughout the Community. At the end of the day all EU citizens want safe flights when travelling inside and outside the Community and we cannot compromise on this objective.

I also firmly believe that the information contained on the blacklist needs to be easily accessible and widely available to all stakeholders (national civil aviation authorities, all EU airports and of course passengers).

As a member of the transport committee I believe it is the role of the European Parliament, as co-legislator, to do everything possible to have such a list quickly established. I believe it is equally vital that the blacklist should also cover aircraft chartered from companies in non-EU countries and Member States should provide the European Commission with a list of carriers banned from their airspace.

Co-operation and co-ordination is the key. In this respect the role of the European Safety Agency needs to be increased in checking international standards and issuing certificates of approval. I reiterate the point that we cannot compromise in any respect the safety of our EU citizens.

3-095

Frédérique Ries (ALDE), *par écrit.* – J'ai bien entendu voté en faveur de cette proposition de réglementation visant à mettre en place une liste noire des compagnies aériennes peu sûres.

L'esprit de cette proposition? Permettre aux voyageurs de choisir leur transporteur en connaissance de cause quant aux conditions de sécurité et d'être prévenus en cas de changement de compagnie de dernière minute.

Cette tâche s'inscrit dans une stratégie plus globale visant à renforcer la sécurité d'un transport aérien en plein essor. En 2003, on a compté 1,7 milliard de passagers aériens dans le monde et l'on en prévoit 2,5 milliards en 2015. En Europe seulement, le nombre de passagers aériens a augmenté en moyenne de 5,5% par an entre 1990 et 2003.

Ce travail doit être mené à l'échelle européenne, en collaboration avec les Etats membres afin de fixer des critères communs d'inspection. Il y a encore trop disparités, notamment au niveau des contrôles.

La Commission, sans se substituer aux gendarmes du ciel, doit faire preuve d'ambition, pointer les mauvais élèves, dénicher les faiblesses et harmoniser la réglementation européenne en matière de sécurité aérienne. C'est la condition sine qua non pour que le transport aérien reste ce qu'il est, le moyen de transport le plus sûr.

3-096

– **Έκθεση: Harms (A6-0282/2005)**

3-097

Milan Gaľa (PPE-DE). – Ako slovenský poslanec a ako člen výboru pre životné prostredie som prirodzene hlasoval za navýšenie podpory na utlmenie dvoch reaktorov jadrovej elektrárne Jaslovské Bohunice. Slovenská vláda, ktorej premiér a ministri prijali v prístupovom rokovania neľahké rozhodnutie o tejto odstávke, by mala veľký problém vysvetliť, ak by hlasovanie v Európskom parlamente dopadlo opačne.

Pokles produkcie elektrickej energie o 19 % a vysoké priame i nepriame náklady, ktoré vzniknú útlmom Jaslovských Bohuníc, sami na Slovensku nezvládneme. Ďakujem preto všetkým kolegom, poslancom Európskeho parlamentu, ktorí pochopili slovenský problém ako problém európsky a hlasovali za navýšenie finančnej pomoci na útlom Jaslovských Bohuníc.

3-098

Árpád Duka-Zólyomi (PPE-DE). – Vyjadrujem spokojnosť s výsledkom hlasovania ohľadne finančnej podpory vyradenia V1 Bohunice z prevádzky. Moje stanovisko je nasledovné: Na V1 Bohunice v deväťdesiatych rokoch bola vykonaná plná rekonštrukcia pod prísnou kontrolou medzinárodnej agentúry v hodnote takmer 300 miliónov eur, a preto ide o predčasné odstavenie. Jadrová elektráreň by dokázala bezpečne produkovať elektrickú energiu aspoň do roku 2015.

Rozhodnutie v roku 1999 bolo politickou záležitosťou, diktované nie so zdravým rozumom, ale so zaujatostou. Priame náklady dosahujú viac ako 1,3 miliardy eur.

Našťastie plénium odsúhlilo aspoň 400 miliónov, čo je však len jedna tretina potrebnnej sumy. Pritom celkové náklady budú 5 miliárd eur, do čoho sú zahrnuté aj také dôležité komponenty ako bezpečné uloženie rádioaktívneho odpadu, značná strata vo výrobe elektrickej energie a iné.

Na Slovensku jadrové elektrárne vyrábajú elektrickú energiu v podiele okolo 57 %. Výpadok V1 znamená vznik nedostatku asi 7 terawatthodín elektriny ročne. To znamená, akoby sme vyšraubovali každú druhú žiarovku v celej krajine. Ďakujem všetkým za podporu.

3-099

Andreas Möller (NI). – Herr Präsident! Die Rekordpreise für Öl und Benzin bringen uns gegenwärtig höchst unangenehm zu Bewusstsein, dass wir wahrscheinlich vor einer neuen Energiekrise stehen. Seit 1960 hat sich der weltweite Energieverbrauch nahezu verdreifacht. Zwar sind die USA mit einem Viertel des Energieverbrauchs hier führend, die wahre Ursache ist jedoch die fortschreitende Modernisierung ehemaliger Entwicklungs- und Schwellenländer.

Noch immer stammen 80 % der weltweit produzierten Energie aus fossilen Quellen wie Öl, Gas und Kohle. Deren Erschließung wird gleichwohl immer aufwendiger und damit teurer, und deren Nutzung schädigt unsere Umwelt. In dieser verfahrenen Situation wiederum nach Kernenergie zu rufen, hieße die Pest gegen die Cholera einzutauschen.

Zwar bietet die Kernspaltung den Vorteil, dass kein Kohlendioxid freigesetzt wird, und trägt damit nicht zur Klimaerwärmung bei, aber solange die bestehenden Probleme wie Reaktorsicherung und Endlagerung des atomaren Abfalls nicht gelöst sind, sollten weder neue Atomkraftwerke gebaut noch die Lebensdauer bestehender verlängert werden. Wir können nur den Sektor der erneuerbaren Energien, welche die einzige langfristig sinnvolle Alternative darstellen, weiter ausbauen, um der Nachfrage Herr zu werden, und die Effizienz der Energienutzung und der bestehenden Technologien weiter verbessern.

3-100

Jan Andersson, Anna Hedh, Ewa Hedkvist Petersen, Inger Segelström och Åsa Westlund (PSE), skriftlig. – Vi valde att rösta emot ändringsförslag 5 och 12 om en höjning av finansieringsbeloppet för avvecklingen av kärnkraftverket Bohunice V1 då vi anser att budgetramen för 2007-2013 inte bör överskridas. Självfallet ska en avveckling av kärnkraftverk ske på ett miljö- och säkerhetsmässigt sätt.

3-101

David Martin,(PSE), in writing. – The purpose of the proposed regulation is to provide finances for the decommissioning of the Bohunice VI nuclear power plant in Slovakia. Slovakia has committed to the closure of Units 1 and 2 of the plant by 31 December 2006 and 31 December 2008 respectively.

The decommissioning process of the plant is an expensive one as it will last beyond 2006 and after the next financial perspective 2007-2013. In light of this, the EU has agreed to extend pre-accession aid by providing financial support for decommissioning up until 2006. Subsequently, an amendment was adopted to raise the budget from EURO 237 million to EURO 400 million.

Despite being largely in favour of raising the budget, I believe the new amount of EUR 400 million proposed by the amendment to be excessive and I welcome the alternative of seeking non-EU funding in order to raise the amount of money necessary for decommissioning to take place.

3-102

Luís Queiró (PPE-DE), por escrito. – A opção pelo nuclear - que me parece ser defensável em determinadas circunstâncias - só é compatível com uma política de segurança absoluta da sua utilização. Por esta ordem de razões, quando é caso disso, deve ser-se determinado no encerramento e desmantelamento destas unidades. No entanto, na situação em apreço, parece-me que não ficaram suficientemente claras as razões para a defesa de uma disponibilização de recursos financeiros tão amplamente superiores à proposta definida pela Relatora. Por esta razão entendi abster-me na votação da presente proposta.

3-103

– Πρόταση ψηφίσματος: B6-0584/2005

3-104

Hélène Goudin, Nils Lundgren och Lars Wohlin (IND/DEM), skriftlig. – Vi stödjer EU:s nordiska samarbete, den så kallade nordliga dimensionen, men anser att samarbetet måste vara baserat på mellanstatlighet, strikt avgränsat och fokuserat på konkreta resultat. Några av de frågor som bör prioriteras är miljöfrågor, kärnkraftssäkerhet samt bekämpande av internationell brottslighet.

Vi stödjer förslaget att EU ska utveckla samarbetet med regionala organisationer, bland annat Nordiska rådet. Det nordiska samarbetet kan fungera som förebild för EU, eftersom det visar hur fri rörlighet kan gynnas och uppmuntras utan en omfattande överstatlig byråkrati. Men anledning av ovanstående väljer vi att rösta för betänkandet.

3-105

Luís Queiró (PPE-DE), por escrito. – A geografia da "nossa Europa", da Europa comunitária foi fortemente modificada em Maio do ano passado. Com evidentes resultados positivos, como é amplamente reconhecido, mas criando novos desafios a uma União Europeia que de um dia para o outro mudou substancialmente de vizinhos, com todo o que tal implica ao nível das diferentes políticas.

Ora, a UE já tem uma longa experiência de políticas de âmbito regional, adaptadas a diferentes realidades geográficas - ainda que algumas tenham menos sucesso do que desejável. Neste sentido, a orientação defendida na presente resolução, preocupando-se com a eficaz acção política ao nível desta dimensão, merece o meu apoio, pois entendo que as políticas não devem ser uniformes, antes devem ser adaptadas às diferentes realidades e especificidades.

3-106

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE), in writing. – I was pleased that this joint motion for resolution gained a sufficiently broad support across the Chamber as this is a particularly important policy area. My own country, Scotland, as a Northern European country should be playing a more active role in this policy, though sadly even with our own Scottish Parliament we have yet to make our voice heard in this topic, so far.

3-107

Bogusław Sonik (PPE-DE), na piśmie. – Szanowni Państwo, przesunięcie granic Unii Europejskiej na Wschód i Północ, jakie dokonało się 1 Maja 2004 roku, niesie ze sobą wiele nowych wyzwań, dlatego też ważne są w tym kontekście takie działania i projekty jak *Północny Wymiar Unii Europejskiej*. Wielostronna współpraca regionalna unijnych krajów rejonu Morza Bałtyckiego ma na celu zapewnienie warunków sprzyjających rozwojowi społecznemu i ekonomicznemu, jak i zapewnieniu stabilności politycznej w tym regionie. Po raz pierwszy Unia Europejska posiada swoje wewnętrzne morze.

Pragnę tutaj zwrócić uwagę na szczególne znaczenie polityczne tej inicjatywy. Kraje Wymiaru Północnego to przecież styl Unii Europejskiej ze wschodem, czyli znaczącymi partnerami jak Rosja czy Białoruś-dlatego region ten może pełnić znaczącą rolę we wdrażaniu specjalnego projektu ścisłej i wielowymiarowej współpracy UE z Rosją.

Wymiar Północny korzystnie wpłynie na współpracę gospodarczą, rozbudowę infrastruktury, a pogłębienie współpracy w wymiarze spraw wewnętrznych i sprawiedliwości powinno zwiększyć bezpieczeństwo w obszarach transgranicznych.

Należy też zwrócić uwagę na pozytywny aspekt ekologiczny Wymiaru Północnego jako cennego i wrażliwego ekosystemu, a więc w tym kontekście współpracę w zakresie ochrony środowiska i wspierania zrównoważonego rozwoju.

Kluczową kwestią do rozwiązania pozostaje sprawa bardzo kontrowersyjnego projektu budowy Gazociagu Bałtyckiego (Północnoeuropejskiego). Decyzja o budowie zapadła bez jakichkolwiek konsultacji z rządami krajów basenu Morza Bałtyckiego i naruszyła w dużym stopniu bezpieczeństwo energetyczne wielu państw. Nie można dopuszczać do dyskryminacji i działaniu wbrew interesom państw słabszych. W innym wypadku Wymiar Północny pozostanie jedynie fikcją i nieprzystającym do rzeczywistości projektem. Projekt Gazociagu Bałtyckiego stwarza również ogromne zagrożenie dla środowiska naturalnego Morza Bałtyckiego.

3-108

– Πρόταση ψηφίσματος: B6-0583/2005

3-109

Luís Queiró (PPE-DE), por escrito. – As vantagens da União Europeia também podem ser uma das causas de algumas das suas dificuldades. Nomeadamente no caso dos desafios tecnológicos, onde a dimensão do conjunto dos 25 Estados Membros pode ser, evidentemente, proporcional às dificuldades de acordo entre si. Ora, no caso das questões de desenvolvimento tecnológico, de adopção de novas tecnologias, é fundamental que sejamos rápidos no pensar e determinados no agir.

Vêm estas considerações a propósito da significativa mudança que representa a evolução tecnológica gerada pela passagem ao digital. Em minha opinião, as orientações referidas nesta Resolução Comum merecem o meu acordo, ainda que salvaguarde a principal preocupação com a necessidade de respeito pelo funcionamento livre deste mercado. A disponibilidade para o apoio ao desenvolvimento tecnológico não pode significar uma intromissão no natural espaço de liberdade que o mercado - muito em particular este especificamente - exige.

3-110

Catherine Stihler (PSE), in writing. – Although I support this report, there needs to be parity when such a switchover takes place. Citizens need to be informed and prepared.

3-111

– Έκθεση: Harms (A6-0279/2005)

3-112

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Na votação deste Relatório foram tidas em conta as posições dos checos sobre as propostas em causa, tendo em conta as pressões a que foram sujeitos para o desmantelamento das centrais nucleares.

Deste modo, são disponibilizados recursos financeiros considerados suficientes para cobrir a totalidade dos custos do desmantelamento e o tratamento, acondicionamento e armazenamento final dos resíduos radioactivos resultantes.

Sabemos que há, actualmente, 14 Estados Membros com centrais nucleares, o que corresponde a 149 reactores, sendo a idade média dos reactores em funcionamento superior a 20 anos.

Ora, em países que aderiram recentemente à União Europeia, como é o caso, e que foram confrontados com estas exigências de desmantelamento, parece-nos correcto que se dê o apoio necessário para a sua concretização de forma mais adequada, tendo em conta a segurança humana e ambiental.

3-113

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE), in writing. – This report is a step in the right direction towards improving financial and technical aspects of decommissioning nuclear power plants.

As we know from experience at Dounreay in Scotland, there is considerable improvement required in the handling of this dangerous, but necessary, process.

Safety must be the number one priority, and the unsatisfactory state of preparations for decommissioning in most EU member states justifies the view that no new nuclear power plans should be built.

3-114

David Martin (PSE), in writing. – I voted for this report. Decommissioning is an important issues as there are some 50-60 nuclear power plants in the EU that will be decommissioned by 2025. It goes without saying that nuclear power plants need to be shut down safely to protect people and the environment. A lack of finance for this process could cause delay and potential safety risks. All nuclear undertakings should have sufficient funds for decommissioning. The Commission is anxious to come up with a common framework, and in the longer term, to harmonise the methods by which decommissioning is financed in the EU. This report makes a contribution to that goal.

3-115

Tobias Pflüger (GUE/NGL), schriftlich. – Die Förderung von Atomkraft durch die EU, wie im Euratom-Vertrag fixiert, ist einzustellen. Wenn die EU ausnahmsweise einmal die Stilllegung von Atomkraftwerken zum Schutz von Mensch und Umwelt fördert, wie im Fall des slowakischen Reaktors Bohunice V1, ist dies unterstützenswert, selbst wenn die Unterscheidung zwischen den "guten" Reaktoren im Westen und den "gefährlichen" im Osten Europas durch die EU-Kommission unhaltbar ist.

Die anfänglich hohe Förderung ist für einen zielstrebigen Beginn der Stilllegung sinnvoll, da die Slowakische Republik über einen Fond erst 320 Mio. EUR angesammelt hat. Die Förderung entspricht den im Rahmen des Beitritts der Slowakei eingegangenen Verpflichtungen.

Ohne die Unterstützung durch die EU ist ein Weiterbetrieb der Reaktoren von Bohunice V1 zu befürchten, welcher mit erheblichen Sicherheitsrisiken einhergehen würde. Ohne EU-Mittel ist darüber hinaus möglicherweise nicht sichergestellt, dass zum Schutz von Mensch und Umwelt auch umgehend Stilllegungsmaßnahmen eingeleitet werden.

Die Verwendung der EU-Mittel sollen allerdings auf die Stilllegung der Reaktoren von Bohunice V1 und die damit zusammenhängenden Maßnahmen beschränkt werden. Der Artikel 2 des Kommissionsvorschlags sollte in diesem Sinne ergänzt werden und über die Präzisierung des Mitteleinsatzes prioritäre Ziele der EU, wie die Einhaltung hoher Sicherheitsstandards bei der Stilllegung und die Verwirklichung des Klimaschutzzieles durch Förderung erneuerbarer Energien festschreiben.

3-116

Luís Queiró (PPE-DE), por escrito. – Votei favoravelmente o relatório sobre a utilização dos recursos financeiros destinados ao desmantelamento das centrais nucleares de potência.

Estou de acordo com os princípios apresentados nestes relatório, não só porque considero que a energia nuclear deve estar rodeada de todas as medidas de segurança, como porque considero que temos que ter em conta, de forma eficaz, os recursos financeiros que gerem o seu ciclo de vida.

Parecem-me responsáveis e eficazes as condições de utilização dos recursos financeiros para o desmantelamento estabelecidas neste relatório e menciono sobretudo a criação de um fundo para o desmantelamento que terá em conta a gestão dos fundos gerados pela produção de energia.

Relembro que é prioritário, sempre que nos debruçamos sobre o nuclear, ter em conta as necessárias medidas de segurança e de protecção ambiental para a vida de uma central nuclear e é neste quadro se deverão incluir as medidas propostas para o seu desmantelamento de forma segura, eficaz e amiga do ambiente.

3-117

Alyn Smith (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – I was pleased to back my group colleagues in supporting this important report as it underlines concerns about the long term viability of the nuclear industry when it comes to decommissioning. With so many alternative technologies available, I believe that we must invest in renewables, which will leave no ecological legacy.

3-118

– Έκθεση: Wijkman (A6-0312/2005)

3-119

Richard Seeber (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte eine Stimmerklärung abgeben zum Bericht Wijkman, den ich an und für sich sehr begrüße. Leider ist der Änderungsantrag vom Kollegen Vidal-Quadras angenommen, so dass jetzt die ausdrückliche Ausnahme der Nuklearenergie gestrichen ist. Das halte ich für falsch, weil ich glaube, dass Nuklearenergie für die Zukunft keine realistische Alternative ist und die damit verbundenen Gefahren noch nicht handhabbar sind. Deshalb haben meine Kollegen und ich insgesamt auch gegen den Bericht gestimmt. Wir sind nicht gegen den Bericht an sich, aber es hätte klarer herausgearbeitet werden müssen, dass Nuklearenergie keine Alternative ist.

3-120

Luca Romagnoli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, temo che la relazione dell'onorevole Wijkman - e spero che il collega non me ne voglia - sia errata a partire dal suo stesso titolo. L'uomo non ha mai vinto e mai vincerà la battaglia contro i cambiamenti climatici, perché su di essi ha un'influenza limitata e non ancora scientificamente dimostrata.

Ritengo che tutt'al si possano più condividere gli auspici di una riduzione delle emissioni dannose e potenzialmente clima-alteranti, ma tra questo e l'approvazione di un documento di dubbia scientificità, perfino presuntuoso nei suoi obiettivi, esiste una grande differenza. A tale riguardo basti citare i punti 2 e 3, dopo il considerando M, ove si pretende di limitare a due gradi l'aumento medio della temperatura del pianeta rispetto ai livelli dell'era preindustriale, sulla quale fra l'altro non esistono registrazioni e dati certi.

Inoltre, non concordo con le affermazioni secondo cui l'Unione europea dovrebbe impegnarsi ad aiutare finanziariamente Cina, India, Brasile e Sudafrica, affinché questi paesi sviluppino strategie energetiche sostenibili. Sarebbe invece più opportuno applicare misure sanzionatorie e di limitazione commerciale nei confronti dei paesi industrializzati, compresi gli Stati Uniti, e dei paesi in via di sviluppo summenzionati, qualora le loro produzioni continuassero a nuocere all'ambiente e fossero, più in generale, di scarsissima attenzione sociale. Pertanto, alla luce di quanto appena affermato, la mia indicazione di voto è stata negativa.

3-121

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Em vésperas da Décima Primeira Conferência das Partes que decorrerá em Montreal de 28 de Novembro a 9 de Dezembro, o Parlamento Europeu insiste na necessidade de atribuir a máxima prioridade às negociações sobre os compromissos respeitantes à redução de emissões para o período pós-2012, decorrentes do Protocolo de Quioto à Convenção Quadro das Nações Unidas sobre mudanças climáticas, que entrou em vigor em 16 de Fevereiro de 2005, após a sua ratificação por 152 países e organizações regionais.

Parece haver algum exagero na fixação das metas dos gases com efeito de estufa, dado que se conhece pouco sobre as efectivas consequências da interferência humana nas alterações climáticas, o que ainda é mais problemático com os EUA fora do Protocolo de Quioto.

Mas consideramos positivas todas as medidas que visam reduzir níveis de intensidade de consumo e desperdício de energia, obtendo maior eficácia energética, desenvolvendo uma nova política de transportes menos poluentes, promovendo os transportes ferroviários e os transportes públicos em geral.

Já temos opinião frontalmente contrária relativamente ao comércio dos direitos de emissão, pois, como é sabido, não resolve qualquer problema e apenas serve para agravar as desigualdades e os desequilíbrios ambientais. Os países mais ricos sempre poderão continuar a poluir, comprando os direitos de emissão a outros, o que não é admissível.

Daí a nossa abstenção.

3-122

Hélène Goudin, Nils Lundgren och Lars Wohlin (IND/DEM), skriftlig. – De globala klimatförändringarna utgör ett betydande problem som vi anser att det finns goda skäl att behandla på internationell nivå. Wijkmanbetänkandet har många förtjänster. Junilistan upprepar emellertid sin ståndpunkt att EU-parlamentet inte skall ta över medlemsländernas utrikespolitik genom att uppmana tredjeländer som ännu inte ratificerat Kyotoprotokollet att göra detta.

Det är vidare beklagligt att betänkandet innehåller ett antal uppmaningar till medlemsstaterna, som borde hanteras på nationell nivå. Här kan till exempel nämnas förslag om gemensamma hastighetsgränser för hela EU, trafikavgifter, skatteincitament, utbyggnad av järnvägstransporterna och de allmänna transportmedlen i allmänhet. Vi är dessutom kritiska till EU-initiativ för att göra medborgarna medvetna om vilka följer en vidlyftig konsumtion och produktion har för klimatet. Detta kan självfallet hanteras på nationell nivå.

Vi har valt att rösta nej till betänkande i dess helhet, men har stött enskilda ändringsförslag, för att enligt vår mening förbättra betänkandet.

3-123

Françoise Grossetête (PPE-DE), par écrit. – Je me suis abstenu sur ce texte

Comme je l'ai précisé dans mon intervention en séance plénière de ce jour, il y a urgence. Il faut agir tout de suite pour répondre à cette menace des changements climatiques, certainement l'une des plus graves de l'histoire de l'humanité.

Dans ce rapport, je soutiens les actions préconisées - tout en rejetant l'idée des éco-taxes -, et le volontarisme politique affiché.

Si je me suis abstenu, c'est pour montrer mon fort mécontentement à l'égard d'un amendement qui remet en cause l'existence du Parlement de Strasbourg.

Il est inadmissible d'utiliser un texte aussi important pour y insérer des considérations qui n'ont rien à voir avec le sujet traité.

3-124

Anna Hedh, Ewa Hedkvist Petersen, Inger Segelström och Åsa Westlund (PSE), skriftlig. – Vi är för en miniminivå på koldioxidsskatt inom EU. Men vi anser att ett sådant beslut måste tas med enhällighet av rådet, ej med majoritetsbeslut. Skatt ska även fortsättningsvis tas ut nationellt och inte av unionen.

3-125

Sérgio Marques (PPE-DE), por escrito. – O excelente relatório do colega Wijkman avança algumas medidas para ajudar a solucionar o problema das alterações climáticas a nível mundial.

Brevemente terá lugar a décima primeira Conferência das Partes em Montréal. Nessa reunião, espera-se que os líderes europeus apresentem propostas para um futuro regime no domínio das alterações climáticas. Esse regime deverá basear-se em responsabilidades comuns, mas diferenciadas, que visam a redução continua das emissões e a participação de mais países nesses esforços.

Por outro lado, deve-se também propor metas mais ambiciosas. O Conselho Europeu de Março de 2005 insistiu na redução de emissões por parte dos países desenvolvidos na ordem dos 15 a 30 % para 2020. O relator propõe estabelecer metas para o longo prazo, sugerindo uma redução de 60 a 80% para 2050.

Finalmente, é necessário desenvolver uma estratégia para tornar a Europa a economia mais eficiente do mundo em matéria de energia. Devem ser criados incentivos para o reforço da utilização de tecnologias "limpas", promover a nível europeu a investigação e a inovação destinadas a apoiar a energia sustentável e a gestão sustentável da utilização dos solos.

3-126

David Martin, (PSE), in writing. – I welcomed the report outlining the need to fight the climate change battle. Once a certain level of Green-house gas concentration has passed in the atmosphere, the whole system will undergo drastic changes. Disasters such as annual material damages due to extreme weather conditions resulting in millions of people left homeless will occur. Developing countries are likely to be the ones who suffer the most. The EU has reduced its emissions by 3% below the 1990 level but more has to be done to reach the 8% target agreed in the Kyoto Protocol.

Although I agree that the EU needs to reduce its emissions to reach the target agreed in the Kyoto agreement, I find the report to be extremely optimistic considering the inclusion of more policy areas and the time limit and would like to see a greater sense of urgency.

3-127

Jean-Claude Martinez (NI), par écrit. – Le climat change. Les peintures rupestres montrent des mammifères au Sahara et des bouquetins à Lascaux. Or, comme ces animaux ont disparu de ces régions, c'est bien la preuve que le climat a changé. Et s'il y a changement, c'est forcément à cause de l'Homme.

Que l'axe de la terre ait un angle d'inclinaison avec le plan de l'écliptique qui change sur une période de 10.000 ans par exemple, et que cela ait une influence sur le climat, comme l'a montré Milankovitch, importe peu. Que la grande respiration océanique, avec d'immenses fleuves plongeant dans l'Atlantique Nord pour ressurgir dans le Pacifique, ait une influence sur le climat, importe là encore peu.

La peur veut des explications, de grandes mythologies rassurantes, des Cosmogonies, du Bien, du Mal, des punitions. On est donc puni de l'industrie, puni du progrès, puni d'inventer, de créer. L'Homme Prométhée qui vole le feu doit être puni aujourd'hui avec la fonte des glaces, la montée des eaux, les canicules et l'oxygène qui fait défaut. Comme hier il y avait les plaies sur l'Egypte.

Tout cela serait sympathique, si ce pataquès post-Moyenâgeux ne conduisait à un changement de climat économique et social qui fait la régression, celle-là bien réelle, dont nous souffrons.

3-128

Luís Queiró (PPE-DE), por escrito. — A importância que deve assumir, entre as nossas preocupações, a questão ambiental, e em particular a questão das alterações climáticas, é, creio, evidente.

Nesta matéria, partilho muito daquilo que são as linhas fundamentais das políticas ambientais que a Europa tem defendido - e de que tanto o relatório como a comunicação da Comissão fazem eco. Mas entendo que devemos ter bem presentes dois aspectos. Por um lado, é evidente que as primeiras preocupações dos países em desenvolvimento não são ambientais, no que não são originais. Por outro lado, as sociedades desenvolvidas também não estão dispostas a abdicar da sua qualidade de vida, nem esse deve ser o nosso propósito nem o nosso modelo. É exactamente por isso que entendo que o principal investimento deve ser na Investigação e Desenvolvimento, já que o objectivo, o modelo, deve ser o de melhor gerir os recursos, garantindo sempre uma melhor, e mais durável, qualidade de vida.

3-129

7 - Διορθώσεις ψήφου: βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά

3-130

(Η συνεδρίαση διακόπτεται στις 12.45 μ.μ. και επαναλαμβάνεται στις 3.05 μ.μ.)

3-131

PRESIDENCIA DEL SR. BORRELL FONTELLES
Presidente

3-132

8 - Aprobación del Acta de la sesión anterior: véase el Acta

3-133

Bernd Posselt (PPE-DE). — Herr Präsident! Im Protokoll ist eine Debatte zwischen der Kollegin Gröner und mir über die Anti-Abtreibungsausstellung des Kollegen Giertych festgehalten. Der amtierende Präsident hatte gesagt, es werde keine Zensur ausgeübt. Inzwischen ist die Ausstellung beseitigt, es wurde also Zensur ausgeübt. Ich möchte darauf hinweisen, dass hier im Haus auch eine Anti-REACH-Ausstellung stattfindet, in der der Kommissionspräsident dargestellt wird, wie er ein Kind vergiftet. Ich finde das – im Gegensatz zur Ausstellung des Kollegen Giertych – in der Tat kontrovers.

Wenn man "kontrovers" als Begründung benutzt, dann muss man beide Ausstellungen demontieren. Ich bin aber der Meinung, man sollte nichts demontieren, man sollte diskutieren, und nicht zensieren.

3-134

El Presidente. — Señor diputado, los Cuestores están al tanto de lo ocurrido y elevarán al Presidente un informe al respecto, en base al cual tomaremos las decisiones oportunas.

3-135

9 - Composición de los grupos políticos: véase el Acta

3-136

10 - Reunión del Consejo Europeo informal

3-137

El Presidente. — El siguiente punto es el debate sobre el Informe del Consejo Europeo y la Declaración de la Comisión acerca de la reunión del Consejo Europeo informal, celebrada en Hampton Court, a la que, como saben, el Parlamento fue invitado en la persona de su Presidente. Agradezco a la Presidencia británica la deferencia que tuvo con el Parlamento.

3-138

Jack Straw, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, it is a very great honour to address this Parliament again – a very high-quality group of parliamentarians are here I know. In all parliaments sometimes you speak to a very large number and sometimes you do not. I take this as full support for all the policies which have been followed both by the UK Presidency and by the United Kingdom on aspects like the budget, which I shall come to in a moment.

This is the 48th time that a British Government minister has appeared before Parliament since the beginning of the UK's Presidency of the European Union and, with six weeks to go, I am happy to tell you there are still many more ministers on the way. That is an indication of the seriousness with which we take Parliament.

Today, I want to report back on the informal summit at Hampton Court. Much of this is now familiar to you, but what was achieved three weeks ago was important. At the beginning of the summer, the people of Europe gave a clear signal that they were unhappy with the way in which Europe was heading. They felt detached from European politics and politicians. At Hampton Court, Europe's leaders took a significant step towards providing a response to that concern by reaching broad agreement on a direction for Europe's economic and social policy. Much of the leg-work had, of course, already been done by the European Commission and published in its excellent paper 'European values in the globalised world'. If I may say to President Barroso, I thought that paper was one of the best and most insightful papers that I have read on the future of Europe and its nations in the last three years.

With 20 million people unemployed across Europe and youth employment running at 18%, the main task for all of us who believe in the social model for Europe is to get Europe back to work and to give our citizens the tools to compete in the global market.

The Hampton Court summit identified six key areas, backed up by a range of specific policies, in which the joint efforts of Member States and of the Commission can bolster Europe's economic prosperity and collective security.

First, there is research and development. We need a strong technological foundation if European companies are to stay ahead of the competition, particularly that posed by the Asian economies.

Second, there is investment in our universities. We are lagging behind the United States and, in some key respects, China and India as well.

The third is facing up to demographic change within the European Union. The EU currently has four people of working age for every elderly citizen, but over the coming decades this will fall from a ratio of four to one to just two to one. At the informal summit EU leaders therefore agreed that we had to examine in much more detail the relationship between legal migration and the EU's future economic needs.

The fourth concern was energy. How do we handle soaring global energy demand while supply remains tight? The summit recognised that the solution requires action on a number of tracks. We have to diversify our sources of energy and approach our current major energy suppliers in a more coherent manner. We have to use our market capacity and power as users with those who are the suppliers. We also have to pursue energy efficiency and clean technologies and develop within Europe a much more genuinely open energy market. It is open in some countries, but not in all countries. I do not call that an open market.

Fifth is the European Union's work on global security. On data retention this Parliament has an opportunity to join in the EU's collective responsibility to shape legislation that will increase the security of our citizens and bring criminals to justice. There is a counter-terrorism strategy that will indicate how we deal with radicalisation, how we protect our infrastructure and how we ensure better exchange of information. We also have to combat illegal immigration and strengthen our borders, whilst ensuring that we harness the benefits of legal migration for the EU and for developing countries.

Finally, the summit agreed that Javier Solana, working with the Presidency, should take forward work on common foreign and security policy aspects of defence and security. There are specific proposals for research and training in this area to fill gaps in our capability. We also have to improve crisis management structures to respond to disasters and look to increase funding for CFSP. In December, by the way, we will be publishing a comprehensive strategy for Africa.

In all areas there will be interim reports to the December European Council and final reports during the Austrian Presidency in the first half of next year. I am confident that in drawing up these reports the Commission will give full consideration to the views of the relevant Parliamentary committees. This, in some detail, is what was discussed at Hampton Court.

However, now that we have broad agreement on the direction of a modern Europe, we have to get the right budget deal to deliver these economic and social priorities. The Presidency is committed to working for a budget deal in December. But we all know that it is going to be extremely difficult to reach one. In June, five Member States rejected the proposed

budget; next month we will need all 25 to agree. So we have some hard negotiating ahead of us. With that in mind, we aim to table comprehensive proposals in early December for discussion at a conclave of foreign ministers.

Changes will be needed in three main areas. First, we have to chart a new direction for the European Union budget to ensure that it can respond to the challenges of the 21st century. That requires establishing a clear timetable for a review covering all aspects of revenue and expenditure, a hard look at where the money comes from, how it is used and how we account for it. Failure to sign off the European Union's accounts for the eleventh successive year – which is very poor – affects the climate of debate and of opinion about the whole of the European Union in every single Member State. So this new direction requires the laying-down of clear objectives for future Union spending, for the accounting for that spending, without which there will not be taxpayer confidence in what this Union is doing, and setting clear pathways for the future reform of the Union's policies.

Second, we have to amend the structure of spending from 1 January 2007 from that which was proposed in the last negotiating box in June, notably to take account of recent discussions by Member States of the proposals by Commission President Barroso, which he made on 20 October.

Third, the consequences of any proposed changes to the own-resources decision – in other words to the amount which is paid by Member States to the EU's budget – must be seen to be fair and balanced in all Member States. For that to happen, significant changes will be needed to the arrangements affecting the United Kingdom – amongst other Member States – from those that were proposed in June. I do not want anybody to be taken by surprise: when I talk about significant changes, I mean significant changes. Without significant changes, I see little prospect of a deal. However, with them, I believe that we can take negotiations forward and we are committed, as the Presidency, to trying to do a deal and we will make every effort to get there.

So far, I have talked about Europe's response to the challenges of globalisation mainly in terms of what we will do – what policies we adopt and what budget we should agree. However, globalisation also poses a challenge to Europe in terms not just of what we do but how we do things. As I have indicated, there is a growing gap between the politics of Europe and the people of Europe.

It is exactly this question that will be the focus of a conference tomorrow in The Hague, jointly hosted by the Dutch and the British Governments. The 'Sharing Power in Europe' conference will look at how regional and national parliaments can work more effectively with European institutions, including the European Parliament, and how we can get the right balance between action at the regional, national and European levels to deliver the best results for our citizens.

I should like here to express great appreciation to Jan Peter Balkenende, the Prime Minister of the Netherlands, for first proposing that such a conference be held – he did so at the June European Council – and to our colleague, Bernard Bot, the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, who has helped the British Presidency to take this idea forward and to host the conference tomorrow.

A part of all this effort has to be to bring Europe closer to its citizens and to make European Union legislation lighter and more relevant. As globalisation has made it more difficult for the people of Europe to relate to its institutions, so too have those people, our citizens, become more critical about the nature of European Union legislation. They are much more impatient of a *dirigiste* regime and more strident in their belief that methods of regulation cannot, and should not, be a proxy for outcome. Too often – it is true of all parliaments and unions but it is particularly true of the European Union – the method has been seen as the same as the outcome. This is not the case. Businesses, non-governmental organisations and Member States want new European rules, for example, to fight unfair competition, to protect the environment or to improve our legal systems. However, they want action that makes our lives better, not more complicated. Standardisation and harmonisation do not add value by themselves.

Thanks to the efforts of the Commission under President Barroso, there are many positive signs now. For example, the Commission has listened to what businesses and people want and has proposed a lighter regulatory touch in financial services. This will help promote a globally competitive European financial sector. The Commission's three-year action programme for simplifying the *acquis* is another very welcome step, as is the recognition that the European Union does not always need to get involved in those areas where it used to get involved. Hence the decision to get rid of a 1968 directive which regulated the number and the size of knots in wood. There may have been a reason 37 years ago for the European Union to regulate the number and size of knots in wood. However, today we ought to leave that maybe to Member States or just to the judgement of those people who buy wood from a timber dealer. Why not?

The proposal to see whether we can simplify the way in which employers have to give compliance reports on 20 separate directives on health and safety at work should lessen the burden on employers, giving them more time to focus on workers' needs – maybe on creating jobs – than on paperwork.

As a co-legislator, the European Parliament has a critical role to play in all this. Let us take REACH – which was the subject of a little excitement outside as I came in and, I have heard, a little excitement in here. It is controversial how far you regulate the European chemical industry to protect the consumer. None of us wants to be poisoned by chemicals. Nonetheless I believe that Europe's record on this is exemplary and second to none in the whole of the universe. Equally, none of us want to see, in a globalised world in which barriers have come down, Europe's chemical industry brought to its knees so that the regulation, which is a very fine one, ends up regulating an industry that has disappeared, to be replaced by industries across the world in China, India and elsewhere, where the regulation is far less good than it is today. That is the dilemma facing Parliament, as it faces all our peoples.

We have to recognise the difficult cases. The proposed changes to the Working Time Directive are a good example of well-meaning legislation that will not achieve what those changes are set out to do, and where method and outcome have become grievously confused.

We are all agreed that European labour markets must embrace decent standards of protection for our workers. Europeans must have rights at work, but they must also have jobs in which they can exercise those rights at work. My Prime Minister said recently that we hoped to resolve the outstanding issues on this directive during our Presidency, and that remains our goal.

Let us be clear about the nature of the challenges we have to address. The Working Time Directive is justified as being about health and safety, and in part, it is. But rigid limits on total hours worked are not the answer. The United Kingdom has one of the best health and safety records in the whole of the European Union. Since you ask, we are second best in terms of days lost through injury and, I believe, third best in terms of deaths at work. We have shown by our record that a strong health and safety record judged by outcomes is entirely compatible with flexible labour markets and flexible working hours. Rigid pan-European limits on working hours will not deliver health and safety for our workforce, particularly where the rules are unevenly applied.

Some European partners have rightly, I believe, expressed great concern that there are other Member States in which working time limits are being applied per contract and not per worker. Some of those countries are the same ones that say there have to be rigid limits; but when it comes to enforcement within their own countries, there is a dodge taking place and in the place of enforcement per worker – which has to be the basis for health and safety – it is per contract. Therefore, if people have two contracts – two jobs, one person – then they can evade the limit, entirely unregulated and unprotected. It does not make sense from a health and safety point of view. It does not make sense from an employment practice perspective. It does not make sense in terms of the reputation of the European Union of applying fair and sensible regulations across Europe.

We have to find ways to implement and enforce the directive which match the needs of all labour markets. We must ensure that all workers enjoy proper employment rights and that none are forced by the rigidities of this directive into a grey economy, for that is what is happening.

The blunt truth about the directive is that in seeking to reset European limits and standards, we risk infringing individual workers' freedom to work the hours they choose. We will undeniably restrict employers' flexibility to adapt to changing businesses and seasonal demands and, in doing so, will threaten the very jobs on which workers' livelihoods depend. That cannot be right. It is vital that workers feel safe and appropriately protected in the workplace. It is good business as much as it is good politics.

We need to judge how much of this should be fixed at European level and how much we should trust national governments, employers and trade unions to agree on an approach that reflects labour traditions and good practice within individual Member States and across Europe. After all, the minimum wage, another aspect of labour regulation in which I happen to believe passionately, has always been left to Member States. I believe that is quite right. Now is the time to leave far more issues concerning working hours to Member States as well. That seems to me to be an excellent example of an area where Europe, in addressing the challenges of seeking to engage more closely with our citizens, must go forward with a lighter touch.

When the United Kingdom took over the Presidency of the European Union we also inherited the need to conduct a wide debate on the future of Europe. The Hampton Court summit was a vital element of that debate. But the debate is far from finished. The process of constructing a modern, confident Europe will be an even longer one. This is a journey which governments, politicians and parliaments, including this one, cannot take alone. We have to bring the benefits of Europe to the people of Europe and take the people with us.

(Applause)

José Manuel Barroso, président de la Commission. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Ministre des affaires étrangères, Mesdames, Messieurs les députés, comme l'a souligné M. Jack Straw, nous pouvons être satisfaits des résultats de ce Sommet informel. Je tiens à vous dire que je me réjouis du fait que la voix du Parlement européen ait pu s'y faire entendre, grâce à la participation du Président Borell à l'ensemble des discussions. Je ne peux que féliciter le premier ministre Blair, pour la façon dont il a contribué à créer une atmosphère positive, un climat de confiance. Je suis particulièrement fier du rôle que la Commission a joué dans le succès de ce Sommet.

Nos discussions à *Hampton Court* ont débouché sur un consensus autour d'une idée fondamentale et de cinq domaines clés. L'idée fondamentale est la suivante: pour préserver nos valeurs, il nous faut moderniser nos politiques. Il n'y a pas de contradictions entre un projet de réforme économique de modernisation de l'Europe et l'attachement à une Europe politique, à une Europe sociale. Les cinq domaines clés sont, brièvement: en premier lieu, un consensus sur l'analyse et la nature des défis auxquels nous sommes confrontés, qui suit la contribution que la Commission a présentée – et je vous remercie à ce propos, Monsieur le Ministre, pour les mots que vous avez eus sur la qualité de notre document. En deuxième lieu, l'importance de mettre concrètement en œuvre des réformes ambitieuses en faveur de la croissance et de l'emploi. Tous les États membres se sont attelés à cette tâche et la Commission fera un rapport sur les programmes nationaux développés pour mettre en œuvre les conclusions de Lisbonne au tout début de l'année prochaine. En troisième lieu, l'approfondissement des travaux concrets sur les réponses politiques à apporter à la mondialisation, au vieillissement de nos populations, portant sur des domaines précis tels que la recherche et le développement, les universités, l'énergie et la démographie, y inclus le problème de l'immigration. En quatrième lieu, précisément, une nouvelle priorité à la politique d'immigration, couvrant à la fois l'immigration légale qui répond sans doute aux besoins de notre économie, la sécurisation des frontières attendue par nos citoyens et des politiques d'intégration efficaces qui sont indispensables dans nos sociétés multiculturelles. En cinquième lieu, de nouvelles initiatives en vue d'examiner comment notre action extérieure peut être renforcée, afin de mieux répondre à la mondialisation et aux nouvelles menaces sur la sécurité qui ne s'arrête aux frontières nationales.

Nous devons maintenant avancer dans ces travaux. J'espère que nous pourrons le faire en collaboration étroite avec le Parlement et avec les Présidences du Conseil actuelle et à venir.

Afin de soutenir la dynamique en faveur de la croissance et de l'emploi à long terme, la Commission se propose de donner un nouvel élan à la recherche et au développement et de présenter des façons de réorganiser les systèmes éducatifs d'Europe et les universités. Nous ferons rapport au Conseil et au Parlement européen sur ces questions, avant le Conseil européen du printemps.

Rechercher les moyens de mieux affronter le défi démographique: dès le début de l'année prochaine, nous présenterons les résultats de la consultation qui a été lancée au début de l'année avec la publication d'un livre vert sur la démographie.

Définir une politique énergétique cohérente: nous présenterons l'année prochaine une stratégie pour l'Europe. Toutes les options doivent rester ouvertes. Cette reconnaissance nouvelle du fait qu'il faut travailler ensemble dans un domaine qui, jusqu'à très récemment, était considéré comme un domaine réservé des États membres est très importante.

Concernant la migration, les travaux sont déjà en cours. Plusieurs propositions ont déjà été soumises au Parlement et, avant la fin de l'année, un document devrait permettre d'approfondir la réflexion et l'action en matière d'immigration légale et illégale.

Enfin, la sécurité nous place devant un double défi. Nous devons à la fois mieux travailler ensemble pour nous attaquer à la criminalité transfrontalière que nous connaissons en Europe, mais aussi donner plus de détermination à notre engagement à lutter contre le terrorisme international. Là encore, d'importantes propositions de la Commission sont sur la table et une stratégie de lutte contre le terrorisme est en cours d'exécution. Mais nous devons aussi consentir de plus gros efforts pour faire en sorte que l'Union européenne tienne pleinement sa place dans le débat sur les réponses à apporter à la mondialisation. C'est pourquoi la Commission présentera un document de réflexion, *a concept paper*, examinant la façon dont nous, Commission européenne, pouvons contribuer avec le Conseil, avec le Parlement, à renforcer la cohérence extérieure de l'Union.

Il est évident que nous pouvons faire plus en faveur de la cohérence de notre action étrangère, non seulement sur le plan de la politique étrangère et de défense commune, mais aussi des différents instruments de politique intérieure qui ont une dimension extérieure, et aussi dans des domaines où la Commission a un rôle spécial à jouer comme l'aide au développement, le commerce international et la politique de voisinage, par exemple.

3-140

Hampton Court showed once again why the European Union matters in a globalised world. Never before has European integration been so much in question, but never before has it been so necessary. Europe has the scale and the range of policies to maximise the benefits of globalisation for its citizens and to minimise the threats. It is European legislation which enables a terrorist suspect to be transferred from Italy to London within 50 days. A process that once took years now

takes weeks because we have an instrument at European level and because we have European legislation that enables us to do that. It is Europe that can provide answers to the challenges of more expensive and scarcer energy. It is also Europe which will help manage the border crossing in Gaza, a very important recent development. It is Europe which is leading the world in aid for Africa. So there is a need for this European dimension.

We agree – and we have done a great deal to achieve this with better regulation – on the need for sensible legislation to avoid bureaucratic measures. However, that does not mean a minimalist Europe – and I want to be totally clear about that. Not at all. It means that Europe should do less in some areas and should make the lives of our citizens and businesses easier. Nevertheless, at the same time, there are areas where we have to do more, not less. It is a very important to avoid the idea of a minimalist Europe.

It is the responsibility of all of us European leaders – at Council level, Parliament level and Commission level – to explain this and to avoid the demagoguery and populism that is sometimes levelled against Europe. Because, in this globalised world, we need a strong Europe more than ever. But all these policies – from external relations, to security, to migration, to energy, to research, to universities – need money; they cost money.

When I was a child my mother told me never to speak about money because it is impolite. But now I have to speak about money. Because without money, we cannot deliver on those policies, we need the resources to go ahead with our policies.

Distinguished members of the Council, you cannot ask the Commission and the other European institutions to deliver and not give them the means to deliver on those policies.

The positive atmosphere, the signs of a stronger European political will that we saw at Hampton Court, must now be turned into action, turned into an agreement on the financial perspective next month. This is the defining issue of the British Presidency; it is the test of whether Europe is on the move, and we need Europe on the move.

In respect of prosperity, solidarity and security, all we can do is give our citizens the means to achieve them. I know the British Presidency is working hard for a deal; the cost of failure would be high. It is hard to see how our positions will converge within a few months. So there is a real risk of no agreement next month, leading to delays in money coming on-stream for the new Member States, a risk that the Community will not be able to deliver on crucial international commitments, including commitments for the poorest.

Without the financial perspective, how can the European Union make medium-term commitments to global funds for HIV/AIDS? How can we respect the commitments we made at the United Nations for the Millennium Development Goals? How can we support the Caribbean countries in adjusting to the changes in the European Community banana regimes, for instance? How can we keep our commitments to African peacekeeping? How can we go ahead with the so-called new policies, the policies for the future? Indeed, if there is no agreement we will keep the policies of the past; we will not have the means for the policies for the future.

I also think we all agree that an enlarged, more diverse European Union needs more investment. I do not say ‘the costs of enlargement’ because I do not like the word ‘costs’ when we speak about enlargement. But now that we are a much bigger Europe and we are a much more diverse Europe we need more investment for those new Members. We have to share the burden of this investment.

We have a duty of solidarity to the new Member States who look to the European Union for support in their rapid and remarkable progress in modernisation and reform. This is a win-win situation for all Member States. This is not a zero-sum game and it is precisely because we have to bridge this gap that I came up with some proposals, including a proposal now being taken into consideration by the British Presidency – I thank the British Presidency for that – linking cohesion and competitiveness. In our thinking there is no contradiction between cohesion on one side and competitiveness on the other, on the contrary. The cohesion and support for the new Member States is also a way for them to improve their competitiveness and for Europe as a whole to be more competitive.

So I hope that those proposals will be taken into account in the final agreement so in the end it will also be clear that what we are proposing is not money for an old concept of Europe, it is money for a more competitive and more modern Europe, but a Europe that at the same time keeps its strong values in terms of cohesion.

We need a fair sharing of this burden. No Member State can do enlargement on the cheap. I trust in the common sense of the British Presidency to deliver a fair and balanced agreement next month. I hope that we will achieve this by strengthening, and not reducing, the Commission and Parliament’s ambition for an enlarged Europe. Because we have to say very frankly that the financial perspectives represent an agreement between the Council, Commission and the Parliament, and the position of Parliament and the Commission should be taken into consideration in the final agreement.

Hampton Court was indeed a success. Hampton Court was the first very important step in a new consensus for a dynamic, modern Europe. I hope that the positive spirit of dynamism and openness which everyone showed there can be turned into agreement on the budget now. I give my full support to the Presidency in its efforts to achieve that and I wish the Presidency and all the Member States the very best.

(Applause)

3-141

El Presidente. — Gracias señor Barroso, la Presidencia desea observar que el debate era sobre el Consejo Europeo de Hampton Court y está derivando hacia un predebate sobre las perspectivas financieras. Pero la Presidencia no va a señalar a los participantes en el debate sobre qué deben debatir. Pueden insistir en el tema de las perspectivas financieras si lo desean aunque no figure específicamente en el orden del día.

3-142

Hans-Gert Poettinger, im Namen der PPE-DE-Fraktion. — Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissionspräsident, Herr Ratspräsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Einen Tag vor Hampton Court war der Präsident des Europäischen Rates hier, nicht der britische Premierminister. Er ist zwar auch britischer Premierminister, aber als britischer Premierminister ist er Präsident des Europäischen Rates.

Es war ein gutes Signal, dass Tony Blair einen Tag vor Hampton Court hier war. Ich fand, das war die richtige Reihenfolge: erst ins Parlament, und dann zu den Staats- und Regierungschefs. Ich begrüße es auch sehr, dass unser Präsident die ganze Zeit in Hampton Court war. Herr Ratspräsident, ich empfehle Ihnen, dass Sie für den Gipfel in Brüssel den Präsidenten des Europäischen Parlaments auch für die ganze Zeit einladen. Das wäre dann eine gute Grundlage für die Zukunft: Man würde sich immer an Großbritannien erinnern, das den Präsidenten des Europäischen Parlaments zur Gänze in den Europäischen Gipfel einbezogen hat.

Sie haben mit wunderbarem britischen Understatement die Qualität der hier anwesenden Abgeordneten erwähnt. Ich finde es wunderbar, wie Sie damit indirekt eine berechtigte Kritik zum Ausdruck bringen: Wir könnten hier zahlreicher sein. Aber Sie haben die Qualität angesprochen, und das zeigt, welcher Meister des Parlamentarismus Sie in Großbritannien sind.

Doch jetzt möchte ich etwas Wasser in den Wein gießen: Sie sprachen von den Besuchen der Minister, 48 Mal sei ein Minister in den europäischen Institutionen gewesen. Das finde ich toll, das wird sich sicher auch noch auf 60 erhöhen, weil wir ja noch sechs Wochen haben, aber am Ende ist entscheidend, dass der Quantität der Minister des britischen Ratsvorsitzes auch die Qualität entspricht, und da haben wir noch die Hoffnung, dass dies bis Ende Dezember dieses Jahres dann auch der Fall ist.

Sie haben gesagt, Europa sei weit weg von den Bürgern. Das ist wahr, darüber müssen wir nachdenken, wie wir das gemeinsam verbessern. Aber dies gilt natürlich auch für die nationale Politik. Insofern haben wir auf der nationalen und auf der europäischen Ebene eine gleiche Anstrengung zu unternehmen, um das Vertrauen in die Politik insgesamt herzustellen.

Ich denke – und das war wohl der Erfolg von Hampton Court –, dass, wenn man das von außen betrachtet, doch zwischen den Akteuren neues Vertrauen entstanden ist. Als Vorsitzender einer Fraktion mit Abgeordneten aus allen 25 Mitgliedstaaten sowie aus 45 nationalen Parteien weiß ich aus Erfahrung, dass man bei einer so schwierigen Interessenlage – die ja auch in den anderen Fraktionen, im Parlament hier insgesamt, wie auch bei den Regierungen besteht – Probleme nur bewältigen kann, wenn Vertrauen da ist. Wenn kein Vertrauen da ist, dann gibt es auch keine politischen Lösungen. Das ist unsere Forderung an die Staats- und Regierungschefs, dass jeder Einzelne seinen Beitrag leistet, Vertrauen zu schaffen im Verhältnis zu den anderen Mitgliedern des Europäischen Rates.

Es war die Rede von der Zukunft Europas, vom Papier der Kommission, von der Globalisierung. Ich will das jetzt nicht alles wiederholen. Entscheidend ist aber, dass wir einerseits die Globalisierung – dass wir eine Welt sind und immer mehr eine Welt werden, das ist doch der Kern der Globalisierung – im Kern akzeptieren; dass wir sie aber andererseits nicht nur erdulden, sondern gestalten, das heißt, dass wir die Auswüchse, die negativen Auswirkungen der Globalisierung, durch politisches Handeln gestalten. Ich glaube, das ist unsere Aufgabe.

Nun möchte ich etwas sagen zu dem wichtigsten Bereich, der zu entscheiden sein wird, und zu dem Sie ja auch eine Debatte geführt haben, wenn auch am Rande. Der Präsident des Parlaments hat es ja schon erwähnt: es ist die Finanzielle Vorausschau. Ich rate Ihnen, wenn Sie gestatten – und wenn Sie es nicht gestatten, rate ich es Ihnen auch –, dass Sie bei der Finanziellen Vorausschau zu einer Lösung kommen. Denn Großbritannien war immer für die Erweiterung – und hier sind Kolleginnen und Kollegen aus den Ländern, die am 1. Mai 2004 der Europäischen Union beigetreten sind –, wenn es auch bei den institutionellen Fragen unseren gemeinsamen Weg nicht immer mitgegangen ist. Wenn Sie mit der Finanziellen Vorausschau scheitern, dann werden Sie insbesondere die am 1. Mai 2004 beigetretenen früheren kommunistischen Länder enttäuschen. Deswegen: Tun Sie alles, Herr Ratspräsident, damit Sie zu einem Ergebnis

kommen! Dazu müssen Sie – und auch der Präsident des Europäischen Rates – allerdings auch den Mut haben, beim Britenrabatt einen klaren Strich zu ziehen.

Sie haben von einem fundamentalen Wandel gesprochen. Wahrscheinlich haben Sie die Agrarpolitik gemeint. Aber wir brauchen auch einen fundamentalen Wandel, was die Beiträge der einzelnen Mitgliedstaaten angeht, und da kann jetzt während Ihrer Präsidentschaft auch Großbritannien einen großen Beitrag leisten. Die Agrarpolitik ist bis zum Jahre 2013 beschlossen. Aber wenn es eine Lösung für den britischen Beitrag gibt, wenn wir zu einer finanziellen Vorausschau kommen wollen, dann muss auch gesichert sein, dass wir zumindest im Sinne einer verpflichtenden Absichtserklärung bereit sind, zu einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt über eine weitere Reform der Agrarpolitik nachzudenken.

Herr Ratspräsident, vergessen Sie nicht, wenn Sie über die finanzielle Vorausschau sprechen und hoffentlich zu Entscheidungen kommen – ich sage das auch an die Adresse der Kommission: Das entscheiden Sie im Rat nicht alleine! Das Europäische Parlament ist Teil der Haushaltsbehörde, und das Europäische Parlament ist gleichberechtigter Mitentscheider. Das heißt: Gewährleisten Sie, dass das Europäische Parlament voll einbezogen wird! Wir repräsentieren, wie Sie natürlich auch, die Bürger Europas, und wenn wir gemeinsam guten Willen zeigen, wenn wir gemeinsam Vertrauen haben, dann wird es auch möglich sein, die Probleme zu lösen.

(*Beifall*)

3-143

Robert Goebbels, au nom du groupe PSE. – Monsieur le Président, *Hampton Court* fut un Sommet sans conclusions formelles. Les promesses du Sommet risquent d'être aussi éphémères que les engagements maritaux contractés par le roi Henri VIII dans le même palais.

La Présidence britannique a raison d'inviter les Vingt-cinq à opérer des réformes, à investir davantage dans les technologies d'avenir, à créer les conditions d'un meilleur emploi. Des réformes restent nécessaires, mais pour beaucoup de citoyens, le mot "réforme" a une connotation négative et est synonyme de perte d'emplois et de racket social.

Jack Straw vient de critiquer la position du Parlement sur la directive relative au temps de travail. Je conseille au ministre de relire la toute première convention adoptée par l'*International Labour Organisation* à l'époque de la Société des nations et qui visait la semaine de quarante-huit heures sans *opt out*.

Les réformes sont acceptées si elles permettent d'améliorer le bien-être général. Pour y parvenir, l'Europe doit changer son discours trop pessimiste, trop misérabiliste. Vue de l'extérieur, l'Union est un exemple. Le Président du Chili l'a répété ici le mois dernier. Mais, à lire les communications de la Commission, l'Europe serait devenue un hospice à l'horizon 2050. Qui d'entre nous pourra contrôler ces projections alarmistes en 2050? Oui, l'Europe sera confrontée à un vieillissement de sa population. Mais le Japon et la Russie connaîtront une population en régression. Et que dire de la Chine avec sa politique de l'enfant unique par famille? Que dire de l'Inde et des autres pays qui n'arrivent pas à juguler une population en croissance trop rapide? Quel pays connaîtra les plus grands problèmes démographiques à l'horizon 2020, sans même oser parler de 2050?

S'il y a un domaine où l'Europe pourrait imiter les États-Unis, c'est celui de la politique d'immigration qui pourrait être plus généreuse. Une grande partie du surplus de croissance américaine de la dernière décennie vient de l'apport des dix millions de latinos et des centaines de milliers de scientifiques européens et asiatiques. Il y a quinze jours, le sénat américain a décidé d'accorder chaque année 330 000 *Green Cards* supplémentaires pour des immigrants très qualifiés.

La compétitivité de l'Europe est un souci permanent. Toutefois, en comparant à d'autres la compétitivité horaire et surtout la compétitivité industrielle de l'Europe, force est de constater que nous battons largement les États-Unis dans la majorité des secteurs économiques. La communication de la Commission sur la politique industrielle le reconnaît. L'Union est toujours la première destination et la première source pour les investissements mondiaux. En 2003, les investissements des Quinze ont été quatre fois plus élevés dans les dix nouveaux pays qu'en Chine, qui n'a reçu que 3,8% de l'investissement européen. Cessons donc de nous faire peur avec la Chine. Il n'est que normal qu'un pays de 1,3 milliard d'habitants prenne une part plus importante dans le commerce mondial, mais en chiffres absolus, la part de l'Europe dans le commerce mondial s'accroît, même si certains secteurs connaissent des difficultés. Toutefois, les neuf dixièmes de nos échanges ne se font pas avec des pays à bas salaire mais avec des pays développés.

La globalisation est une grande chance pour réduire la misère dans le monde. La croissance des échanges internationaux est depuis cinquante ans plus rapide que la croissance du produit mondial brut. Cela démontre que le commerce extérieur n'est pas un jeu à sommes nulles mais a permis de tirer de la pauvreté des millions d'humains tout en bénéficiant aux consommateurs des pays riches. Ce sont en fait nos consommateurs qui, en achetant les produits les moins chers, forcent nos industriels à devenir plus compétitifs.

L'Union reste la première force exportatrice au monde, tirée par l'Allemagne, la France et l'Italie. Ces trois pays sont néanmoins en panne de croissance intérieure. Leurs citoyens accumulent une épargne record. De leur côté, les Américains et les Britanniques consomment tout en s'endettant dangereusement. Pour retrouver la croissance, il faut redonner confiance aux Européens. Il n'y a pas d'alternative au marché, mais le marché est incapable de produire la solidarité qui est le signe distinctif du modèle européen. Il faut de la volonté politique pour créer plus de solidarité entre nos pays et dans nos pays.

La politique se résume toujours à une question de moyens – et sur ce point, je rejoins le président Barroso –, or ce sont les moyens budgétaires qui manquent cruellement à l'Europe. Tony Blair a raison de nous inviter à investir davantage dans la recherche, dans les universités. Cela implique que le budget de l'Union devrait être alimenté avec des moyens supérieurs au misérable 1% du PIB que veulent bien concéder quelques grands pays, à commencer par la Grande-Bretagne.

(*Applaudissements*)

Le groupe socialiste jugera la Présidence sur sa capacité à dégager des perspectives financières réalistes mais plus généreuses. Le Sommet de décembre doit être le Sommet de la solidarité retrouvée. Un engagement fort des Vingt-cinq en faveur d'une politique de relance coordonnée ainsi que des investissements infrastructurels nationaux et transeuropéens plus importants permettront à l'Europe de retrouver la croissance, condition nécessaire, Monsieur le Président, pour faire accepter des réformes structurelles difficiles. C'est la croissance qui engendrera la stabilité, Monsieur le Président, et non l'inverse.

(*Applaudissements*)

3-144

El Presidente. – Muchas gracias, señor Goebbels. El debate se anima, y esto es positivo para conseguir que algunos diputados más se incorporen a él.

3-145

Karin Riis-Jørgensen, for ALDE-Gruppen. – Hr. formand! Kære kolleger! Jeg kan forstå, at parterapien på højt niveau i Hampton Court tilsyneladende gik, som den skulle. Men terapien foregik jo også i de rette romantiske og eksklusive omgivelser, så I havde alle odds med jer. Nu, hvor alle regeringslederne er hjemme igen efter terapien, skal det for alvor vise sig, om terapeuten Tony Blairs indsats har båret frugt. For vi ved jo alle, at når ægteskaberne knager, falder man ofte tilbage på de samme dårlige vaner. Jeg har derfor en konkret opfordring til formandskabet og Kommissionen!

I praksis er det reelt meget lidt, EU-landene i fællesskab kan gøre for at få gang i den nødvendige og efterlyste reformproces for at modernisere det europæiske arbejdsmarked, så det passer til samfundet af i dag. Vi ved jo alle, at dette nødvendige arbejde skal udføres af det enkelte medlemsland. Reformarbejdet er alene et nationalt anliggende.

EU kan og skal derimod færdiggøre arbejdet med at skabe et fuldendt indre marked for kapital og for serviceydelse. Mens parterapien stadig har en effekt, opfordrer jeg derfor formandskabet og Kommissionen til at arbejde for at sikre fuld liberalisering af det europæiske servicemarked og kapitalmarkedet. Hvis dette lykkes, er jeg overbevist om, at det vil afføde reelle arbejdsmarkedsreformer efter devisen: "There's no other alternative". For borgerne er fordelene ved en sådan reform enorme, og det er jo det, EU-samarbejdet drejer sig om: At give en ekstra værdi til vores medborgere.

Og så et klart spørgsmål til Dem, hr. Straw! De nævner Revisionsrettens årsberetning. Er De parat til at være et godt eksempel og sørge for, at De og Det Forenede Kongerige tager ansvaret for administrationen af et EU-tilskud i Deres land? Det har Deres finansminister jo desværre nægtet i sidste uge. Jeg efterlyser et klart svar fra Dem. Tak for Deres opmærksomhed.

3-146

Pierre Jonckheer, au nom du groupe Verts/ALE. – Monsieur le Président du Conseil, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, j'aurai trois réactions à votre discours, Monsieur Straw.

Sur la Conférence de La Haye, que vous avez évoquée, je me permettrai de vous suggérer très modestement de relire le projet de Constitution que vous avez signé et qui, à mon avis, comprend des solutions à la fois sur la répartition des compétences et sur le rôle des parlements nationaux. Pourquoi abandonner ce projet?

En ce qui concerne la politique sociale et la directive relative à l'aménagement du temps de travail, je suis d'accord avec vous: il faut dire oui à la diversité nationale, mais s'il faut s'inspirer d'un modèle, j'aimerais autant m'inspirer du modèle scandinave.

Et puis, sur la question du marché unique, j'espère que vous conviendrez avec moi du fait que la concurrence doit également être *fair and balanced*. En d'autres termes, le marché unique se construit aussi sur des normes communes sociales, s'inscrivant ainsi dans l'esprit même des traités.

Enfin, en ce qui concerne le budget, je pense que nous rencontrons un vrai problème de crédibilité au niveau à la fois des recettes et des dépenses – M. Barroso et le Parlement européen y ont suffisamment fait allusion. Réussir l'Union européenne à vingt-cinq, exprimer notre solidarité constante vis-à-vis des nouveaux pays membres et mener une politique extérieure avec des moyens suffisants, éventuellement plus de 5 % du budget, supposent une augmentation du budget communautaire.

Et surtout, et je terminerai par là, il nous faut sortir du débat budgétaire caractérisé par une montée des égoïsmes nationaux. Il faut que, dans l'évaluation à mi-parcours appelée par la Commission et par le Parlement, la Présidence et l'ensemble du Conseil européen prennent l'engagement politique de proposer un mécanisme européen dotant l'Union européenne de véritables ressources autonomes pour l'avenir des politiques de l'Union. Avec un tel engagement, nous pourrions peut-être convaincre nos citoyens de l'utilité de la politique européenne.

3-147

Κυριάκος Τριανταφύλλιδης, εξ ονόματος της ομάδας GUE/NGL. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, χαίρομαι που σήμερα έχουμε την ευκαιρία, με την παρουσία του προεδρεύοντα του Συμβουλίου καθώς και του Προέδρου της Επιτροπής, να κάνουμε μία αποτίμηση του άτυπου Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου το οποίο έλαβε χώρα στο τέλος του περασμένου μήνα.

Δυστυχώς, ενώ η ιδέα για τη σύγκληση του Συμβουλίου δεν ήταν κακή, η εκτέλεση έπασχε τα μέγιστα. Πράγματι, σε μία εποχή όπου η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πνέει τα λοίσθια αφού μετράμε είκοσι εκατομμύρια άνεργους, όπου δεν ξέρουμε πώς να αντιμετωπίσουμε τα κοινωνικά προβλήματα ιδίως αντά που ξέσπασαν προσφάτως στη Γαλλία, και όπου η εμπιστοσύνη του πολίτη προς τους κυβερνώντες μειώνεται κατά γεωμετρική πρόοδο, η ιδέα να βρεθούν οι ηγέτες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στο Λονδίνο για να συζητήσουν το ευρωπαϊκό κοινωνικό μοντέλο και την αντίσταση στην παγκοσμιοποίηση ήταν, φαινομενικά, πολύ καλή.

Δυστυχώς, αντί να επικρατήσει συναίνεση, είδαμε πάλι τους πατροπαράδοτους καυγάδες να ξεσπάνε για ένα τόσο σημαντικό θέμα για το μέλλον της Ευρώπης, όπως είναι των δημοσιονομικών προοπτικών.

Θυμίζω, κύριε Πρόεδρε, ότι ο κύριος Μπλερ, κατά την αγόρευσή του στο ίδιο βήμα εδώ στο Ευρωκοινοβούλιο στις 23 Ιουνίου, είχε δηλώσει ότι ανέκαθεν ήταν ένας ενθουσιώδης υπέρμαχος της Ευρώπης. Αναρωτιέμαι, τεσσεράμισι μήνες μετά, με ποιον τρόπο μετατρέπει αυτά τα λόγια ο κύριος Μπλερ σε πράξη. Ποια είναι η αποτίμηση της Προεδρίας της χώρας του μέχρι τώρα αφού ένα μήνα πριν από τη λήξη της δεν έχουμε πετύχει συμφωνία για τις δημοσιονομικές προοπτικές. Το κοινωνικό μοντέλο δεν έχει προχωρήσει ούτε σπιθαμή και η απάντηση του Συμβουλίου στην παγκοσμιοποίηση είναι η δημιουργία ενός διφορούμενου ταμείου ρύθμισης.

Αναρωτιέμαι πραγματικά, κύριε Πρόεδρε της Επιτροπής, εάν έχετε σκεφτεί σοβαρά την αντίδραση των απολυμένων εργαζομένων όταν θα τους απαντάτε ότι για όλα τα κακά της παγκοσμιοποίησης υπάρχει η πανάκια του ταμείου.

Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η Βρετανική Προεδρία είχε την ευκαιρία να γράψει ιστορία στο Hampton Court. Αντ' αυτού, απέδειξε για άλλη μια φορά ότι πρόκειται για ένωση συμφερόντων σπαταλώντας άσκοπα ώρες και δημόσιο χρήμα για συζητήσεις άνευ ουσίας και της οποίας τα λάθη καλείται, δυστυχώς, να πληρώσει ο Ευρωπαίος πολίτης.

3-148

Michael Henry Nattrass, on behalf of the IND/DEM Group. – Mr President, the Hampton Court meeting was to be the 'social model' summit. Then Mr Blair socialised – the same Mr Blair who strode into Brussels in July promising root and branch reform, but then pruned it down to the most invisible square root of a branch of any EU Presidency in memory.

The comments after Hampton Court were from those amazed that nothing happened. In fact it should be labelled the Hampton Court 'aMaze'. The ARD TV station in Germany said that, after four months, nothing happened – absolutely nothing. The Polish media called it one of the most bizarre EU summits. In Italy, *La Repubblica* just called it 'embarrassed' and 'embarrassing'.

Mr Blair claimed it debated the things the public wanted it to debate, but the public does not want European policies for universities when the EU has no competence in education. Nor does it want things like nine separate missions around the world as part of an EU defence policy.

If Hampton Court proved anything, it was that vacuums are dangerous when filled with hot air from politicians. I propose that a blue metal plaque be placed on the wall at Hampton Court saying: 'On this spot on 27 October 2005 nothing happened' or, as they say in Yorkshire: 'Eee, you must be jokin'".

3-149

Roberta Angelilli, a nome del gruppo UEN. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Ministro Straw, parafrasando le sue parole iniziali, io ci sono e mi permetto di dissentire. Battute a parte, nonostante le apprezzabili buone intenzioni di Blair e di Barroso, il vertice di *Hampton Court* risulta ampiamente insoddisfacente nei suoi risultati pratici.

Innanzitutto, la tanto attesa piattaforma sul modello sociale europeo della Commissione è apparsa piuttosto deludente. Non è stata proposta nessuna vera strategia e nessuna ambizione per un autentico rilancio dell'economia europea, ma piuttosto una politica di riduzione del danno. Dietro a denuncie altisonanti, come la "lisbonizzazione" delle risorse e il fondo per la globalizzazione, a tutt'oggi non vi è nulla di concreto.

Per quanto riguarda il presidente Blair, il bilancio politico non è di certo positivo. Di fatto, nonostante le continue rassicurazioni di facciata, non c'è nessun accordo sulle prospettive finanziarie, che sono ovviamente il nocciolo del problema.

In conclusione, non esiste soprattutto nessuna reale intenzione di ridiscutere l'iniquo assegno inglese. Si tratta di privilegio che viene pagato prevalentemente dall'Italia e dalla Francia, sottraendo preziose risorse ai nostri rispettivi paesi.

3-150

James Hugh Allister (NI). – Mr President, from the spin of today one would think that much had been achieved at Hampton Court, but as we have already heard, the verdict of the informed EU press was almost universally negative. One press agency reported that many papers could not recall a more useless and shallow example of posturing with no outcome. One paper talked of a bizarre show of relaxed leaders who dodged the most crucial issues facing Europe. Another called it a summit of impasse with a facade of forced smiles. The *Financial Times* said in an article that the leaders attempted to answer the question of what impact globalisation would have on the European economy and concluded that we needed more research and development and, of course, more money. In other words, they failed to answer the question. The EU, the *Financial Times* said, is the wrong institutional platform from which to deal with globalisation. It has become too large and divided. The appropriate political levels are national governments and the eurozone. I suggest that the article in the *Financial Times* comes close to the truth. If individual Member States were to expend the same effort and energy addressing the issue of how, as nations, to compete in a global market as they did in preparing showcase summits, then I suspect we might all see much more product.

My biggest fear arising from the failure of the Hampton Court summit and a lacklustre British Presidency is that it will make my government over-eager to secure a face-saving deal on the budget in December and that, as a result, Mr Blair will concede far too much on the British rebate, just so it can be said that something was achieved by the British Presidency – that is to say something other than ensuring EU bankruptcy by opening the door to Turkish accession.

3-151

Timothy Kirkhope (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I am very sorry but I am afraid I have to be a little bit churlish as well. The summit at Hampton Court was what I warned it would be: something of a talking shop – or even a talking palace. And I think that Mr Straw's speech was as Churchill once said 'a pudding without a theme'.

First the Prime Minister downgraded the Hampton Court meeting to one day. He then constructed an agenda that was thin on specifics and avoided all the major and pressing issues facing the EU and finally, amazingly, he decided there would be no communiqué at the end. These are hardly the hallmarks of a Presidency and Prime Minister leading the agenda and shaping our future. I am frankly surprised the Presidency has anything at all to report to us from the summit. At least, however, this Parliament is receiving a report, something which the Prime Minister failed to give the British House of Commons in the aftermath of the event.

The Informal Council was a wasted opportunity. Europe needs direction on economic reform. Instead, the Presidency produced a couple of discussion papers written by academics and even these were not discussed. Europe needs direction on reforming the so-called social model. Again all we had were a few worthy but irrelevant discussion papers. Europe needs direction on being more flexible and responsive. However, the fundamental issue of what to do following the rejection of the Constitution was not even on the table for discussion. Europe also needs direction on its future financing. There are serious issues here, not least the question of the rebate. But the Presidency continues to avoid the matter and the drift continues.

I agree with Mr Barroso that the Presidency must make efforts to reach an outcome at the December Council. We will be looking carefully to see precisely what is contained there and whether Mr Blair ditches his previous commitments, in protecting the British rebate.

Transparency and openness is another issue for the Presidency. Recently I called for meetings of the Council to be held in public when it is operating in a legislative capacity. Mr Blair says he wants progress on this. I challenge the Presidency to implement such a procedure before its term of office ends and I look forward to the Council's answer in this matter at Question Time following this debate.

What about the Court of Auditors' report on the EU accounts? For the eleventh year in succession, the Court has been unable to give a statement of assurance on the accounts. This really must be sorted out by the Presidency. Drift and indecision have been a fundamental characteristic of the British Presidency. Indeed, the Prime Minister of Slovakia

speaking on it said ‘silence reigns, we do not have information’. I must agree with that analysis and, whilst enjoying Mr Straw’s speech today, I cannot see that it takes us anywhere useful at all.

Hampton Court provided no evidence that the Presidency and particularly that the Prime Minister had any strategy. He gave every appearance of drifting from summit to summit unable or unwilling to provide the kind of leadership we British Conservatives called for in June. Let us hope that the last chance saloon at the forthcoming Brussels Summit will demonstrate that my disappointment with the British Presidency is actually misplaced.

3-152

Gary Titley (PSE). – Mr President, recently a terrorist suspect wanted by the British Government was arrested and extradited from Rome in a matter of weeks. This was a direct result of the European arrest warrant; previously it could have taken years. This is just one example of the positive benefits the European Union brings to its citizens.

Each citizen has benefited from the single market by some EUR 6 000 a head in increased output. It is possible, if you wish, to swim in the sea off Blackpool in my region because of European Union laws that have improved the environment. Those are positive benefits for our citizens. We need to do more to shout those positive benefits.

I welcome the papers that were presented at Hampton Court, because they deal with how the European Union can bring added value to our citizens, particularly in the area of the energy markets where we have a crisis waiting to happen. However, we have to ensure that there is follow-up on these matters. One of the difficulties with the Lisbon Agenda in particular is that Member States themselves promise to deliver but do not. I would hope that out of the Hampton Court discussions came a clarification of the role of Member States and the important role of the European Commission in ensuring that Member States carry out that which they have already agreed. If that were to happen, the European Union could move much further forward without necessarily having any of the grand plans that some people have outlined in this debate. Let us stick to delivering what we agreed to deliver. That will be the key success of the European Union.

I congratulate the President-in-Office for the commitment made by this Presidency to Parliament. We are delighted at the extent to which ministers have engaged Parliament and particularly the extent to which the British Home Secretary has ensured that Parliament is involved in taking forward that security agenda. That is one of the most important dimensions of where the European Union is going in future to protect the interests of its citizens.

(Applause)

3-153

Marielle De Sarnez (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, une rencontre pour rien ou pas grand chose, dans un cadre agréable, sous un chaud soleil d’automne, voilà ce que fut le Sommet informel d’*Hampton Court*. Aucun résultat concret, aucune avancée, aucune perspective. Bref, les chefs d’État et de gouvernement n’ont même pas essayé d’esquisser un début de réponse à la crise profonde de l’Europe, comme si, finalement ils s’en accommodaient fort bien. Au lieu de cela, ils ont égrené comme à leur habitude la litanie de propositions mille fois répétées. Oui, bien sûr, il faut accroître l’effort européen en matière de recherche et de développement. Oui, bien sûr, il faut des centres d’excellence universitaire en Europe. Oui, bien sûr, il faut une politique commune de l’énergie. Oui, bien sûr encore, il faut une véritable politique d’immigration. Oui, bien sûr enfin, l’Europe a besoin d’une politique de sécurité.

Mais on en arrive toujours aux mêmes problèmes. Si on veut faire des choses en commun, il faut une volonté politique, il faut des institutions efficaces et démocratiques et il faut un budget commun. Or, force est de constater que, sur ces trois points, rien n’a été entrepris, ni même tenté, par la Présidence britannique. La Présidence britannique n’a pas seulement échoué à remettre l’Union en marche, elle a concouru à son affaiblissement. Désormais, sa responsabilité est clairement engagée.

Monsieur le Ministre, le Sommet de décembre sera celui de la dernière chance pour doter l’Europe d’un budget conséquent et redonner ainsi espoir à tous ceux qui croient en son avenir. Mais, ce sera aussi le dernier moment utile pour le Premier ministre britannique pour qu’il ne reste pas dans l’histoire comme l’homme qui aura contribué à l’échec européen, pour qu’il ne reste pas dans l’histoire comme celui qui aurait délibérément tourné la page de l’Union politique de l’Europe.

3-154

Elisabeth Schroedter (Verts/ALE). – Herr Präsident! Herr Ratspräsident, mit Verlaub, der Gipfel von Hampton Court war die größte Peinlichkeit, die sich eine Präsidentschaft je geleistet hat. Anstatt die dringenden Probleme wie die Finanzielle Vorausschau und die Verfassungsdebatte voranzubringen, wurden diese Punkte von der Tagesordnung gestrichen. Selbst dem gesetzten Thema "Soziales Europa" ist der Gipfel nicht gerecht geworden. Keines der Politikinstrumente für ein soziales Europa ist diskutiert worden, weder Mindeststandards noch Arbeitsgesetzgebung noch die Instrumente zur Beseitigung von Arbeitslosigkeit und sozialer Ausgrenzung.

Ihre Vorschläge, Herr Minister Straw, sind Kleinstaaterei und bringen das soziale Europa nicht voran. Statt Aktionen gab es nur Ideen; statt mit proaktiven Maßnahmen der Globalisierung zu begegnen, haben Sie mit reaktiven Maßnahmen

reagiert, wie z.B. diese Idee des Anti-Schock-Fonds. Ziel darf es aber nicht sein, ein rückwärts gewandtes Europa zu entwickeln, sondern das Ziel muss ein zukunftsfähiges Europa sein.

3-155

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL). – Não basta constatar que há problemas sociais na União Europeia e no mundo. Tal como o meu grupo referiu antes da cimeira informal de final de Outubro, é fundamental analisar as causas e alterar as políticas que estão na origem desta situação.

Mas a verdade é que o que ouvimos aqui não dá garantias dessa disposição para alterar políticas, mesmo quando é notório o crescente descontentamento das populações e se vivem tensões sociais sérias em diversos países, mesmo aqui no coração da União Europeia.

Em vez das propostas que se exigem para dar uma resposta efectiva aos graves problemas sociais, o Conselho insiste na cartilha neoliberal que já todos bem conhecemos. A Estratégia de Lisboa, com as liberalizações e privatizações de serviços públicos nas mais diversas áreas, aliada a uma cada vez maior precarização do trabalho que a famigerada proposta de directiva de criação de um mercado interno dos serviços é um exemplo a que se junta, nalguns casos, o Pacto de Estabilidade para apertar ainda mais o garrote aos trabalhadores e às pequenas e médias empresas.

Sempre em nome da sacrossanta concorrência apostava-se em medidas que visam criar a concorrência entre os trabalhadores para tentar nivelar, cada vez por níveis mais baixos, os salários e outras prestações sociais. Daí a insistência numa maior flexibilidade laboral, na mobilidade e no apoio a reestruturações que reduzem empregos, contribuindo para mais desemprego e maior precariedade laboral.

Como o demonstra o enorme crescimento das taxas de lucros dos grandes grupos económico-financeiros da União Europeia, as políticas actuais visam fundamentalmente dar resposta à Agência da Unice. O que hoje aqui ouvimos vai no mesmo sentido. Mesmo quando se referem à necessidade de criar um ambiente favorável às empresas, sabemos todos que estão a referir-se apenas às grandes empresas.

Aliás, ontem, o Comissário Mandelson tornou-o aqui bem claro nas respostas que deu às preocupações com as consequências da liberalização do comércio internacional em sectores industriais altamente sensíveis para países do Sul, como os têxteis, o vestuário e o calçado, que estão a ser utilizados como moeda de troca para obter ganhos para sectores de alta tecnologia e de serviços nas negociações da OMC. É isto que é preciso inverter.

3-156

Mario Borghezio (IND/DEM). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, si ha l'impressione che i capi di Stato e di governo riuniti a *Hampton Court* abbiano discusso sotto una campana di vetro.

Sui grandi temi sociali, economici e politici, che sono stati evocati in molti interventi precedenti, sono stati raggiunti risultati decisamente scarsi. Mi sembra molto grave che, mentre in mezza Europa le città bruciano, si parli in termini così generici e approssimativi dell'immigrazione e dell'emergenza sociale ed economica, che sono invece la causa di quanto sta avvenendo a Parigi, Strasburgo e Bruxelles.

La sfida che ci lanciano questi ragazzi in rivolta è invece una sfida molto grave e pericolosa, sulla quale dovremmo riflettere seriamente quando parliamo di immigrazione. Non intendo certo puntare il dito contro questi giovani, ma piuttosto contro chi ha elaborato queste politiche sbagliate, contro chi ancora oggi parla di immigrazione in termini così burocratici, generici e superficiali.

Abbiamo perso la sfida dell'immigrazione. Le politiche dell'immigrazione hanno rappresentato un fallimento per l'Europa e ritengo sia nostro dovere prenderne atto e discuterne. Penso che questo *summit* avrebbe dovuto dare indicazioni in tal senso e credo che la soluzione proposta dalla Commissione, ovvero lo stanziamento di una manciata di soldi per le *banlieues* parigine, non sia una risposta adeguata.

E' invece necessario intervenire a monte, cambiare la politica e frenare le scelte dissennate, come i facili ricongiungimenti familiari o i facilissimi riconoscimenti di nazionalità. In sostanza, c'è bisogno di una politica seria in materia di immigrazione.

3-157

Armando Dionisi (PPE-DE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Ministro, signor Presidente Barroso, il confronto aperto dai Primi ministri e dai capi di Stato a *Hampton Court* rappresenta una significativa presa di coscienza delle difficoltà che vive attualmente l'Unione europea. Il clima di ritrovata serenità fra i 25, dopo le tensioni dei mesi scorsi, e la volontà di chiudere il negoziato sulle prospettive finanziarie entro dicembre devono essere valutati in maniera positiva.

Vorrei tuttavia richiamare l'attenzione del Consiglio sul fatto che non si può raggiungere un accordo al ribasso e, soprattutto, che non si può ignorare la posizione del Parlamento. Le priorità individuate da Tony Blair per il rilancio dell'Europa, vale a dire la ricerca, l'innovazione e la formazione permanente, costituiscono proposte da condividere, che sono infatti contenute anche nella nostra relazione sulle prospettive finanziarie.

Inoltre, anche la necessità di una politica energetica europea, l'aumento dell'aiuto comunitario per i paesi di transito degli immigrati e il fondo di compensazione per la globalizzazione costituiscono obiettivi prioritari per l'Europa, che necessitano tuttavia di risorse finanziarie adeguate.

I cittadini dell'Unione sono consapevoli del fatto che ormai nessun governo, da solo, può fornire una risposta ai più gravi problemi attuali, quali la disoccupazione, la precarietà, la perdita di competitività, il terrorismo internazionale e l'immigrazione clandestina. Solo l'Europa può rispondere positivamente e garantire benessere e sicurezza ai nostri paesi. Un bilancio magro non permetterà di raccogliere queste sfide e il Consiglio europeo di ottobre rappresenta una premessa positiva. E' per questo motivo che guardiamo con moderato ottimismo al Vertice di dicembre.

3-158

Bernard Poignant (PSE). – Monsieur le Président, j'ai regardé dans mon dictionnaire de langue française ce que voulait dire informel. Informel, en langue française, signifie mal formé et disgracieux. Cet adjectif était employé par Montaigne en 1580 pour qualifier quelque chose qu'on a du mal à définir. Je vous laisse juge du sommet d'*Hampton Court* et du fantôme de Catherine Howard.

Vous n'avez pas de chance, en tant que Président britannique. La France a dit non et on demande au Royaume-Uni de relancer l'Europe. Je trouve que c'est beaucoup. Cela dit, pendant de nombreuses années, quelques horizons s'offraient à nos concitoyens, avec lesquels ils vivaient et on les faisait vivre, et qui sont la réunification de l'Europe, la Constitution, la Charte des droits, le marché unique et la monnaie unique.

Si je pense à nos concitoyens, je me dis que Lisbonne ne remplit pas cette fonction. Aujourd'hui, c'est le vide. À la limite, je ne conteste pas les priorités du Sommet. Ce n'est pas le problème. Le problème, c'est le lien avec le citoyen. C'est comme s'il y avait quelque chose que l'on partageait qui a un peu disparu. Je pense que le Sommet prochain ou ceux d'après doivent nous permettre de retrouver un horizon à partager avec nos concitoyens. Bien sûr, on pense à la cohésion des 25. On appelle parfois cela le Plan Marshall, pour ceux qui nous rejoignent. Parce que l'élargissement sans fin et l'avarice sur le financement n'échappent pas au regard des citoyens. Ce n'est pas bon du tout. Selon moi, il serait bon de reprendre, malgré tout, le mot "harmonisation" dans l'écriture européenne, en quelque sorte en voie d'extinction, ce qui est également malheureux. D'autant qu'il reste des choses à harmoniser. On ne va pas tout harmoniser mais il est encore possible de progresser dans quelques domaines. Et si on oublie de le faire, si on néglige ce mot et cette valeur, les citoyens s'éloigneront alors.

Enfin, un autre domaine me tient à cœur, celui des échanges entre les jeunes. J'ai consulté les statistiques. En 2005-2006, l'Europe finance 280 000 jeunes dans le cadre des trois programmes: Comenius, Erasmus et Leonardo. Or, ils sont 58 millions. Multiplier le budget correspondant par dix ne nous coûterait pas trop cher, d'autant que c'est avec ces jeunes qu'il faut jouer la conscience européenne.

3-159

Jack Straw, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I would like to deal with two specific points and then comment more widely on the debate. Mrs Riis-Jørgensen asked me about the Court of Auditors and she asked for a yes or no answer. My apologies, but I have to give a yes and a no because this matter is in the hands of finance ministers, and you know what they are like! The answer is that the Ecofin Council on 8 November adopted conclusions listing a range of actions for both the Commission and Member States. They talked about a roadmap which they said was vital, not least because it focuses greater attention on Member States' responsibility to improve their systems of auditing and to take responsibility for the money spent in their countries. My judgement is that where Member States have control of the money, they ought properly to account for it as well. If they do not have control of it then the European Union will have to account for it, but I am with you on encouraging our finance ministers to get a grip on this. Nevertheless, this is the responsibility of the Commission and of this Parliament together. We all have responsibility for this.

On the issue of transparency, which Mr Kirkhope raised with me, we will shortly be circulating an options paper with ideas for improving transparency, and essentially will be putting two options before the Council. It will be up to the Council to take a decision on the basis of a simple majority, as with all procedural issues, so I am glad to be able to satisfy you in this respect, Mr Kirkhope, if not in any others.

Colleagues here have been very frank, so I will be frank in return. My problem with what a number of colleagues have said is that people refer to the need for change and then say that the future for the European Union nevertheless lies in the past. All I can say to colleagues here is that globalisation is a fact of life. The French, my comrade friend, may not like it, but we either have to deal with it or it will engulf all of us. I did not invent it, President Barroso did not invent it and nor indeed did President Chirac, but it is a fact of life. It has come about as a result of other policies that we have pursued over

many years, namely to build up the World Trade Organization, to encourage free trade and to lift countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America out of poverty, meaning that they now want to share in trade and they want to work to their competitive advantage, just as we have done in the past. That means that the old European economic and social model will not work to deliver prosperity, social justice and jobs in the way it used to. This is a big challenge, especially, if I may say so, for the country you represent, and for a number of others on the continent. However, I simply do not understand why you continue to clutch at old methods, such as inflexible methods of labour regulation, including the Working Time Directive, which may have worked in the past but which cannot work for the future.

France is a country which knows that, and it is for that reason there is a higher level of evasion in France than in other countries. France is one of those countries which goes in for saying, as we understand it, that people can be assessed on whether they work 48 hours a contract rather than 48 hours an employer. We do not want to be lectured about our employment practices when we enforce the law, even if it is inconvenient, by countries which bang the drum for enforcement and then go through the back door to ensure that the law is not enforced. This is a fact, and this Parliament undermines confidence in its own measures if it turns a blind eye to what is going on when everyone knows that this has happened.

Moreover, it is better to be flexible. There is no European-wide requirement to set a minimum wage, which in my view is a fundamental human right. There is no requirement on it, however, and it is left to national governments. Some countries have a minimum wage and some do not, so why should there be a *dirigiste* requirement across Europe regardless of national circumstances and the nature of employment contracts, to set limits on working hours when the test for that ought to be health and safety? The countries that apparently have slightly longer hours actually have a better health and safety record than some other countries, including, my friend, your own.

Turning to the important issue of the budget, I listened very carefully to President Barroso's speech. He said that the defining issue of the British Presidency will be the financial perspective, which is a test of whether Europe is on the move. It certainly is a test of whether Europe is on the move, but we do not regard it as the defining issue. If you asked me to bet on what historians will judge to be the defining issue of this Presidency in ten or twenty years' time, I would not bet on it being whether or not we reached agreement on the financial perspective in December, although I hope we do. I think it will be judged on the fact that on 3 October we agreed to start negotiations with Croatia and Turkey. That is what will help to shape Europe for the future. I would remind colleagues that the last financial perspective was not agreed until the equivalent of the March Council 2006, rather than the December Council 2005.

We very much hope that we can reach agreement, but it is going to be difficult. Why? Well, Mr Jonckheer spoke of not allowing this issue to be dominated by national egos. I agree with that but would say to colleagues – and they know this to be true – that this debate is bound to be dominated by the different national perspectives and by whether a country has traditionally been a high contributor or a net recipient of funds from the European Union. That is a fact. If one ignores that or abuses those of us – including Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and a number of other Member States whose citizens have real concerns about the amount they have paid in the past and the amount they will pay in the future – by saying that this is all about national egotism, we will not get anywhere.

I would remind those colleagues from Belgium that their country has been a net recipient, despite the fact that it is a wealthy country, and will continue to be so under any of the exemplifications of the budget between 2006, 2007 and 2013. Luxembourg – a country that I like very much – is the richest country in Europe but will continue to be a net beneficiary. If we were in that happy position we would be saying to the Presidency: 'Come on, do a deal'. If the only issue was whether we ended up with EUR 3 billion or EUR 6 billion in our pockets, that would be easy.

The problem, however, for a number of Member States – and not just the United Kingdom – is that we have historically been very high contributors. I am just saying this so that colleagues can understand the problem we have within the United Kingdom. We might as well lay our cards on the table and be frank. The problem is that over the latest financial perspective the UK has paid EUR 39 billion, France has paid EUR 28 billion, Italy has paid EUR 24 billion and Germany has paid EUR 77 billion, which is another extreme. However, the UK has still paid EUR 39 billion, which in population terms is much more than those other two countries. Spain has benefited by EUR 48 billion and Portugal by EUR 14 billion, so that puts a different perspective on things.

I agree that we have all got to pay our way for enlargement. With any, even the most minimal, change to the financial perspective, or no change at all, the United Kingdom would be paying another EUR 11 billion – getting on for another third more – towards the next financial perspective to pay for enlargement.

The issue is not whether the United Kingdom or the better off countries pay a bit more for enlargement – though some better off countries would not pay anything extra – but of how much more one pays in a context in which the United Kingdom has, over the last 20 years, paid 2.5 times the equivalent of say France or Italy, notwithstanding the fact that our GNIs have been equivalent over that period. That is the problem. We are working through it. We see our responsibility as being to the Union as well as to our publics. No one can accuse my Prime Minister of not being courageous or of not being

very committed to this Union, as we have done a great deal. I just wanted to make that clear so that everyone understands the difficulties we all face.

The last thing point I wish to make, on a more hopeful tack, is that President Barroso spoke very eloquently about the fact that the European Union has to do less in some areas and more in others, and I think that is exactly the right way of looking at things. This is not about a minimalist Europe, because Europe's achievements have been astonishing over the last 60 years when one recalls the condition of conflict which had characterised Europe for three centuries prior to that. When I look around other areas of conflict today, particularly the Middle East, with horror, it reminds me of the Britain that I grew up in as a young child just after the war and of the even worse conditions that existed on the Continent. That is the European Union's achievement. What we have to do for the future, however, is to build on that achievement and recognise that the challenges are a little different.

One of the areas in which we can do the greatest good, and are doing so with the great leadership of Javier Solana and the Commission, is in the field of foreign, defence and security policy. Take what was agreed yesterday by Condoleezza Rice and Javier Solana. Take the fact that the European Union is now the third party in that agreement to allow Palestinians to travel in and out of Gaza and the West Bank. We were not always regarded by the government of Israel as the third party in such matters. Take what we are doing together with respect to Iran, take the joint declaration we have just agreed with Afghanistan and take the tangible increase in aid of Africa. It is here that we can see real progress being made by Europe collectively. It is in this area, as well as in many others, that we need to do more, and at the same time rebalance what the Union does compared to what national, regional and local government does in respect of domestic policy.

This Presidency has been a great privilege for us, Mr President. I have certainly enjoyed it, and I look forward to another six weeks of interesting times here in Strasbourg, Brussels and in other cities.

3-160

Lapo Pistelli (ALDE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che la Presidenza britannica e Tony Blair siano in realtà vittime della grande aspettativa che il Premier britannico aveva sollevato con l'intervento del 2 luglio in questo Parlamento. E' ovvio che quando si creano grandi aspettative, grande è poi anche la delusione.

Il tempo è agli sgoccioli, i risultati scarseggiano e io credo che la Presidenza britannica non si debba stupire del criticismo che il Parlamento sta esprimendo in questo dibattito. In realtà, più che di un Consiglio informale, si è trattato di un Consiglio inconsistente, che nel mese precedente avrebbe dovuto discutere del modello sociale europeo e che si è trovato, invece, ad affrontare una discussione sul mondo a 360 gradi, senza prendere nessuna decisione.

Non mi brucerò in piazza per questa Costituzione, ma credo che emerge con grande forza un limite delle Presidenze semestrali. Infatti, ogni Presidenza eredita l'agenda della Presidenza precedente e aggiunge un nuovo strato di impegni, facendo aumentare l'indice delle decisioni da prendere e diminuire il capitolo delle decisioni adottate. Noi continuiamo ad aggiungere ingredienti alla torta, ma la torta non esce mai dal forno.

Vorrei citare un esempio che ho fatto ieri sera al Presidente Barroso. E' vero che in passato l'Europa ha vissuto altre crisi profonde. Io non sono un nostalgico dell'Europa a sei, né credo ci sia un'età d'oro alla quale guardare. Tuttavia, quando si è lasciati dalla fidanzata a diciotto anni, la vita sembra molto dura ma si è consapevoli del fatto che le cose andranno comunque avanti, mentre quando finisce un matrimonio a quarantacinque anni, con cinque figli e il mutuo della casa da pagare, tutto è più complicato. Mi sembra che l'Europa, in questa fase che segue l'allargamento e precede la Costituzione, si trovi in una situazione molto più simile al secondo caso che non al primo.

Io non temo la crisi istituzionale, le prospettive finanziarie o la strategia di Lisbona di per sé, ma ho paura che tutti questi elementi nel loro insieme stiano arrecando un grave danno all'Unione europea.

La presidenza britannica dispone ancora di sei settimane per portare a termine il suo lavoro e spero che sia in grado di dare un messaggio positivo all'Europa di domani.

3-161

PRÉSIDENCE DE M. MOSCOVICI
Vice-président

3-162

Ian Hudghton (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, normally I would complain that one minute is not enough to sum up a presidency in its latter stages, but not in this instance. UK Presidency: no progress.

It is interesting that Mr Straw commented on the sparse attendance here and made an extremely limp attempt to be humorous about it. The fact is that most of my colleagues had better things to do than to listen to him give the same speech today that Tony Blair gave at the start of the Presidency and then repeated with minor variations just a couple of weeks ago.

I had hoped, had Mr Straw still been here, to ask him the same question that Mr Alexander failed to answer when I put it to him directly a couple of weeks ago, but I will ask it again. Will the UK Presidency give an assurance that the interests of Scotland's fishing communities will not be traded away in the interests of something more important to Whitehall in the mess of horse-trading it has stored up for itself for the December Council, and for the subsequent Fisheries Council, which will be almost the last act of the Presidency?

3-163

Jana Bobošíková (NI). – Dámy a pánové, zásadně odmítám odpovídat na výzvy globalizace zřízením tzv. globalizačního fondu. Je jen odsouváním problému a populismem politiků, kteří se bojí říci občanům pravdu, tedy že globalizace zde je, byla a také bude a že nevede jen ke ztrátám pracovních míst, ale také, a to zejména, ke vzniku nových pracovních příležitostí. Hlavně se z ní dá těžit, ale jen ve svobodném tržním prostředí, které je pružné a kde se vyplatí pracovat. Evropská politika je často v rozporu s touto realitou, vybízí občany k pasivitě a někdy odměňuje i lenost. Už 10 let klesá podíl Evropské unie na světovém obchodě a podíl Spojených států a zejména Číny a Indie prudce rostou. Tak oceňuje unijní politiku volný trh a leadeři pětadvacítky reagují opět přerozdělováním, které je možná náplastí na přítomnost, ale v žádném případě není lékem pro budoucnost. Jsem přesvědčená, že namísto hádek o protekcionistický globalizační fond by měly země Unie urychleně reformovat své pracovní trhy. Odkládání těchto reforem totiž podkopává podporu veřejnosti pro politiku volného trhu a je živnou půdou pro růst nacionalismu, xenofobie a rasizmu.

3-164

Margie Sudre (PPE-DE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président en exercice du Conseil, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, mes chers collègues, l'Union européenne fait face à une crise d'identité, à une perte de ses valeurs, à un désenchantement général. Pour la première fois depuis longtemps, les Européens craignent que leurs enfants vivent moins bien qu'eux. Comment pouvons-nous réagir et apporter des éléments de réponse face à ces graves préoccupations?

Le Sommet de *Hampton Court* se voulait une étape dans cette réflexion. Je crains qu'il n'en soit ressorti que peu de résultats concrets car, si les questions posées étaient fondées, à savoir: "existe-t-il un ou des modèles européens dans un monde globalisé", les éléments de réponse apportés à cette question manquaient pour le moins de lisibilité.

L'Europe est plongée dans une crise car elle ne sait pas ce qu'elle veut. Elle est partagée, certains ayant pour seul objectif d'en faire une zone commerciale, sans barrières tarifaires, bref une Europe courant derrière le train de la mondialisation avec une Union qui s'élargirait sans fin. D'autres ont une vision différente, une ambition politique selon laquelle l'Union doit être définie par ses frontières et par son projet afin de s'affirmer et de faire partager ses valeurs humanistes dans un monde déstabilisé.

Les députés européens UMP, ainsi que la grande majorité des membres du groupe PPE-DE, ont clairement choisi de se battre pour que la deuxième vision l'emporte, conscients du défi qu'il nous faut relever.

Les propositions de la France, divulguées à travers toute l'Union par le Président Chirac à la veille du Sommet, ont le mérite de mettre l'accent à la fois sur la nécessité d'achever le marché intérieur, de promouvoir la solidarité entre les États et d'assurer l'émergence d'une Europe des grands projets.

Mais pour envisager une relance européenne, le Conseil européen doit au préalable lever un obstacle fondamental. Car à partir du moment où, à l'issue des négociations entreprises par la Présidence luxembourgeoise, la presque totalité des États membres sont parvenus à un avis convergent sur les perspectives financières 2007–2013, ceux-ci doivent impérativement trouver un accord d'ici la fin de cette année. Tout autre débat se résumerait à de pures conjectures.

(Applaudissements)

3-165

Christopher Beazley (PPE-DE). – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais intervenir pour une motion d'ordre, conformément à l'article 65, point c, si mes souvenirs sont corrects. On vient d'entendre le ministre britannique des affaires étrangères. Je pose, par l'intermédiaire de votre présidence, la question suivante à la Conférence des présidents. Un collègue vient de prendre la parole pour une minute. Le ministre de Sa Majesté britannique chargé des affaires européennes est avec nous. Comment le Parlement européen peut-il se voir limiter le temps de parole à une minute pour réagir? Peut-être pourriez-vous en parler avec vos collègues de la Conférence des présidents, pour décider de l'approche à adopter à l'avenir?

3-166

Le Président. – Merci Monsieur Beazley, je crois qu'on a compris votre argument. Ce sont les groupes politiques qui répartissent les temps de parole. S'ils ont envie de laisser dix minutes, un quart d'heure à leurs orateurs principaux, c'est leur droit, dans le cas contraire aussi. Les temps de la Commission et du Conseil ne sont, eux, pas comptés. Mais les uns et les autres ont à cœur de veiller à ne pas en abuser, je l'ai remarqué.

3-167

Nicola Zingaretti (PSE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Ministro, io sono tra coloro che hanno apprezzato e apprezzano lo sforzo fatto invece da questa Presidenza per tentare di rilanciare l'Europa, con le sue speranze e le sue sfide, in un momento drammatico.

Questo è avvenuto con atti e impegni anche concreti. Mi riferisco alla positiva soluzione della vicenda della Turchia, che non sarebbe stata possibile senza un forte impegno della Presidenza britannica, e alla capacità di indicare una via, una prospettiva e degli obiettivi chiari che si sono poi concretizzati, almeno nelle vocazioni, a *Hampton Court*, vale a dire l'università, l'energia, la sicurezza e la politica di difesa.

Mi permetta tuttavia di dire che, proprio guardando a quelle grandi ambizioni e ai pochi risultati concreti, mi convinco sempre di più - e invito anche tutti voi a riflettere su questo punto - del fatto che esiste un'enorme contraddizione tra le vocazioni di quell'Europa e l'illusione che quei risultati possano essere raggiunti con un'Europa che possiede meno risorse di quelle necessarie e che soprattutto non è disposta a modificare sue regole.

Intendo dire che se vogliamo raggiungere anche solo la metà di quegli obiettivi e vogliamo essere leali tra di noi, occorre andare a fondo sui nodi della crisi. Questi nodi implicano più risorse, che devono essere utilizzate in modo migliore, meno Europa intergovernativa e più Europa dell'integrazione, più Europa politica, ovvero regole nuove per la Commissione, proprio per raggiungere gli obiettivi che ci siamo prefissi.

La definizione di una nuova architettura istituzionale e la sempre maggiore condivisione di politiche rappresentano ormai una via obbligata per il futuro. Il mantenimento dello *status quo*, che rappresenta forse il maggiore risultato ottenuto dal semestre britannico, porterà inevitabilmente a una rinazionalizzazione delle politiche, aggravando la crisi, aumentando il potere di voto dei governi e l'incapacità decisionale dei vertici.

Spero quindi che questo semestre riesca a convincere anche i più scettici del fatto che non basta avere buone idee e buona volontà, ma che occorre prendere atto del fatto che o si ha il coraggio di cambiare, facendo un salto in avanti sulla via dell'integrazione, oppure si muore.

3-168

Chris Davies (ALDE). – Mr President, I would be fascinated to know at what stage the British Presidency realised that to have adopted as its logo a flight of birds heading towards Europe was a mistake!

If the British Presidency does not secure a deal on the future budget perspectives, it will not be regarded as a success.

I agree that movement has to be made on the issue of agriculture. While the British Presidency has to recognise that, at some point, it is going to have to compromise, it is also important for other Member States to realise that they must give too. At some point the French – above all, it seems – must give something to enable those seeking a deal to be able to point to future changes and reviews of the agricultural policy, not just to help the UK out of a difficult situation but to help the world secure an agreement on the Doha Development Round.

3-169

Othmar Karas (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Herr Ratspräsident, ich hoffe, Sie spüren, dass die Ungeduld mit ihrer Präsidentschaft steigt und die Enttäuschungen wachsen. Ihre Zeit ist zwar noch nicht abgelaufen, aber der größere Teil ist bereits vorbei. Wir vermissen nicht nur Tony Blair, aber ich frage mich, ob er vielleicht endlich erkannt hat, dass zwei gute Reden noch keine erfolgreiche Ratspräsidentschaft bewirken. Wir vermissen aber vor allem konkrete Ergebnisse, konstruktive Vorschläge und ernsthafte Verhandlungen mit dem Europäischen Parlament zur Lösung der Probleme und zur Erarbeitung der Antworten auf die Fragen der Menschen.

Vertrauen schaffen wir nur mit einem neuen Miteinander und nachhaltigen Lösungen. Vielleicht hat sich Ihr Außenminister gerade ein bisschen verraten, als er nämlich nicht den Blick nach vorne gerichtet, sondern gesagt hat: „Die Bedeutung der Präsidentschaft liegt schon hinter uns, nämlich Kroatien und die Türkei.“ Ich frage Sie: Sind das wirklich die Prioritäten der Bürger Europas? Sind das wirklich die Fragen, die die Menschen, die keine Arbeit haben, Europa, das wettbewerbsfähiger werden muss, haben? Ich sage Nein. Vielleicht haben sie die falschen Prioritäten. Mit Absichtserklärungen alleine machen wir keine erfolgreiche Präsidentschaft. Alle sechs Punkte von Hampton Court, Herr Ratspräsident, sind zwar politisch richtig, aber sie sind großteils nicht die Kompetenz der Europäischen Union. Wenn Sie wollen, dass wir das erreichen, was Sie selbst postulieren, dann geben Sie uns die Kompetenzen, geben Sie uns das Geld, verhindern Sie nicht Europa auf dem Weg zur politischen Union. Verhindern Sie nicht die gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik.

Zur Finanziellen Vorausschau: Zwischen Ihrem Vorschlag und unserem liegen 70 Milliarden Euro. Zwischen Ihrem Vorschlag und dem Vertrag liegen 2 Milliarden Euro. Zwischen Ihrem Vorschlag und dem der Kommission liegen über 100 Milliarden Euro. Sagen den Menschen, was Sie Ihnen wegnehmen wollen, bevor Sie so tun, als wären Sie auf der Seite der Bürger....

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

3-170

Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (PSE). – Tisztelt Elnök Úr! A Hampton Court-i csúcsstalálkozó megmutatta, hogy az Európai Uniónak alapjaiban kell megújulnia. Az Uniónak egyszerre van szüksége a kutatás-fejlesztés harmonizálására, az oktatásra fordított összegek jelentős növelésére, a szolgáltatások liberalizálására és a közös európai energetikapolitikára. A diagnózis megvan, de a válaszokkal adósak Európa vezetői.

Azt tudjuk, hogy mit kellene tenni, de azt nem, hogyan lehet ezeket a célokat elérni. Nincsenek meg ehhez a megfelelő források sem. Több Európát nem lehet kevesebb pénzből megcsinálni. Továbbra sincs megegyezés a 2007–2013-as pénzügyi perspektíváról, ami számunkra, új tagállamok számára tragikus lehet, hiszen lehetséges pénzügyi támogatásunknak a kétharmadát veszíthetjük el. Számunkra ezért igen nagy a jelentősége a pénzügyi irányelteknek.

Azt is nagyon fontosnak tartom, amikor Tony Blair megtámadta a közös agrárpolitikát, hogy nem úgy kell nekünk előrehaladni, hogy az eddigi közösségi politikákat leromboljuk, hiszen a kohéziós politika és a közös agrárpolitika az Unió óriási vívmányai. Ezeket nem lerombolni kell, hanem más területeken kell több közösségi politikát megvalósítani. A nagy kérdés az, hogyan lehet mindezt megtenni.

Gyurcsány Ferenc magyar miniszterelnök azt javasolta, hogy a közösségi politikák mellett hozzunk létre koordinált együttműködést, amely azt jelentené, hogy a különböző területeken a nemzeti politikákat összehangolnánk. Ez nem jelentene új közösségi politikákat, de segítené akár az energia terén, akár a kutatás-fejlesztésben a jobb együttműködést. Kérem Barroso urat, kérem a Bizottságot, hogy segítsük, hogy Európa kigyógyuljon a jelenlegi válságából, lépjünk előre a koordinált együttműködés terén is.

3-171

Bogusław Sonik (PPE-DE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Brytyjczycy słyną ze stalowych nerwów, dystansu, spokoju, swoistego poczucia humoru, a także z wielkiej powściągliwości w wyrażaniu swoich emocji. Dlatego też z wielkim zaskoczeniem przyjąłem wczoraj oświadczenie ministra Lorda Bacha, że jeżeli rozporządzenie REACH nie zostanie kompromisowo przyjęte w tym roku, to uzna to za klęskę Prezydencji Brytyjskiej i swoją.

Chciałbym dzisiaj zapytać Panie Ministrze, czy usłyszę te same słowa z Państkich ust? Czy brak perspektywy budżetowej na lata 2007-2013 przyjętej w tym roku uzna to za klęskę osobistą Pana oraz pana premiera Blaira?

Tony Blair wygłosił świetne przemówienie w czerwcu w Brukseli. Analiza kryzysu Europy godna lektury. Niestety kolejne miesiące, kolejne wystąpienia ministrów to tylko za każdym razem gorsze powielanie tez premiera Anglia. Mam wrażenie, że straciliście Panowie Brytyjczycy wolę walki o wprowadzenie Waszej wizji Unii Europejskiej. Postanowiliście się prześlizgnąć przez te sześć miesięcy Prezydencji. Niestety udzielił się Wam również pewien gen niemocy i paraliżu europejskiego.

Chociaż trzeba przyznać, że minister Straw przyciągnięty pytaniami i wystąpieniami na tej sali wreszcie zaczął mówić normalnym głosem, tak jak powinni mówić politycy, o interesach. Europę można budować skutecznym działaniem, decyzjami, które zapiszą się na zawsze wielkimi trzcionkami w historii naszego kontynentu. Odkładanie debaty nad perspektywą budżetową na ostatnią chwilę, przygotowywanie jej założeń w ukryciu, zastępowanie twardej debaty o interesach nowomową o problemach cywilizacyjnych świata jest stratą czasu, albo świadomą grą, by ten gorący ziemniak, jakim jest budżet przerzucić w grudniu do Wiednia.

Dzisiaj najważniejsza jest perspektywa budżetowa. Szacuje się, że jeśli perspektywa ta nie zostanie przyjęta, nowe Państwa Członkowskie otrzymają w roku 2007 na swój rozwój 10 miliardów euro. W przypadku przyjęcia perspektywy suma ta wyniosłaby około 22 miliardów plus 3,5 miliarda na Rumunię i Bułgarię. Państwa te stracą więc około 60% możliwych środków. Proszę o poważne potraktowanie perspektywy budżetowej i rozpoczęcie działań, żeby skutecznie doprowadzić do jej przyjęcia w grudniu.

3-172

Líbor Rouček (PSE). – Dámy a pánové, dnes zde diskutujeme výsledky neformální schůzky Evropské rady v Hampton Courtu, nediskutujeme zde výsledky šestiměsíčního britského předsednictví. Pokud jde o Hampton Court, já jsem s výsledky spokojen a výsledky vítám. Schůzka jasně identifikovala šest oblastí, které jsou důležité pro přežití a úspěch Evropy v globalizovaném světě. Je to věda a výzkum, jsou to investice do našich univerzit, energetická politika, globální bezpečnost, společná zahraniční bezpečnostní politika.

Podíváme-li se například na situaci v energiích, Evropa je stále více a více závislá na jednom zdroji, dnes již z 65 %, a ten zdroj je v oblastech, které jsou velmi nestabilní, at' je to již posovětský prostor nebo Blízký a Střední Východ. K tomu důvodu potřebujeme společnou energetickou politiku, společnou zahraniční a bezpečnostní politiku, ale především také potřebujeme k financování těchto společných politik peníze. Zde bych se obrátil na britské předsednictví, aby udělalo co nejvíce nejenom pro nové členské země, ale i pro staré a aby v prosinci na této vrcholné schůzce opravdu došlo k poctivé a

vyvážené dohodě. To bude ten největší úspěch britského předsednictví, o kterém budeme diskutovat 20. prosince. Já věřím, že výsledek bude pozitivní.

3-173

Geoffrey Van Orden (PPE-DE). – Mr President, Mr Straw proudly told us that we have had 48 ministerial speeches during the British Presidency but I have to say that we have very little to show for any of them. I am amazed that with just a month to go before it comes to an end, the UK Presidency is still talking about agendas, strategies and timetables. I speak for those many people of East Anglia who want to see action, security, prosperity and a real change of direction in the EU, rather than empty promises.

Citizens of many countries have woken up to what has been happening in their name. They seriously question the nature and direction of the EU project. People want more local control over their own lives, but our governments continue to cede powers to regions and to Brussels. I ask you: what sort of relationship with what sort of Europe is right for our people and our nations in this first half of the 21st century?

That vital question is never asked by our government or by the EU institutions. It should perhaps have been the central question at Hampton Court. The fact is that at Hampton Court there was no fundamental reappraisal of the European Union. It just carries on regardless. There is no end to unhelpful legislation. Mr Straw mentioned the working time directive and the temporary workers directive. There are dozens more such irrelevant and interfering items of EU legislation on the stocks. What is being done about all this?

The budget was mentioned. Pretty fundamental, but still unresolved. In comparison with a similar sized economy such as France, the United Kingdom already contributes disproportionately to the EU budget and that is after Margaret Thatcher's rebate. Apparently you want us to pay more. Meanwhile our nations and societies are being dangerously fractured as a consequence of catastrophic asylum and immigration policies. Instead of creating and sustaining world class centres of academic excellence, we are destroying them through lack of funding and misconceived class-driven doctrines. Our armed forces are desperately over-stretched and lack key items of equipment. At the same time gallant officers and soldiers are hung out to dry by a government-inspired system that cares little for their wellbeing but everything for its own political agenda...

(The President cut off the speaker)

3-174

Ana Maria Gomes (PSE). – Mr President, the Hampton Court Summit was to discuss how Europe could do better in the world. People in Ethiopia voted in their masses in May under EU eyes, but the first results did not please the ruling party. Suddenly, the observers were obstructed, media openness was suppressed and demonstrations were banned. People were brutally repressed in June: over 40 were killed and 5 000 arrested.

Despite that, a few weeks later, Prime Minister Meles attended the Gleneagles Summit hosted by the British Presidency. In September, several governments and the President of the Commission sent him messages of congratulation. On 1 November, another bloodbath took place: 58 elected leaders, journalists and NGO members are in jail and, according to the Prime Minister, face the death penalty; dozens more were killed, hundreds wounded and thousands were arrested. Yet, a few days later Mr Meles was officially wined and dined in Germany.

President-in-Office, why does the Council send contradictory signals instilling a sense of impunity in rulers who violate human rights and democratic principles, rulers who may then choose to go to war with neighbours to divert attention? Did you consider this at Hampton Court? Can the President-in-Office say that Europe is doing enough and doing its best for human rights, democracy and development in Ethiopia, the second most populous country in Africa?

3-175

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, it is an honour to conclude this debate today on the discussions that took place at Hampton Court. It is a particular pleasure for me to be speaking alongside President Barroso.

The debate following the departure of Foreign Secretary Jack Straw was taken forward by Mr Pistelli, who spoke of the European Union being like a family. Clearly, on the basis of our brief discussion this afternoon, it is a family within which, like any other family, there can be disagreements from time to time. But I certainly concur with his view that there are challenges that we face in the weeks ahead.

A rather less lofty point was then made by Mr Hudghton. As a fellow Scottish representative, a Member of Parliament representing a Scottish seat, I would happily spend all day debating with him why backward-looking nineteenth century nationalism offers no future to any part of Scotland, nor to any group within Scotland. But I, unlike him, am aware that I speak today for the Presidency of the European Union rather than simply rehearsing domestic political disputes between our parties.

Mrs Bobošíková spoke of the opportunities provided by globalisation. With that I certainly concur; that was a central focus of much of the constructive and useful discussion that took place at Hampton Court.

Mrs Sudre emphasised the need for agreement on future financing by the end of December. As the Foreign Secretary made clear, we are working towards that aim. Indeed, a number of other speakers addressed this continuing issue of the importance of reaching agreement. I will say a word about that in a moment.

Mr Zingaretti generously acknowledged the importance of Turkish accession. For that I am grateful. It reflects the distinctive approach taken by Jack Straw as the Foreign Secretary, whereby – somewhat similar to future financing – questions were raised as to the strategy the Presidency was adopting. I am glad to say that on the occasion of 3 October we secured the outcome for which so many of us had worked for so long: seeing the accession talks beginning both with Turkey and Croatia. I hope that we achieve a similar outcome in relation to future financing.

Mr Davies, who has now left the Chamber, again emphasised the importance of future financing. On the basis of the British motivation and indeed the British capacity to deliver the deal, what matters is not the will of one country – of the Presidency – but the willingness of all Member States to work together to find a consensus. If what mattered was simply the motivation of the Presidency, we would have seen agreement reached in June rather a situation in which five Member States were unable to accept the Luxembourg proposals.

Mr Karas questioned the importance of enlargement in the face of enduring significant competitive challenges that we face, such as unemployment. Surely the very point that he makes about enduring unemployment and the need for us to address those challenges, makes the case for Hampton Court. It is necessary for Europe to have a clearer sense as to its future direction before we would be able to try and secure the consensus we want on the basis of the financing of the European Union.

Mr Tabajdi offered a qualified welcome to particular aspects of the work programme that was agreed at Hampton Court and Mr Sonik quoted to me the earlier remarks of my ministerial colleague, Lord Bach. I am sorry to disappoint him: as regards future financing, there can be no guarantees that agreement can be reached. What I can guarantee is that the British Presidency is earnest in our endeavours to try and reach that agreement, but critical days and critical discussions lie ahead. It is important for all the relevant parties to recognise how significant the progress reached since June – where disunity rather than unity was the hallmark of the conclusion of the discussions – will need to be.

Mr Rouček said that he was content with the outcome of Hampton Court and argued for an honest, fair and well-balanced deal on future financing. With that I would have no disagreement. I disagree with many of the points that were raised by Mr Van Orden, who has now left the Chamber. He ranged very widely indeed while claiming to speak for the people of East Anglia, before having his microphone switched off. Suffice it to say that he did not have the chance during his speech to acknowledge the invaluable work that had been undertaken by the Commission in the course of the British Presidency on exactly that issue of better regulation. Today I pay tribute to the personal commitment of President Barroso and indeed to Commissioner Verheugen in driving forward this agenda during the British Presidency.

Mrs Gomes raised important challenging points in relation to human rights, democracy and development within Africa. Again, I would simply return to the progress that was made by European Union development ministers back in June, when we effectively agreed to double the level of overseas direct assistance provided by Member States from approximately USD 40 billion to USD 80 billion. I would re-emphasise the commitment reached at Gleneagles between 6 and 8 July effectively to double the aid being provided to Africa. I would reflect again on the very constructive and unified approach taken by European Union Member States at the Millennium Review Summit which took place in September of this year.

I should like to echo a point made earlier by Mr Davies, that those of us who are sincere and genuine in our commitment to help the developing world recognise that there is a continuing challenge that lies ahead of us in the remaining weeks of the British Presidency, which is to try and have an ambitious and balanced outcome to the Hong Kong ministerial meeting that will take place in December. I can assure Members that this remains a continuing priority of the British Presidency.

3-176

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – Mr President, to sum up, there will be a defining issue for the British Presidency: to get an agreement on the financial perspectives. I think that message was very clearly transmitted to the British Presidency today.

I understand what the Foreign Secretary Jack Straw said before he left about other issues that were very important and that will have strategic consequences. Precisely because of that, it is important to get an agreement on the financial perspectives, because this will be the first test for the enlarged Europe.

Let us be frank. There are some people who believe that with 25 Member States we cannot work and we cannot deliver. There are some people who believe that a greater Europe will be a weaker Europe. I know that is not the idea of the British

Presidency, I know that is not the idea of the Commission. We believe in this greater Europe we are now building. We believe it is a great achievement that we now have 25 free, democratic Member States – as we have. However, we cannot do enlargement on the cheap. We need resources for this new Europe that we are helping to consolidate. That is why it is crucially important to have an agreement on the financial perspectives, because if not, if we do not have that instrument for what people are asking of the European institutions, there will be, and I really believe this, a crisis of confidence that will be reinforced in Europe. And this not only applies to the current situation in Europe, but also to the future of Europe, future accessions to Europe, to our capability to build a Europe. However, for a greater Europe we need greater politics. *Pour une grande Europe, il nous faut une grande politique.*

And that is the point. Are we ready? Are we able to do it? Can we deliver? That is why I urge the British Presidency to do everything in its power – and I well know the energy and commitment of your Prime Minister and indeed of all your officials – to get an agreement.

Of course everyone has to move: it is not only the responsibility of the British Presidency. Of course it is not. But I really believe the key to the problem, or it would be better to say the key to the solution, is in your hands. You can achieve that agreement, at least among Member States. We came very close in the last formal European Council: we can do it. It is crucially important and it is my duty and my responsibility, as President of the European Commission – which has to represent the general European interest – to call on the responsibility of all leaders in Europe to make the best efforts to achieve that compromise.

Let me tell you very frankly, President-in-Office, from my contacts with all the Member States – which, because of my responsibility, I have to keep on a daily basis, especially with the new Member States – I know they look to you and to the role of your Presidency with this expectation. In fact, everything that we have done so far has been, from my point of view, a great contribution for Europe. As I said in my previous statement, I think that the Hampton Court Summit was a good summit, it made a good contribution to that new, emerging consensus about a stronger, more modern Europe. However, the test in the minds of the new Member States, the test for a major proportion of the European public centres around whether we can really show that we are on the move on those concrete questions. That is the great challenge. So let us do our best, let us ask all the Heads of State and Government to be ready to compromise; let us ask the British Presidency to do its very best. I believe it is possible. It is difficult but it is possible, and the real test for our leadership is to make possible that which is necessary and I believe we can do it.

(Applause)

3-177

Le Président. – Le débat est clos.

3-178

11 - Récentes déclarations de M. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Président de l'Iran

3-179

Le Président. – L'ordre du jour appelle les déclarations du Conseil et de la Commission sur les récentes déclarations de M. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Président de l'Iran.

3-180

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I am delighted to be able to address the Parliament in this important and timely debate on Iran and I am delighted to be speaking alongside my good friend Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner in this important discussion. During the last debate on this subject in this House on 12 October I used those same words in indicating that discussion on Iran was timely. I now feel that this debate is perhaps even more timely than the debate on 12 October because international concern about Iran's policies remains high and I believe that Iran is facing crucial choices about its future. It is right, therefore, that the European Union should be active in shaping that debate.

Iran's decisions about its relations with neighbouring countries can affect the security and prosperity of peoples well beyond the region of the Middle East. It is important for the security of the region and beyond that Iran now makes wise choices.

As all Members of this House will know, Iran elected a new President in June of this year. I believe that the international community, and particularly the European Union, must maintain its dialogue with Iran's new government. We have a responsibility to encourage those who now hold power to make choices that are in the best interests of that country and the region as a whole. As I said the last time I had the privilege of addressing this Parliament, Iran is a land of genuinely vast potential. It has a young, educated and entrepreneurial population. It has immense natural resources, in particular oil and minerals. I suggested that the combination of these factors should make for a vibrant economy and society in any country if its government can create a culture of opportunity based on the rule of law. Today, more than ever, there is a real need to encourage the growth of such a culture within Iran.

I know that many honourable Members of this House were, as I was, outraged by the recent remarks made by the President of Iran about Israel. These are deeply troubling statements. Moreover, they have been made against the background of mounting concerns about Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile programmes, its human rights record and its commitment to countering terrorism.

Let me turn first to those specific comments. As you know, on 26 October, President Ahmadinejad addressed a conference in Tehran on the subject of a world without Zionism. In his speech he is reported to have called for Israel to be wiped from the map and said 'the Islamic world will not let its historic enemy live within its heartland'. The European Union led the international response which was swift and, I am glad to say, unequivocal.

The Presidency statement issued on behalf of the European Union Heads of Government meeting at Hampton Court on 27 October strongly condemned President Ahmadinejad's remarks. Josep Borrell said on behalf of this esteemed body that you were 'deeply shocked, sickened and revolted by this statement'. He spoke of total condemnation by the leaders of your political groups. I know that Hans-Gert Poettering, who will be speaking in a moment, also expressed his concern at these comments at that time.

Today in this debate we are being called upon to discuss these remarks and their implications. Calls for violence and the destruction of any state are manifestly inconsistent with any claim to be a mature and responsible member of the international community. The Presidency summoned Iran's chargé d'affaires in London to protest at these remarks, and many governments across our Union of 25 nations did likewise in their national capacity. I welcome the swift response from the wider international community, including from governments within the Middle East region itself. Saeb Erekat put it eloquently on behalf of the Palestinian authority when he said he hoped President Ahmadinejad will focus on adding Palestine to the map rather than calling for Israel to be wiped from the map.

Kofi Annan, the United Nations Secretary-General, spoke for the world when he stated that Israel is a long-standing member of the United Nations, with the same rights and obligations as any other. Under the United Nations Charter, Iran, like other members of the organisation, has undertaken to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. I hope that President Ahmadinejad will recognise the damage that these remarks have caused to its standing in the international community and withdraw them unconditionally. His remarks are a further reminder of the imperative for Iran to take steps to address international concerns about its intentions in relation to the nuclear programme.

Iran's nuclear ambitions were discussed by European Union foreign ministers when we met in Brussels on 7 November. At that meeting the Council reiterated its grave concern at Iran's resumption of activities at the uranium conversion facility at Isfahan and urged Iran to implement all the measures requested by the International Atomic Energy Agency Board. These include a reinstatement of the full suspension of all fuel cycle activities.

The European Union's preferred approach remains the resumption of negotiations within the framework agreed in Paris last November. The European Union has urged Iran to take the steps necessary to make this possible. A satisfactory resolution of the issue of Iran's nuclear ambitions is of fundamental importance to the international community. A nuclear-armed Iran would add greatly to instability in the region and it could do irreparable damage to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the rest of the international non-proliferation system.

Turning to the field of human rights, we continue to be deeply concerned by the serious and continuing violations by Iran. We continue to hear reports of juvenile offenders being sentenced to death. Iran continues to restrict freedom of expression and to imprison political prisoners, such as the investigative journalist, Akbar Ganji. Iran continues to persecute religious minorities, including the Baha'i Community.

I know from our last debate on this issue that this is a matter of ongoing and profound concern to many Members of this Parliament. We therefore urge Iran to strengthen respect for human rights and the rule of law. It is disappointing that the EU-Iran human rights dialogue has not been held since June 2004, despite repeated attempts – I can assure you – on the European Union's part to agree dates for the next round. It is important that Iran take steps to resume substantive discussions under the dialogue.

I welcome the resolution on human rights that Canada tabled last week at the United Nations General Assembly. European Union Member States have agreed to co-sponsor it. Iran must demonstrate by its actions that it is willing to improve respect for human rights. Iran can begin to do this by fulfilling its obligations and earlier commitments in relation to juvenile executions and by permanently releasing prisoners of conscience. I hope that Iran's government does this without delay.

Turning now to terrorism, the Council remains concerned by Iran's approach to terrorism. The fact that President Ahmadinejad's comments were made on the same day as the horrific attack at Hadera in Israel, for which Palestinian Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility, should reinforce for us all the lesson that incitement to violence and the terrorism that

it breeds are despicable and unacceptable acts. The European Union has encouraged Iran to join, without reservation, the international consensus on the necessary existence of two states – Palestine and Israel – living peacefully side by side within recognised borders. The European Union stresses that support for Palestinian terrorist groups is unacceptable. All states have a responsibility to work together to combat the threat of international terrorism.

I believe that this is genuinely a crucial time for Iran and for its government. The recent remarks by President Ahmadinejad have focused attention upon Iran and its position in the world. It is imperative that this attention be channelled constructively into effective influence on Iran to address its policies on the nuclear issue, terrorism, human rights and regional and other questions, including the Middle East peace process.

The international community can have most influence when it is united. I believe our united response to President Ahmadinejad's remarks about Israel has been successful in putting Iranian policy on this issue directly under the spotlight. As foreign ministers of the European Union said on 7 November, the evolution of the long-term relationship between Iran and Europe must depend on action by Iran to address effectively all the European Union's areas of concern. It is up to Iran to determine through its actions whether its long-term relationship with the European Union will improve or deteriorate.

3-181

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, even though I am repeating something that has already been said, I would like to do so because I think the matter is so serious that it is necessary to do so. There was indeed a very broad and very speedy reaction from all the different European institutions. President Barroso reacted immediately on behalf of the European Commission by issuing a very firm condemnation in the clearest possible terms. We know that the President of the European Parliament has also condemned this statement very forcefully and, as Mr Alexander has already said, the European Council also issued a very strong declaration from Hampton Court.

I also reiterated in public that Mr Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's statement on Israel was shocking and completely unacceptable. It has also rightly been condemned in the strongest terms across the international community. I would also like to thank the Presidency for having associated our heads of delegations in statements made by the Presidency, together with the Commission, especially in the Arab countries. The Foreign Ministers further reiterated this collective condemnation of calls for violence and for the destruction of any state. They also concurred in the fact that 'such comments cause concern about Iran's role in the region and its future intentions'.

There is a long, very ugly string of precedents at political rallies, military parades and other events, going all the way back to the early years of the revolution. But when they are made in the current delicate climate, and especially by the Head of State himself in connection with a conference entitled 'The World without Zionism', I think it really is time to draw a red line and to remind the Iranian President of the responsibilities that come with being a member of the family of nations.

On the most burning issue, the nuclear track, we still believe that engagement is far preferable to brinkmanship, confrontation and isolation. We therefore support the efforts by the British Presidency, France, Germany, Mr Javier Solana and like-minded partners to bring Iran to a fuller cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency and Dr ElBaradei

In this regard the next meeting of the board of the IAEA will be crucial. Clearly we all want to avoid Iran becoming a nuclear weapons state. But this is not the only area where we would expect the Iranian Government to deliver. Iran's attitude towards the Middle East peace process in particular is very important. Since the launch of our EU-Iran comprehensive dialogue, the successor of the critical dialogue, that has been identified as one of the major issues of concern, along with weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and human rights.

During Mr Khatami's presidency, we used this channel of engagement to good effect. Even though Iran did not officially acknowledge the existence of Israel, we registered some positive signs and a better appreciation of the whole Middle East equation. In particular, it was stated that Iran would not obstruct the peace process and would not pretend to be 'more Palestinian than the Palestinians'.

But the intemperate remarks by President Ahmadinejad came as a setback. Among the many condemnations it triggered, I was particularly pleased to note also that the Palestinian Authority representative, the chief Palestinian negotiator, Mr Saeb Erekat, displayed real statesmanship by recalling that the PLO and the Palestinian Authority had recognised the State of Israel, with which they pursued a peace process. Thunderous neo-revolutionary warnings by the Iranian leadership to other Muslim countries not to recognise Israel seem curiously out of step with the modern world and may very well backfire.

Over the past months, the EU has invited Iran to reactivate our tracks of dialogue, by holding sessions of both the comprehensive dialogue and the human rights dialogue. I strongly hope that Iran will recommit itself to these processes and seize the opportunity to clarify its position, dispel misunderstandings and start restoring an overall confidence that has been badly damaged by recent remarks.

Although today is not the occasion, one could speak at length about human rights and the positive expectations that were initially created during the first years of Mr Khatami's presidency, and then about the subsequent negative trend that has regrettably cemented itself. Improvements are indeed badly needed and the European Union obviously cannot remain silent on the matter.

I believe that we should try to build bridges with the Iranian people and I prefer to think that not all Iranians identify with the remarks and the line taken by their leaders. Freedom of expression and association in Iran are eroding. We should continue to monitor closely, for instance, the treatment of individual cases, such as that of Mr Akbar Ganji.

But as the Council clearly stated last week, 'the evolution of the long-term relationship, avoiding a deterioration between Iran and Europe, will depend on action by Iran to address effectively all of the EU's areas of concern'. That includes Iran's attitude towards the Middle East peace process. The ball is now in the Iranian Government's court. As a basic prerequisite we expect the Iranian Government to exercise responsible leadership, both domestically and internationally. Iran has remarkable historical, cultural and geo-political assets, as well as immense natural and human resources. This entails special responsibilities in order to foster peace and stability within a particularly volatile neighbourhood.

3-182

PRESIDÊNCIA: MANUEL ANTÓNIO DOS SANTOS
Vice-presidente

3-183

Hans-Gert Poettering, im Namen der PPE-DE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Herr Vertreter des Rates, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Unsere Fraktion hat diese Debatte beantragt, und ich möchte den anderen Fraktionen herzlich dafür danken, dass sie sofort einverstanden waren, diese Debatte zu führen.

Das, was der iranische Präsident Ahmadinejad am 26. Oktober über das Ausradieren Israels gesagt hat, ist so ungeheuerlich, dass wir es aufs Schärfste verurteilen müssen. Wir wissen, dass der Revolutionsführer Khomeini schon eine ähnliche Politik betrieben hat, aber umso mehr wissen wir heute zu schätzen, dass der frühere Präsident Khatami sich dieser Linie nicht angeschlossen hat.

Wir sagen an die Adresse Israels – und ich selbst habe Israel in diesem Parlament häufiger kritisiert: In einer solchen die Sicherheit, Stabilität und Integrität Israels betreffenden Frage stehen wir ohne jede Einschränkung an der Seite Israels, und jede Infragestellung und jeder Angriff auf Israel ist eine Infragestellung der westlichen Zivilisation, es ist eine Kriegserklärung auch an Europa und an die gesamte Welt. Dies muss die iranische Führung wissen.

Mich enttäuscht die Entwicklung im Iran deswegen so sehr, weil ich gerade zu dem Zeitpunkt für eine ganze Woche im Iran war, als Ahmadinejad die Regierung übernommen hatte, und ich damals noch die Illusion hatte, dass ja vielleicht doch nicht alles so schlimm kommt, wie es aussieht. Aber weil alles so schlimm kommt, müssen auch diejenigen, die mit sehr viel gutem Willen der neuen Regierung eine Chance geben wollten, heute ein klares Wort sagen: Wehret den Anfängen; das muss unsere Position sein.

Das Tragische ist, dass dieses Verhalten des neuen iranischen – man muss ja sagen – Regimes im Grunde genommen auch denen nicht hilft, denen man vorgeblich helfen will, nämlich den Palästinensern. Nicht nur die Israelis haben ein Recht darauf, in sicheren Grenzen zu leben; als EVP-ED-Fraktion haben wir immer das Recht der Palästinenser anerkannt, in sicheren Grenzen zu leben. So, wie sich der iranische Präsident verhält, stellt er den gesamten Friedensprozess im Nahen Osten in Frage, und das ist nicht nur schlimm für Israel, es ist auch schlimm für die Würde des palästinensischen Volkes.

Nachdem wir Ahmadinejad kritisiert hatten, habe ich im deutschen Fernsehen gesehen, dass es in Teheran Demonstrationen gab, bei denen Männer mit Selbstmordgürteln zu sehen waren. Das ist doch schon ein Aufruf zum Terrorismus. Als ich im Iran war, habe ich ein Magazin gesehen, in dem junge Leute aufgefordert wurden, sich zu melden als Selbstmordattentäter oder Freiheitskämpfer – wie immer man es bezeichnen will, aber es ist ein Aufruf zum Terrorismus. Ich habe gestern gehört, dass im iranischen Kinderfernsehen palästinensische Kinder mit diesen Selbstmordgürteln gezeigt wurden, um sozusagen ein Beispiel für iranische Kinder zu sein, sich für diese Selbstmordaktionen zur Verfügung zu stellen. Und gestern sagte mir ein britischer Kollege, dass zwei Personen im Iran wegen gleichgeschlechtlicher Beziehungen gehängt worden seien. All dies zeigt, dass es ein Rückfall in das tiefste Mittelalter ist, und wir müssen die iranische Führung auffordern, zur Einsicht zu kommen.

Sowohl der Vertreter des Rates als auch die Kommissarin haben von dem zivilen Nuklearprogramm gesprochen. Darauf hat der Iran natürlich ein Recht. Aber der Iran hat nicht unser Vertrauen, und deswegen sind wir nahezu sicher, dass man die zivile Nuklearentwicklung eines Tages auch für Nuklearwaffen nutzen wird. Und Nuklearwaffen in den Händen von Leuten, die dem Mittelalter zugerechnet werden können, ist etwas, was wir als europäische und Weltzivilisation nicht verantworten können.

Ich habe heute Morgen einen Repräsentanten der russischen Regierung aufgefordert, alles der russischen Regierung Mögliche zu tun – sie hat ja einen gewissen Einfluss auf den Iran –, damit in all diesen Fragen der Entwicklung von Nuklearenergie endlich Transparenz entsteht, so wie dies auch die Kommissarin, so wie dies auch der Vertreter des Rates gefordert haben.

Meine Damen und Herren, lassen Sie uns sehr wachsam sein, was den Iran angeht. Der Iran muss selber wissen, dass er seine große geographische und strategische Rolle verspielt. Der Iran spielt eine große Rolle beim Friedensprozess in Afghanistan, beim Friedensprozess im Irak, im Verhältnis zu Syrien, Israel, Libanon, Palästina. Das iranische Volk ist ein großes Volk; viele haben sich an der Wahl nicht beteiligt, weil sie das Schlimmste befürchteten und es nicht verhindern konnten. Doch wir sollten diejenigen im Iran, die guten Willens sind, nicht vergessen. Der Iran braucht eine gute Zukunft, und hoffentlich hat der Präsident ein Einsehen, dass er sich zivilisiert verhalten möge im Umgang mit den Menschen und den Staaten in der Welt.

3-184

Pasqualina Napoletano, a nome del gruppo PSE. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anche noi abbiamo condiviso la necessità di sostenere questo dibattito, perché vogliamo che le gravi dichiarazioni pronunciate dal Presidente iraniano Ahmadinejad nei confronti dell'esistenza dello Stato di Israele trovino una risposta ferma e unanime del Parlamento europeo.

Il gruppo socialista ritiene che non si debba sottovalutare la gravità dell'accaduto, poiché queste parole sono state pronunciate in un momento estremamente delicato della situazione mediorientale. A onor del vero, nei giorni successivi abbiamo per fortuna potuto ascoltare le dichiarazioni del *leader* Khatami, che vanno in tutt'altra direzione. Egli si è infatti espresso contro le crociate di qualsiasi tipo, contro la guerra e conto la violenza, definendole immorali.

Per tornare al Medio Oriente, da una parte si sono riaperte le speranze per un processo di pace che porti alla nascita dello Stato palestinese accanto allo Stato di Israele, che per noi non è mai stato e mai sarà messo in discussione, ma dall'altra parte sappiamo che sono molti i nemici di questo processo e che il terrorismo è di fatto alleato con chi non vuole che si arrivi alla fine di questo dramma.

La pace, la democrazia, la libertà e la giustizia sociale sono i valori che vogliamo si affermino in Medio Oriente e vogliamo che l'Europa abbia un ruolo crescente in questa prospettiva. Accogliamo pertanto con favore la responsabilità che l'Unione europea ha assunto nel controllo del confine di Rafah, che speriamo possa costituire nel prossimo futuro uno dei confini dello Stato palestinese.

L'Iran è un grande paese e non vogliamo che si isoli dalla comunità internazionale. Al contrario, riteniamo che le sue scelte, a partire da una chiara e incontrovertibile rinuncia all'armamento nucleare, potranno contribuire alla stabilizzazione pacifica dell'intera area.

Israele e Palestina sono legate da uno stesso destino e cancellare Israele equivale a cancellare la Palestina. Dico questo perché è ora di smascherare coloro i quali, in nome della difesa dei diritti dei palestinesi, contribuiscono ad alimentare il loro dramma. A differenza del presidente Ahmadinejad, noi lavoreremo per aggiungere un nuovo Stato alla carta geografica del Medio Oriente.

Facciamo infine presente a Israele che l'Europa non può dimenticare l'Olocausto, perché ciò equivarrebbe ad annientare le ragioni stesse della propria esistenza come progetto politico.

3-185

Annemie Neyts-Uyttebroeck, namens de ALDE-Fractie. – Voorzitter, mevrouw de commissaris, collega's, ik zal voor een deel hetzelfde zeggen als mijn collega's, maar ik geloof dat het belangrijk is dat wij bewijzen dat alle fracties in dit Parlement eensgezind zijn in onze veroordeling van de recente gebeurtenissen in Iran. Iran is een bakermat van beschaving en heeft een onschatbare bijdrage geleverd tot het culturele, artistieke, religieuze, intellectuele en wetenschappelijke patrimonium van de mensheid. Nadat Iran zich omvormde tot een islamitische republiek werd het decennia lang geïsoleerd. De Europese Unie heeft het voortouw genomen om dat isolement te doorbreken en is een veelomvattende dialoog gestart, onder meer over de economische relaties, internationale samenwerking en mensenrechten.

Sedert het aantreden van president Ahmadinejad echter, is er een duidelijke verstrakking merkbaar. Veroordelingen van minderjarigen, hernieuwde vervolgingen van journalisten en mensenrechtenactivisten en het terugroepen van 40 ambassadeurs wijzen hierop. De recente verklaringen van de president die zelfmoordterroristen feliciteerde en stelde dat Israël van de kaart moet worden geveegd, zijn volkomen strijdig met het Handvest van de Verenigde Naties en zijn zowel uit politiek en internationaalrechtelijk, maar bovenal uit menselijk en moreel oogpunt absoluut te veroordelen en totaal onaanvaardbaar.

Het bestaansrecht van Israël binnen internationaal erkende grenzen en in veiligheid naast een leefbare Palestijnse staat is onaanvaardbaar. Iran zou er beter aan doen bij te dragen tot een oplossing in het Midden-Oosten en op te houden het

internationaal terrorisme te steunen. De jongste presidentiële verklaringen dreigen Iran, dat inderdaad een groot land is, opnieuw in een isolement te dringen en verhinderen alleszins dat dit belangrijke land in zijn regio een leidende rol zal gaan spelen.

3-186

Angelika Beer, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Auch meine Fraktion der Grünen ist froh, dass wir eine einstimmige Entschließung verabschieden werden, in der auch das Europäische Parlament deutlich macht, dass jemand – egal ob eine Organisation oder ein Staat –, der das Existenzrecht Israels in Frage stellt oder selbst Hassreden dagegen schwingt, hier keinerlei Akzeptanz findet und eindeutig zurückgewiesen wird.

Auch Kommission und Rat haben deutlich gemacht, vor welch schwierigen Problemen wir stehen. Durch die Reden von Präsident Ahmadinejad ist klar geworden, dass wir Europäer einen Hassprediger, der durchs Land zieht und Tausende mobilisiert, nicht stoppen können. Das ist nicht unsere Aufgabe und auch nicht unser Bereich. Aber ich appelliere trotzdem an die iranischen Verantwortlichen, zu überprüfen, ob sie nicht doch eine positive Rolle in der internationalen Staatengemeinschaft einnehmen und für ein Existenzrecht Palästinens und Israels eintreten wollen, anstatt diesem Präsidenten die Möglichkeit zu geben, dieses reiche Land Iran in die internationale Isolation zu treiben.

Deshalb appelliere ich an die Europäer und an uns: Wir müssen differenzieren. Iran ist ein faszinierendes Land mit einer jungen, gut gebildeten Gesellschaft. Iran ist eine Gesellschaft mit aktiven Frauenorganisationen, die um ihre Rechte kämpfen. Iran ist auch ein Akbar Ganij, der in seinem Leben bedroht ist, weil er sich weigert, sich der Zensur zu beugen. Iran ist auch die Gesellschaft der Weblogger und der Journalisten, die versuchen, mit uns Kontakt aufrechtzuerhalten und dieses Regime dort zu entlarven. Iran ist die Friedensnobelpreisträgerin Schirin Ebadi, die hier bei uns gesprochen hat. Iran ist auch Rechtsanwalt Soltani, den wir eingeladen hatten und der jetzt im Gefängnis sitzt.

Deshalb sollten wir versuchen, diesem anderen Iran die Hand zu reichen. Wir sollten nicht den Fehler machen, jetzt die Kontakte zur Zivilgesellschaft abzubrechen, die Tür zuzuschlagen. Genau das ist es, was ein Präsident Ahmadinejad erreichen will; dem sollten wir nicht folgen.

Wir haben uns den Menschenrechten, dem Frieden und der friedlichen Konfliktlösung verpflichtet. Dies ist unser Weg. Das ist nur der Dialog ...

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

3-187

Eva-Britt Svensson, för GUE/NGL-gruppen. – Herr talman! Irans regim förhindrar all opposition inom landet. Man bryter mot de mänskliga rättigheterna, man dömer barbariskt mänskor till döden genom hängning osv. Listan över regimens brott kan göras lång, men detta är tydligt inte nog för denna regim. Nu har Irans president gjort fruktansvärdta uttalanden om en annan stat. Han har talat om att utplåna staten Israel. Detta är naturligtvis fullständigt oacceptabelt och måste fördömas av alla. Jag utgår ifrån att vi är ett enat parlament som står bakom fördömandet av detta uttalande, liksom fördömandet av iranska regimens brott mot mänskliga rättigheter. Det finns en risk för att presidentens uttalande ytterligare försvärar arbetet för fred i Mellanöstern.

Vi måste också samtidigt kräva att staten Israel lever upp till FN:s säkerhetsråds resolutioner, att Israel omedelbart lämnar de ockuperade områdena, att Israel tar sitt ansvar för en tvästatslösning och därmed äntligen accepterar en palestinsk självständig stat med östra Jerusalem som huvudstad. Vi måste i detta sammanhang också kritisera staten Israels byggande av en mur på de palestinska områdena, en mur som hindrar bönder att nå sina odlingsmarker, en mur som skiljer skolelever från deras skolor, en mur som hindrar sjuka att nå sjukhus osv. Denna mur måste också bort.

3-188

Gerard Batten, on behalf of the IND/DEM Group. – Mr President, Iran is developing a nuclear programme that it does not need since it is sitting on a sea of oil. It is clearly intended to provide the country with nuclear weapons. The President of Iran thinks that Israel should be wiped off the map. The ability of the West to deal with the threat posed by Iran has been severely restricted by the war in Iraq, a war Britain entered into because of the lies and deceit of our Prime Minister, Mr Blair. We all hope that the situation in Iran can be resolved peacefully, and this is certainly one of those cases where the West needs both to speak softly and to carry a big stick.

Unfortunately Britain's big stick – its armed forces – is being merged into the euphemistically named European Defence Identity, i.e. a European army. If accomplished, this will prevent Britain from being able to embark on any independent military actions in the future. But once again, the EU assumes the attributes of a political state in order to address this problem and its pretensions are fully supported by a minister of Her Majesty's Government. Meanwhile, this Parliament continually calls on both France and Britain to decommission their independent nuclear deterrents. If they did so there would not be the big stick that might ultimately be needed in any negotiations with Iran.

3-189

Cristiana Muscardini, a nome del gruppo UEN. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, le esternazioni di odio e violenza rilasciate dal Presidente iraniano, tendenti a cancellare dalla carta geografica lo Stato di Israele, rappresentano un pericolo per tutto il mondo civile.

L'Iran è un paese che conta sessantotto milioni di abitanti, esteso per un milione e settecentomila chilometri quadrati e grande produttore di petrolio, che il suo attuale presidente sta tentando di trasformare in uno Stato espressione del fondamentalismo islamico più profondo, sostenendo o non condannando azioni terroristiche e adoperandosi per produrre energia nucleare senza l'avvallo della comunità internazionale. Se il presidente iraniano non modificherà in maniera chiara la propria posizione, rappresenterà una minaccia non solo per Israele e per la regione, ma anche per tutti noi, per la pace e per la democrazia.

A tale minaccia bisogna rispondere nella maniera più forte. Il riarmo nucleare unilaterale dell'Iran deve essere impedito in linea con la nostra risoluzione del 13 ottobre 2005 e con le conclusioni del Consiglio "Affari generali" del 7 novembre. Dobbiamo inoltre trovare una soluzione diplomatica che dissiphi le legittime preoccupazioni sul programma nucleare iraniano.

Se questa minacciosa tendenza della politica iraniana non dovesse fermarsi, dovremo parlare in termini decisi di conseguenze diplomatiche ed economiche, perché le dichiarazioni di incitamento alla violenza contro uno Stato democratico e sovrano rappresentano un pericolo per tutta la comunità democratica. Come Istituzioni dovremmo invece continuare a incentivare i rapporti con la popolazione.

Esprimiamo la massima solidarietà allo Stato di Israele che ha avuto attestazioni di sostegno anche da quella parte del mondo islamico che rifiuta il terrorismo e che ha avuto il sostegno spontaneo dei cittadini di molti dei nostri paesi. Il perseguitamento di una pace duratura passa da una ferma condanna e dalle necessarie e conseguenti azioni contro tutti coloro che sono istigatori di odio e di violenza.

Chiediamo che le nostre Istituzioni siano anche più attente ai movimenti di opposizione in Iran che denunciano i sistemi di un regime violento e liberticida anche contro il proprio popolo.

3-190

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, it has once again been a high-quality debate on an important subject, similar to the last time we had an opportunity to debate these issues in this Chamber.

A number of speakers including the Commissioner and Mr Poettering have underlined the significance of the Iranian President's statement for the wider Middle East peace process, and with that I would concur. President Ahmadinejad's comments caused concern about Iran's role more widely within the region and indeed about its future intentions. The fact that these comments were made on the same day as a horrific attack on Israeli citizens should reinforce for all of us the lesson that incitement to violence and to the terrorism that it breeds are despicable and unacceptable.

Frankly it is clear what Iran must do. It must renounce groups using terror and violence, including the kind of sickening propaganda that was referred to by Mr Poettering, and support a solution to the Palestinian question based on the principle of two states living side by side in peace and in security.

There is no reason why an Islamic political system such as Iran's should deny fundamental democratic rights such as freedom of choice and freedom of expression and there can be no excuse for any system abusing human rights, as a number of speakers have made clear in the course of their contributions to this debate.

On the wider nuclear issue, Iran must provide objective guarantees that its nuclear programme is solely for peaceful purposes. The governments of the European Union are now in close consultation with each other and key partners such as the United States, Russia, China, India and South Africa about the next steps. We all look to Iran to reinstate the suspension of uranium conversion activity which it agreed to last year and which the IAEA board itself has said is essential for confidence to be rebuilt and we urge Iran to come back to talks on long-term arrangements on the basis of the Paris agreement.

On 7 November, as speakers have mentioned, European Union Foreign Ministers reaffirmed the Union's support for a diplomatic solution to international concerns over Iran's nuclear programme which should include an agreement on long-term arrangements. Such a solution would help create the climate we believe to be necessary for a better relationship with Europe generally and the international community as a whole. Working and engaging with Iran is of course a challenge, but we must do our best to meet that challenge in the important weeks and months ahead.

Our preference remains to aim for a mutually beneficial relationship based on cooperation and our shared interests, in that Europe wants to see Iran realise its potential and to grow and prosper. That is certainly what its young population deserves and that is, as Ms Beer said, why it is important to keep open the links so that the other Iran, as it was described – the more

open Iranian society to which speakers have addressed themselves today – can welcome the efforts which are being made to maintain that dialogue, certainly by the Commission and by others.

But a relationship of this sort will also need to address the European Union's main concerns, including, of course, nuclear proliferation and human rights.

In conclusion, on behalf of the Presidency, let me say simply this: Iran stands at a critical juncture. The world is watching to see how its new government faces up to the very important choices that it has to make in the weeks, months and years ahead. We from a European Union point of view will continue to encourage Iran to address international concerns about its policies and about its statements. I hope that Iran does this and that its relations with the wider world and the European Union in particular are therefore able to evolve in the direction in which I believe this House wants them to develop.

(Applause)

3-191

Presidente. – O debate está encerrado.

A votação terá lugar na quinta-feira, 17 de Novembro de 2005.

3-192

12 - Período de perguntas (perguntas ao Conselho)

3-193

Presidente. – Segue-se na ordem do dia o período de perguntas ao Conselho (B6-0339/2005).

3-194

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 1 de Marie Panayotopoulos-Cassiotou (H-0889/05)

Assunto: Previsão em matéria de reestruturações

Como analisa o Conselho o impacto dos acordos bilaterais e internacionais e dos compromissos assumidos pela União Europeia sobre a evolução do mercado europeu em matéria de transferências e reestruturações de empresas, em particular nas regiões insulares, rurais e remotas da UE?

Tem o Conselho uma previsão sobre as reestruturações de empresas e a evolução económica e laboral futura de cada sector do mercado e de cada tipo de posto de trabalho nessas regiões?

Através de que mecanismos assegura o desenvolvimento sustentável dessas regiões, a preservação do seu tecido social, a regular progressão dos trabalhadores e a programação da formação das novas gerações?

3-195

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I am conscious that your direction to honourable Members also, no doubt, includes the Presidency, so I shall endeavour to keep my answers as brief as is appropriate, given the range of questions that we have been asked.

In response to Question 1, the assessment of the impact of international agreements in terms of companies relocating and restructuring is not within the Council's competence. The Council does not have any forecasts for the restructuring of companies. The European Social Fund is the main financial tool through which the European Union supports Member States' employment policies within the framework of the European employment strategy. Set up by the Treaty of Rome, it is the longest established Structural Fund.

The Structural Fund supports measures to improve employment opportunities and to develop human resources and integration into the labour market in order to promote a high level of employment, equality between men and women, sustainable development and economic and social cohesion.

Furthermore, the Council will be taking forward discussion of the Commission's proposals for a globalisation adjustment fund, which could provide assistance for those affected by economic restructuring. Rural development also makes European Union funding available in parallel with national funding for developing rural areas. In 2007 to 2013, this money will focus on increasing the competitiveness of European agriculture, food and forestry, land management and the environment, and quality of life and diversification in rural areas. Thus the European Structural Fund and rural development funding provides the tools to help workers adjust to the situations referred to by the honourable Member.

3-196

María Panayotopoulou-Kassiotou (PPE-DE). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να ρωτήσω τον εκπρόσωπο του Συμβουλίου αν το Ταμείο των αναδιαρθρώσεων θα έχει συγκεκριμένους χρηματικούς πόρους και εάν η Βρετανική

Προεδρία χρησιμοποίησε ήδη την ανοικτή μέθοδο συντονισμού ώστε να φέρει καινούριες προτάσεις για τη διαχείριση των αναδιαρθρώσεων.

3-197

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I would start with the basic point, which is that, clearly, the level of funding is contingent upon the wider conversation about the future financing of the European Union. We have had a long and useful debate in the course of the afternoon which, while apparently directed towards the Hampton Court informal Heads of Government meeting, in reality strayed into the issue of future financing.

I would simply reiterate the points made by the Foreign Secretary when he was speaking here earlier this afternoon in saying that we are sincere in our endeavours in reaching a conclusion to those discussions on future financing in the course of the British Presidency. However, the specific details of specific programmes are obviously contingent on the resolution of that matter.

3-198

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 2 de Manuel Medina Ortega (H-0892/05)

Assunto: Impostos no domínio do tráfego aéreo de passageiros

Que impacto pode ter sobre o mercado interno a adopção de medidas nacionais divergentes sobre a fiscalidade no domínio do tráfego aéreo de passageiros e que disposições deveriam ser tomadas para a harmonização das referidas medidas?

3-199

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Data concerning the effect on the international market of national measures to tax passenger air traffic are limited.

Were Member States to adopt national measures for the taxation of passenger air traffic that were not compatible with the internal market, measures could be proposed by the Commission and adopted by the Council after consulting the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee under Article 93 of the Treaty establishing the European Community. However, it remains the right of Member States to set tax rates according to their own national circumstances.

3-200

Manuel Medina Ortega (PSE). – Gracias, señor Presidente en ejercicio del Consejo, por su contestación. La pregunta, sin embargo, versa sobre la incidencia que la introducción de cualquier tipo de fiscalidad sobre el tráfico aéreo de personas va a tener en el mercado interior. Usted es de una isla, yo también; esta medida, aunque no afectaría a los países que sólo tienen una estructura continental, sí afectaría, y muy negativamente, a las regiones insulares y, sobre todo, a aquellas que están muy alejadas del núcleo central de la Unión Europea. Por tanto, éste es un tema que probablemente merezca la consideración del Consejo, de acuerdo con la Comisión.

3-201

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I would certainly not want the impression to be left in this Chamber that somehow by dint of geography Britain is isolated from the mainstream of the European Union. Indeed I hope many of our efforts in the course of the Presidency have challenged that impression.

As I suggested in my initial answer, there is provision within the Treaties for action to be taken when necessary by the Commission. Nonetheless it remains a matter for individual Member States to make decisions in relation to taxation, as I sought to declare. If the honourable Member is suggesting that further action needs to be taken either at Member State level or at European level, I am not convinced that would necessarily relate to issues of taxation as distinct from potential other public policy remedies for the problems that he claims to have identified.

3-202

Joseph Muscat (PSE). – Grazzi Sur President. Nahseb inkunu žbaljati jekk nibqgħu nieħdu din il-kwistjoni strettament min-naħha ta' tassazzjoni, rridu nharsu lejha mill-kwistjoni ta' moviment hieles ta' persuni u ta' servizzi, tnejn mil-libertajiet essenziali ta' l-Unjoni Ewropea. Ha nagħti eżempju b'pajjiżi - b'Malta. Biex inti taqta' biljett bejn Malta u Brussell jiġik bejn wieħed u ieħor 104 Euros prezz tajjeb, it-tassazzjoni u s-'surcharges' fuqha jiġi 126 Euro, jiġifieri 121% tal-prezz, bejn Malta u Londra 200% tal-prezz huma t-taxxi u c-'charges' l-oħra. Irridu nharsu lejha bis-serjetà, ma jistax ikun li l-ivjaġġar, speċjalment minn postijiet iżolati u remoti, jkun meqjus b'xi mod bhala lussu. Aħna ma nistgħux naqbdu l-karozza biex imorru 'main land Europe', x'naqbdu nagħmlu ngħummuha imbagħad?! Jiġifieri rridu nharsu lejha verament mil-lat ta' libertà ta' movimenti.

3-203

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I would simply reiterate the caution that I emphasised earlier as to the legitimate remit of the Council in these matters. There is, as I said, provision for the Commission to take action in particular circumstances, and Mr Muscat is right to recognise that free movement of services is one element of the original Treaty of Rome.

However, to counterbalance the rather negative construction that he has placed on the present position in relation to air fares in one particular Member State, it is important to recognise that some of the measures taken at European Union level in recent years have resulted in very dramatic drops in the price of tickets that are being charged to European Union citizens to travel elsewhere within the European Union. Only this morning I had the opportunity to travel to Budapest where I was hearing directly about the seventeen daily flights now available between a number of regional airports in the United Kingdom and Hungary. That would have been inconceivable only a matter of years ago, and the European Union deserves credit in recognising the extent to which it has contributed towards the new opportunities that are afforded to many citizens to travel, which have now been enjoyed by many citizens in recent months and years.

3-204

Philip Bradbourn (PPE-DE). – Last month I tabled a question for this session of Question Time to the Council on a related subject, that of EU kerosene tax. In response to the question as to what the Council's position on EU kerosene tax was, I was told that because it had not received a proposal from the Commission, the Council could not take position. I have here documentary evidence that the Commission has made proposals to the Council. The issue was last discussed in the Council by the Luxembourg Presidency, prior to the British Presidency, which British ministers would presumably have attended. Can the Council Presidency please tell me whether this is a case of incompetence, or is there a secret agenda to introduce a kerosene tax?

3-205

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I can assure the honourable Member there is no secret agenda as far as I am concerned. On the other hand, if he would like to share with me the information he has waved before this House today I shall certainly look into the matter that he has addressed and I will make sure that a reply is forthcoming to him.

3-206

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 3 de Sarah Ludford (H-0895/05)

Assunto: Convenção do Conselho da Europa relativa ao tráfico de seres humanos

Por que motivo não assinaram todos os Estados-Membros da UE a Convenção do Conselho da Europa relativa à luta contra o tráfico de seres humanos, nos termos da qual as pessoas que constituem objecto de tráfico deverão ser tratadas em primeira instância como vítimas, e não como imigrantes ilegais?

Está o Reino Unido, na qualidade de país que exerce a Presidência, a dar um bom exemplo nesse domínio?

3-207

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – The Council is not in a position to give information on the state of individual Member States' decision-making concerning the signature of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. The convention has to date been signed by five Member States of the European Union: Austria, Cyprus, Poland, Portugal and Sweden. No Member States have ratified the convention. It is noted that part of the convention is under EC competence and will therefore need to be signed and ratified by the EC.

The Council is currently considering an action plan on trafficking in human beings to develop a comprehensive and strategic European Union approach on this issue. The action plan will build on the conference held on 19 and 20 October, 'Tackling human trafficking: Policy and best practice in Europe', organised by the United Kingdom Presidency, the Commission and Sweden.

3-208

Sarah Ludford (ALDE). – That is rather inadequate. The Commission's recent communication said that victim protection is the top priority, but Member States tend to lump trafficking together with illegal immigration and prefer to make victim protection conditional on being a witness. That is why they dislike the convention.

The advice that I and colleagues received from the police is that victims will cooperate with police voluntarily once they and their families are safe. Police are dismayed that the chances of a successful prosecution of traffickers are being undermined by a policy of deporting victims as illegal immigrants or making assistance conditional. Mr Blair said recently that you need powerful reasons to turn round and say 'no' to the police. Why are 17 EU Prime Ministers – and you are now telling me it is actually 20 Prime Ministers, including Tony Blair – saying 'no' to the police by refusing to sign up to this convention?

3-209

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I would first like to repeat to the honourable Member the point that I made at the beginning that it is not for me, representing the Presidency in the course of today and in the course of this debate, to speak in terms of the decision-making of those 20 Prime Ministers that she identifies. I would however say that it rather ill befits her to suggest that there is a conflation between illegal immigration and human trafficking when the conference that I described on this important issue of human trafficking was entitled 'Tackling human trafficking: policy and best practice in Europe'. This was a matter which, as I said, was taken forward by the British Presidency and therefore

the allegation that she seems to be levelling that there is somehow a profound and perpetual confusion between illegal immigration and human trafficking seems, not least on the basis of the title of the conference, to be refuted by the evidence.

3-210

Elizabeth Lynne (ALDE). – Following on from that, I think the reason my colleague said what she did was because the UK Presidency seems to view this as a security and stability issue rather than a human rights issue.

Further to what the President-in-Office has said, could he try to make sure that the Council discussions on the EU action plan on trafficking is in the public domain, because we do not have any information about it at present. Could he also give reassurances that at least the minimum standards that are written into the EU Convention against trafficking are put into that EU action plan?

3-211

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Let me assure the honourable lady that there is widespread support for the aims of the Convention on Action against Human Trafficking and that European Union Member States want to see concerted action to tackle at source what is undoubtedly an abhorrent trade, in order to protect and support the victims of which she has spoken and bring those responsible to justice.

I can assure the honourable lady that the United Kingdom, as Presidency of the European Union, has prioritised work on combating human trafficking, and the EU Action Plan for best practices, standards and procedures for combating and preventing trafficking in human beings has been the focus of our efforts. We have held not one but two conferences on the subject. That action plan will, I can assure her, address the whole cycle of human trafficking and specifically recognises the importance of a human rights and a victim-centred approach. So, I hope that, on the basis of the answer that I have been able to offer, some of her concerns over the approach that the British Presidency has taken on this important issue transpire to be misplaced.

3-212

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 4 de John Purvis (H-0897/05)

Assunto: Imposto especial de consumo sobre o tabaco e o álcool

A Comissão e o Parlamento Europeu são favoráveis à supressão das directrizes sobre as quantidades de tabaco e de álcool que os consumidores podem comprar noutra Estado-Membro e levar para casa para consumo pessoal. Que diligências efectuou a Presidência para convencer o Conselho a aceitar a supressão das referidas directrizes a fim de que os consumidores possam exercer plenamente os direitos garantidos pelo mercado único?

3-213

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – The proposed deletion of the indicative amounts for tobacco products and alcohol constitutes only one of the elements of the relevant Commission proposal amending the arrangements for products subject to excise duty. Indicative amounts are used as an important indicator of whether the quantity of excise goods carried across borders is for commercial reasons or for private consumption by non-taxable persons. They are not in themselves an obstacle to the rights of cross-border shoppers.

The Commission proposal has been discussed on several occasions in the relevant bodies since it was transmitted to the Council, with no indication that Member States would agree to abolish the minimum indicative levels. The Presidency therefore does not believe that further discussion of this issue would be productive.

3-214

John Purvis (PPE-DE). – Would the President-in-Office not agree with me that a single market in the European Union, in which goods, people, services and capital can move as freely across European borders as they do within Member States, is a vital policy objective? Would he agree with me that we should prefer tax competition between Member States to harmonisation of tax rates across the EU? If he so agrees, can he see any justification for any limits or guidelines as to how much in the way of excisable products our citizens can take with them across our borders?

3-215

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – It is refreshing to hear a point of view being put forward in this Chamber that differs so much from some of the allegations normally levelled against the British and the British Presidency.

The free movement of goods and services is, of course, reflected in the original treaties of the European Union, and one of the focuses of our work in the course of our Presidency has been the completion of the single market. We have sought to take forward, and continue to seek to take forward, work in relation to services. Indeed, countries who at times in the past have questioned our pro-European credentials have been some of those most critical of our efforts to continue to advance discussions in relation to the issue of services.

On the specific issue that the speaker raised in relation to cross-border shopping, let me simply say that the Presidency fully supports the rights of cross-border shoppers. At the same time, though, we are committed to tackling those who abuse freedoms that would otherwise be enjoyed by citizens right across the European Union. We are determined to tackle abuses of the freedoms within the single market by those who engage in illegal activities such as smuggling. Guide levels are therefore essential to assist customs authorities to distinguish between genuine cross-border shoppers and smugglers.

On the more general point with which he concluded his remarks, I think the rather robust case which was put by our Foreign Secretary in terms of the limits of harmonisation within the European Union earlier this afternoon is an eloquent testimony as to the British Government's view on the appropriate balance between harmonisation and competition within the European Union.

3-216

David Martin (PSE). – Would the President-in-Office agree that guidelines are precisely that – guidelines – and that if individuals can prove that what they are importing is for their own use then, even if they exceed the guidelines, they would not be outwith the law? Also, would he agree that the guidelines exist to ensure that the single market functions in this area and that, if we did not have the guidelines, the very objective that Mr Purvis wants might be undermined, because the guidelines are there to stop the abuses that the President-in-Office referred to?

3-217

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I can assure the honourable Member that we take seriously the kind of abuse of which he speaks so eloquently. Speaking for a moment from the United Kingdom point of view rather than the Presidency point of view, it is the case that in the United Kingdom we have the highest guide levels of all the Member States of the European Union.

We, like every Member State, apply sanctions to those who bring in excise goods that are not for their own personal use with the intention – exactly the intention to which the honourable Member refers – of evading the duty that would otherwise be due. These sanctions, I believe, are proportionate to the nature of the offence. Therefore he is right in recognising that guidelines are exactly that.

3-218

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 5 de Elspeth Attwooll (H-0898/05)

Assunto: Noivas sem fronteiras

O Governo do Reino Unido pretende obrigar muitas mulheres britânicas a abandonar o Reino Unido para se reunirem aos maridos, aos quais foi recusada a autorização de residência. Afirmam-lhes que é seguro residir em países como o Iraque, Irão, Afeganistão, Congo e Burundi, que o Ministério dos Negócios Estrangeiros e da Commonwealth do Reino Unido e o Departamento de Estado norte-americano consideram perigosos para os visitantes ocidentais e/ou culpados de violação dos direitos fundamentais.

Como pode esta prática ser compatível com a Convenção Europeia dos Direitos do Homem, nomeadamente o direito à vida familiar, a Carta dos Direitos Fundamentais da UE e o artigo 6º do Tratado da União Europeia?

3-219

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – The Council has never debated this question and it is not within the sphere of its competence.

3-220

Elspeth Attwooll (ALDE). – I must say that I find the lack of any legal justification in terms of European Community law and the European Convention on Human Rights somewhat distressing. There is little to reassure me about the welfare of my constituents.

The President-in-Office will be aware that, since February 2005, non-EU/EEA nationals have to obtain Home Office permission to get married in the United Kingdom. Its effect is that we are talking about a limited number of couples.

Would the President-in-Office be prepared at least to convey to his Home Office colleagues my request that an amnesty be granted to such couples, at least where it is recognised that there is a genuine and subsisting relationship, and that the requirement to travel to the country of origin in order to apply for spousal residence be waived?

3-221

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I can assure the honourable Member that I have concerns for the welfare and interests of her constituents, not least because we share constituents, representing as I do the constituents of Paisley and Renfrewshire South in Scotland.

I am respectful of her experience, not least in the field of constitutional law, but I would simply state what seems to me an obvious point, i.e. that my responsibilities today are not to explain or to articulate the position of the British Government in

relation to this particular policy issue, but instead to outline the position of the European Union Presidency of which Britain holds the chair at the moment.

I would therefore be perfectly content if the honourable Member would wish to write to me on a bilateral basis on the specific points that she has raised in order that we could ensure that a reply be directed towards the Home Office in the United Kingdom. But I would hesitate to go further than that, given that it is not really the appropriate focus for our discussions in this Chamber this afternoon.

3-222

Sarah Ludford (ALDE). – I note that in relation to the question on alcohol guidelines the Minister commented on UK practice, so I am sure he is prepared to do so on this subject: does this practice in the UK not jar with EU free movement rules in the developing concept of European citizenship?

If one of my constituents who has been caught by the new rule and whose marriage is accepted by the government moves to France, she would have the right to have her husband with her. So, the bizarre effect is that couples get greater protection of their right to family life in an EU country other than their own. There is a strong European dimension to this, so I believe it is apt to ask the UK Minister to answer as Presidency.

3-223

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Well, Mr President, it was a valiant attempt in the supplementary to try and draw us into a discussion of Britain's domestic policy, but I think the appropriate response, and one which is genuinely respectful to this Chamber, is to address ourselves to the points that have been raised in responding as the Presidency.

I have already made an offer to one of the Member's parliamentary colleagues that if she wishes to write directly to me, I will facilitate the correspondence being passed on to the Home Office in the United Kingdom, but I think, not least given the constraints of time always upon us during Question Time, it is important that we focus on questions to the Council at this stage, rather than to continue what is an appropriate discussion within respective Member States.

3-224

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 6 de Frank Vanhecke (H-0900/05)

Assunto: Censura à Internet na China

Em 25 de Setembro de 2005, o Ministério da Informação chinês promulgou legislação relativa à difusão de informação na Internet. Esta última não pode incitar à comparência em reuniões ilegais, à pertença a associações ilegais e à participação em manifestações ilegais que perturbem a ordem social.

A nova legislação destina-se tanto aos sites como ao correio electrónico. Ela pretende impedir toda a difusão de informação (notícias, comentários, etc.) que não seja previamente verificada e filtrada pelo regime. Os portais da Internet têm a obrigação de recolher todas as notícias e comentários das fontes noticiosas oficiais. No que respeita ao correio electrónico, todos os particulares e os grupos privados têm de registrar-se primeiro como "organização noticiosa" e só depois podem eles próprios divulgar notícias (ou análises destas).

Ainda antes da promulgação desta legislação, em 22 de Setembro de 2005, o Sr. Zheng Yichun foi condenado a sete anos de prisão por ter incitado na Internet a reformas políticas.

De que forma irá o Conselho abordar esta nova violação fundamental da liberdade de expressão pelo governo chinês? Neste contexto, irá o Conselho discutir também o caso do Sr. Zheng Yichun e exortar à sua libertação?

3-225

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – In reply to Question 6, the Council shares the concerns of the honourable Member regarding restrictions on freedom of expression, including on the internet in China. The European Union has most recently expressed these concerns in the context of the EU-China human rights dialogue, which took place on 24 and 25 October 2005 in Beijing. The European Union has also repeatedly raised this issue in other bilateral meetings, including at the highest level.

With a view to China's signature and the process of ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it is of particular importance that freedom of expression be guaranteed in line with international standards. Article 19 of the ICCPR was therefore the subject of a recent legal seminar of European Union and Chinese academics and practitioners that took place in Beijing in June 2005 in the context of this dialogue. The joint recommendations that resulted from that seminar were handed over to the Chinese side during that last dialogue.

As part of the dialogue and in the context of the European Union guidelines on human rights defenders, the European Union has raised with the Chinese authorities a number of cases of individuals detained for peacefully expressing their opinions, asking for more details on their fate and pressing for their release.

3-226

Frank Vanhecke (NI). – Voorzitter, ik dank vanzelfsprekend de Raad voor dit antwoord. Ik heb echter toch de indruk dat daar van de kant van de Chinese regering, dat daar op een aantal welwillende verklaringen na, eigenlijk concreet zeer weinig gebeurt. Ik heb de indruk dat van onze kant, van de kant van de Raad en van de Europese Unie, toch voor een stuk met twee maten wordt gemeten en twee gewichten wordt gewogen en dat met name China toch voor een flink stuk wordt ontzien omwille van de macht van het getal en omwille van de vanzelfsprekend zeer grote economische belangen in dit land.

Ik denk persoonlijk dat de Raad, wanneer het om zeer essentiële mensenrechten en zeer essentiële vrije meningsuiting gaat, toch een hardere, meer principiële en meer moedige politiek zou moeten voeren. Ik zou de Raad willen vragen om, indien dat mogelijk is, het concrete geval dat ik heb aangehaald, nogmaals te bestuderen en misschien ook in dit concrete geval met de Chinese autoriteiten contact op te nemen.

3-227

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – The supplementary question ranges more widely than simply the specific case and the concerns regarding censorship of the internet and questions as to whether there is an effective response to the European Union's pleas and discussions with China in relation to human rights. There is a fundamental choice to be made as to whether isolating any one country with which we have disagreements on standards of human rights is the right way forward.

The European Union has taken a view historically that to have a structured dialogue and to have engagement is the best means of effecting the kind of change I am sure all Members of this Parliament would wish to see. The dialogue has, for example, encouraged China to become more involved in international human rights mechanisms, including the ratification in March 2001 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. China received the European Union's Special Representative on Education in 2003, the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention in 2004 and we very much hope that China will receive the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture this year.

I can assure the honourable Member that the dialogue is both very open and very frank and, as I sought to reflect in my initial answer to his question, this is a dialogue that takes place not simply at official level but at the very highest levels of the contact that exists between the European Union and China.

3-228

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 7 de Richard James Ashworth (H-0901/05)

Assunto: Relatório anual do Tribunal de Contas

No decurso desta semana, o Tribunal de Contas Europeu deverá publicar o seu relatório anual sobre as actividades financeiras da União Europeia. Nos últimos dez anos, o Tribunal não conseguiu apresentar uma declaração de fiabilidade satisfatória, o que consideramos inaceitável.

Que medidas tomou a Presidência do Reino Unido para rectificar esta situação? Pode o Conselho garantir-me que, no próximo ano, podemos esperar uma declaração de fiabilidade positiva para as actividades financeiras da UE?

3-229

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – The Council shares the concerns expressed by the honourable Member regarding the fact that for the past 11 years the European Court of Auditors has been unable to give, in its annual reports, a statement indicating that there was a reasonable assurance as to the legality and regularity of most of the underlying transactions. However, for the 2004 accounts the Court was able to give assurance on the legality and regularity of underlying transactions for pre-accession assistance as well as on own-resources and administration. For the first time, the Court has been able to conclude that the Integrated Administration and Control System – IACS – has reduced the risk of error for most agricultural expenditure to an acceptable level.

I can assure the House that the Council has consistently attached great importance to this issue and has regularly expressed its concern about the level of errors in transactions underlying payments and weaknesses in the control system.

As Members of the House will know, the Council has examined the recent Commission communication on a roadmap to an integrated internal control framework, which is part of the process towards a positive statement of assurance. The UK Presidency and the Commission established a panel of experts which helped prepare a draft Council conclusion on this issue. The Council adopted conclusions on 8 November 2005, confirming that achieving a positive statement of assurance is the European Union's objective and listing a series of recommendations for action by the Commission and by Member States. The Council considers those conclusions to be an important step towards a positive statement of assurance and will continue to support the Commission's efforts to contribute actively to improving the financial management of the European Union at all levels, but the decision lies ultimately in the hands of the Court of Auditors.

3-230

Philip Bushill-Matthews (PPE-DE), deputising for the author. – I accept that in your reply you acknowledge that there have been some improvements, but I hope that the Presidency will also accept that we have had lots of recommendations for action before but been a little bit short on action.

Very briefly, the information note from the European Court of Auditors says on page 7 that the adaptations and validations necessary to ensure the full implementation of the new accounting framework have been delayed. Why, and for how long? On page 8 it concludes that CAP expenditure was still materially affected by errors. Why? It adds that on internal policies the risk of errors will persist unless the legal framework is changed. Will it be changed and when?

We should all accept that these problems are not the fault of the Presidency. But will the Presidency accept that it has a responsibility to press for actions on these recommendations and could it perhaps write to me on the specific points that I have just raised?

3-231

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I can assure the honourable Member that these are matters that we take extremely seriously. Indeed in the remarks that were made by my ministerial colleague the Foreign Secretary in this House this afternoon, he made clear that ‘failure to sign off accounts for the eleventh successive year, which is very poor, affects the climate of debate in all our countries’. So at every level of the British Government and in the course of our Presidency, we have recognised the need to take forward work on this issue. That is why we have been working with the Commission to improve financial management and control of the budget.

In January 2005, the Commission introduced a new accounting system, which should offer the Court of Auditors better information as the basis for giving a positive opinion on the presentation of accounts. The new system, I understand, will be used to produce the accounts for 2005. The Presidency also secured Member States’ agreement at the 8 November ECOFIN Council on a package of further proposals for improvements in financial management and control, known as I described in my earlier answer as the roadmap, which the Commission has put forward.

So I can assure the honourable Member that this is not simply a matter of concern to the British Presidency, but one which, in the course of that ECOFIN meeting and in support of the renewed efforts of the Commission, we have been determined to take forward. He is generous in acknowledging the fact that this problem, because it is a real problem for the European Union, long predates the British Presidency. I hope that in the course of the six months of the British Presidency, we will have been able to play our part in resolving what has been a long-standing issue, which has brought no credit to the European Union and on which I hope a way forward can be found in the months and years to come.

3-232

David Martin (PSE). – Would the President-in-Office accept that there are few, if any, individuals in Brussels stuffing their pockets with money? Would he also accept that most of the complaints that the Court of Auditors brings forward concern systems and procedures, and not fraud in its narrow sense, and that if fraud does occur it is generally in donor countries or, indeed, sometimes in the Member States of the European Union?

3-233

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – The honourable Member is of course right to acknowledge that although the European Court of Auditors’ report concerns the European Union accounts, 80% of the spending under that is in fact implemented by Member States through agriculture and structural funds. However, we must be take care not to simply deploy that argument in case we are perceived to be complacent in the face of the challenge we face. I would simply reiterate the point the Foreign Secretary made earlier, which is that, in the hands of those who are hostile towards the very idea of the European Union, the failure to sign off the accounts for the eleventh year is ammunition which we should certainly endeavour not to provide in the years ahead.

It is certainly true that action needs to be taken at Member State level rather than simply at the bureaucratic level within Brussels, but that should not in any way provide an excuse for the action that other Members have called for not being taken both in Brussels and at Member State level.

All of us with an interest in building and sustaining support for the European Union and its efforts amongst European citizens have a strong vested interest in seeing this long-standing problem being resolved. That will involve action at the Member State level, but it will also involve the kind of important work that we took forward at Ecofin and which, I am glad to say, has the support of the European Commission.

3-234

Christopher Beazley (PPE-DE). – I wish to follow Mr Martin’s observation to the Presidency-in-Office, because the President-in-Office used the expression ‘has brought no credit to the European Union’, as if somehow the European Union is a different institution from our national institutions. I simply should like to emphasise the fact that the reason the Court of Auditors has found it difficult to sign off the accounts is not because of corruption in the European Union – as distinct from the Member States – but because the Member States do not assist the European Union to give the sort of valid accountancy that the Court of Auditors and EU institutions require.

I wish to ask the President-in-Office to give the public confidence that, of course, we must be scrupulous; but it is not somebody else's fault: it is our Member States' fault.

3-235

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – With the greatest respect to the honourable Member, I disagree that the best way to tackle this problem that has existed for 11 years is somehow to get into an apportionment of responsibility which suggests that one is better than the other, or vice versa.

The challenge, surely, is to recognise that there is a shared problem. It would simply be disingenuous if I were to suggest that this does not present a very considerable reputational risk to the European Union, not least in the way that this failure to secure a statement of assurance for the eleventh year running has been presented in newspapers in a number of countries across the European Union, rather than get into a 'who is right, who is wrong' argument.

The challenge is to find solutions that reflect the respective responsibilities of the Commission, the bureaucracy in Brussels and the Member States, but it is not an adequate response to the fact that, for 11 years, a statement of assurance has not been forthcoming simply to say that this is a matter for Member States and therefore there is no shared responsibility to find a way forward. There is a shared responsibility on all of us who wish to see statements of assurance being forthcoming in the future to take the very kind of practical steps that the Commission's proposals represented and that, I am glad to say, we advanced during the British Presidency at the recent Ecofin meeting.

3-236

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 8 de Richard Corbett (H-0903/05)

Assunto: Comitologia

Poderá o Conselho informar de que modo está a proceder, após ter retomado a apreciação da proposta de revisão da Decisão de 1999 relativa à comitologia?

Está o Conselho de acordo em que a proposta revista da Comissão, apresentada em 2004, poderia, com apenas algumas alterações, oferecer uma base aceitável para uma solução duradoura da controvérsia sobre comitologia?

Está o Conselho disposto a encarar a alteração da referida proposta, de modo a excluir a possibilidade de a Comissão manter inalterada uma medida de aplicação que tenha sido rejeitada pelo Conselho ou pelo Parlamento?

3-237

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I welcome the question from the honourable Member who I know has a long-running interest in the issue of comitology. He will know that discussions of the Commission's amended proposals resumed once more only in September so I hope that he will understand that it is too early at this stage for me to give a definitive answer to his question on behalf of the Council.

The working group considering the Commission's revised comitology proposal has met three times so far and will meet twice more under the British Presidency. I understand, however, that discussions are going well.

3-238

Richard Corbett (PSE). – May I just thank the Presidency for its answer and urge it to persevere. If we manage to find a solution to this issue which has beleaguered the Union for many years, we will be making a notable contribution to our endeavours to regulate better. So much now comes to three readings each in Parliament and Council that really ought to be delegated to the executive. But we will not delegate unless we have the guarantee that we can, if necessary, call things back, in the same way that the Council can. Equality between Parliament and Council is the key to this. If there is better opportunity for scrutiny, we will in turn be willing to delegate much more readily.

3-239

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I pay due tribute to both the experience and expertise of the honourable Member on this matter. I find myself in concurrence with his view, both as to the importance of this issue and to the fact that we need to persevere. I can assure him that, from a Presidency point of view, we are persevering on this important point and will continue to do so.

Finally, I just wish to reiterate that, notwithstanding the fact that these discussions only resumed in September, I am glad to say that real progress has been made in the discussions that have already taken place. I am optimistic that further substantial progress can be made in the two remaining meetings during the British Presidency.

3-240

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 9 de Sajjad Karim (H-0905/05)

Assunto: Inconsistência nas abordagens dos ministros relativamente ao equilíbrio entre segurança e direitos humanos

Num período de apenas duas semanas, recebemos mensagens contraditórias de dois ministros do Governo do Reino Unido, actual detentor da Presidência do Conselho. No seu prefácio ao Relatório Anual 2005 da UE relativo aos Direitos Humanos, publicado em 3 de Outubro, Jack Straw, ministro britânico dos Negócios Estrangeiros, citou Kofi Annan: "Não teremos desenvolvimento sem segurança, não teremos segurança sem desenvolvimento e não teremos nenhum dos dois sem respeito pelos direitos humanos". Além disso, Jack Straw declarou que "é fundamental que continuemos não apenas a reafirmar estes valores, mas a insistir na sua validade". Todavia, em 26 de Setembro, o ministro do Interior do Reino Unido, Charles Clarke, foi citado no New Statesman, sendo-lhe atribuída a opinião de que "a ter de escolher entre segurança e a Convenção dos Direitos do Homem, [...] a primeira responsabilidade é a segurança nacional". Pode o Conselho conciliar estas declarações aparentemente contraditórias? Se tal não for possível, qual das duas representa mais aproximadamente o ponto de vista do Conselho: a ter de escolher entre segurança e direitos humanos, qual seria a sua prioridade?

3-241

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – All governments face the challenge of dealing with the current unprecedented threat of global terrorism. However, there is no choice to be made between security and human rights. Without security there are no human rights, and without human rights there is no security.

Following the attacks in London on 7 July this year, the Council held an extraordinary meeting on 13 July. At this meeting the Council adopted a declaration on the European Union response to those terrible bombings. In the declaration the Council made it clear that, and I quote directly: 'the attacks are an affront to universal values on which the European Union is based. Central to those values is a commitment to democratic and open institutions and societies governed by the rule of law within which people of all faiths and backgrounds can live, work and prosper together. The terrorists who reject that commitment and seek to use violence to impose their ideas will be defeated'. They added thereafter that the European Union was strengthening, and again I quote directly: 'its commitment to combating terrorism and upholding the fundamental principles of freedom, security and justice'.

3-242

Sajjad Karim (ALDE). – Thank you for your response. I accept that this is a matter in which there ought to be more choice and it is an issue of striking the right balance.

What I would like to know is: in what way does the detention of persons without charge, the refusal to provide meaningful information for the reasons for detention and the removal of a lawyer's right to take meaningful instructions in such matters either reaffirm these values or assert their validity?

3-243

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I would suggest respectfully that the honourable Member is trying to tempt me into discussions as to the approaches or suggested approaches of one Member State or another, when my responsibility today is to speak on behalf of the Council. I can assure him that from a Presidency point of view the statement that I shared with Parliament and which was agreed by Council Members on 13 July is a strong basis on which, as a united front, we can confront the threat of international terrorism. Let us be very clear: the terrorists want to deny us not just life, through their vicious and unprecedented attacks on us, but also our way of life. That is why I think the statement made by the Council on 13 July is such a strong reflection of pan-European sentiments as to how we should deal with these challenges.

3-244

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 10 de Hélène Goudin (H-0908/05)

Assunto: Orçamentos de defesa dos Estados-Membros da UE

Em 14 de Outubro de 2005, a imprensa sueca noticiou que o Ministro da Defesa britânico, John Reid, se pronunciara publicamente no sentido de que os Estados-Membros da UE devem aumentar as verbas atribuídas aos respectivos sectores da defesa. De acordo com a mesma imprensa, o Ministro da Defesa declarou que um nível razoável para os orçamentos de defesa dos Estados-Membros corresponde a cerca de 2,5% do PNB, o que equivale ao montante afectado pelo Reino Unido. No ano transacto, as despesas da Suécia com a defesa ascenderam a 1,7% do PNB deste país.

Será a opinião geral da Presidência do Conselho que os Estados-Membros da UE devem diligenciar no sentido de atribuírem à defesa verbas equivalentes à do Reino Unido? Considera a Presidência do Conselho que os Estados-Membros da UE que, como a Suécia, gastam menos de 2% do PNB com a defesa, devem aumentar os montantes atribuídos este sector? Considera a Presidência do Conselho que esta questão constitui, antes de mais, uma questão comum a toda a UE ou que compete aos Estados-Membros decidir do nível de PNB mais adequado para o orçamento da defesa?

3-245

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – The Council has not discussed the level of Member States' defence budgets as this is a national responsibility.

As regards defence capabilities, ways are being sought to improve them by increasing levels of research spending, as well as research collaboration, tackling capability gaps and training. For this reason, and following up on the discussion at the informal Heads of Government meeting in Hampton Court, the Presidency has asked the High Representative, in association where appropriate with the Presidency, the future Presidency and the European Commission, to take forward

work in this particular area. Working with the Presidency, the High Representative will present a summary of his initial orientations ahead of the December European Council.

3-246

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 11 de Dimitrios Papadimoulis (H-0912/05)

Assunto: Acordo sobre as perspectivas financeiras para 2007/2013

Uma das principais prioridades da Presidência, tal como foram apresentadas ao Parlamento Europeu a 23 de Junho de 2005, é fazer progressos na questão do financiamento da UE e das perspectivas financeiras para 2007/2013. Tendo em conta que um acordo de última hora dificultará a programação atempada e a correcta aplicação dos programas plurianuais da comunidade, pode o Conselho informar em que fase se encontram as conversações sobre este tema específico. Que iniciativas tenciona tomar para que se chegue a um acordo antes do final da Presidência britânica?

3-247

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, the Presidency is fully aware of the importance of reaching an agreement on the new financial perspective by the end of the year and will do everything it can to facilitate this. This has been something of a recurring theme of the discussions in the Chamber this afternoon. To this end, the Council undertook a series of bilateral consultations with Member States during the summer and discussions on this issue resumed in the Council on 7 November. They will continue, of course, at the General Affairs Council on Monday, 21 November. The Presidency will continue to work towards an agreement, but until such time as it might be ready to submit to the Council an overall compromise proposal, it cannot comment on what such a proposal might or might not contain.

3-248

Δημήτριος Παπαδημούλης (GUE/NGL). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, σκοπεύετε να κοινοποιήσετε στο Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο, πριν από τη σύνοδο κορυφής του Δεκεμβρίου, το συμβιβαστικό κείμενο που ετοιμάζει η Προεδρία;

Με δεδομένο ότι το Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο πρωτοστάτησε τον Ιούνιο στην αποτροπή μιας συμφωνίας, έχει ειλικρινή διάθεση η Προεδρία να μετακινηθεί προκειμένου να επιτευχθεί μία συμφωνία των εικοσιπέντε;

Αναλογίζεσθε στο Συμβούλιο ότι η Βρετανική Προεδρία κινδυνεύει να αποδειχθεί μία από τις πιο αναποτελεσματικές και αποτυχημένες στην ιστορία της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης;

3-249

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – My colleague the Foreign Secretary indicated that this was the 47th appearance of a British Minister in the course of the Presidency before this Parliament. I can assure the honourable Member that I will be back in my customary place in the course of the further plenary sessions of this Parliament. Our Prime Minister has committed himself to coming back to speak to Parliament. Whatever other criticisms or scepticism may be directed toward the British Presidency, a lack of discussion with the European Parliament is perhaps not one of the most forceful.

3-250

Esko Seppänen (GUE/NGL). – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa puheenjohtajavaltion edustaja, käytän tilaisuutta hyväkseni, koska olen laatinut oman kysymyksen samasta asiasta, kysymyksen numero 17, johon ei ehkä ehditä vastaamaan tämän kyselytunnin aikana. Kysyn, onko mahdollista, että tähän kompromissitykseen sisältyy myös maatalouden yhteisrahoitusmenettely, jotta päästään sopimukseen Yhdystyneen kuningaskunnan ja sen erityisen jäsenmaksualennuksen poistamisesta?

3-251

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I admire the opportunism of the honourable Member in seizing the chance of a supplementary to raise the issue he was going to bring up in Question 17. I would simply, perhaps disappointingly, reiterate to him my earlier response to the effect that it really would not be appropriate, given the delicacy and importance of the issues that are being discussed and that will be taken forward in the course of our Presidency, to try and draw out a particular element of the potential package around which we hope to secure consensus in December.

3-252

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 12 de Nils Lundgren (H-0916/05)

Assunto: A segurança jurídica na UE

Desde 1998 que o cidadão sueco Lech Sierpinski está sujeito a uma proibição de viajar na Polónia, o que o impede de deixar este país. Como cidadão estrangeiro na Polónia, nos últimos sete anos Lech Sierpinski não tem gozado de direitos fundamentais, como o acesso ao sistema de saúde e a uma autorização de trabalho, não podendo já continuar a financiar as despesas de advogado.

Todos os Estados-Membros da UE devem preencher os critérios de Copenhaga e assinaram a Convenção Europeia que, entre outros, estabelece o direito a uma protecção jurídica efectiva e a um processo judicial justo.

Con quanto ciente da dificuldade de comentar casos específicos, gostaria de perguntar se a Presidência do Conselho considera que será possível diligenciar, a nível do Conselho, no sentido de pressionar um Estado-Membro da UE que, como no caso vertente, não satisfaz requisitos razoáveis em matéria de garantias de segurança jurídica?

3-253

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I can be brief in answer to this question. The Council has never debated this question and it is not within its sphere of competence.

3-254

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 13 de Chris Davies (H-0917/05)

Assunto: Transparência e abertura

Que progressos foram feitos em relação ao problema da transparência e da abertura do Conselho, desde que o Presidente do Conselho em exercício respondeu à minha questão H-0567/05¹ sobre esta matéria?

Pergunta nº 14 de Timothy Kirkhope (H-0957/05)

Assunto: Transparência no Conselho

Na sequência da campanha lançada por personalidades políticas britânicas no Parlamento Europeu, que progressos foram feitos pela Presidência para procurar convencer o Conselho a tornar públicas as suas reuniões em nome da transparência, da abertura e da responsabilidade?

3-255

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, following the ongoing debate on transparency and openness in the Council and the exchange of views between the United Kingdom Presidency and Members of the European Parliament on this issue, a first discussion took place in COREPER, the Permanent Representatives' committee, on 19 October. The Presidency is currently exploring, together with the incoming Austrian and Finnish Presidencies, a series of possible measures aimed at further increasing legislative transparency in the Council.

3-256

Chris Davies (ALDE). – I thank the President-in-Office. Let me say what an enormous relief it is to have a few minutes of not debating REACH in endless groups around this Parliament – a few minutes only, I fear. I see that Mr Kirkhope is not here, but I am conscious that he raised this issue in an earlier debate.

I should like to personally thank the President-in-Office for his efforts in this matter. I recognise that he is doing what he can to promote the agenda. I have here a copy of a letter from Mr Rasmussen, the Prime Minister of Denmark, stating that he supports a change in the rules of procedure. I suspect that similar letters could be obtained from Estonia and Sweden to start off with. We already know the British position. That is four votes and you need only another nine. I know the Council prefers to do things by consensus but in order to achieve something of real substance – a real change – should the Presidency not push this to a vote at the next General Affairs Council and name and shame Member States that do not support this position?

3-257

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I am intrigued by the advice being offered by the honourable Member. A strategy of not seeking consensus and naming and shaming is a curious line of argument to advance but I think it indicates the seriousness of the strength of feeling among many honourable Members of this House on this important issue.

The position of the British Government on this matter has been stated by none other than our Prime Minister, but he is right in recognising that the United Kingdom, although acting as Presidency, is not the sole actor on this stage. I fear I will disappoint the honourable Member by pointing out that, because the agenda for Monday is so heavily charged, as not only defence ministers but also development ministers will be involved, we will not discuss transparency next week.

An options paper will be issued in the coming days and it will be discussed by the Anticipatory Group before a discussion in COREPER II. COREPER I will also feed into that process so I am grateful for the generous words of the honourable Member. I can assure him it is a matter on which we are making continued efforts but we are convinced that the way forward is not to address it on 21 November at the forthcoming General Affairs Council, but to seek to make what will be important progress in these other fora which I have described.

3-258

James Hugh Allister (NI). – Mr President-in-Office, you were intrigued by the questioner. I am intrigued by your answer in pretending that the British Government stands in favour of more transparency.

1 Resposta oral de 7.9.2005.

I have in my hand the House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee report published on 24 October. It contains an answer setting out the British Government's position in response to the proposition that there should be meetings of the Council held in public. It says: 'the Government believes that it would not be possible for the European Council to reach agreement on difficult issues which cannot be resolved by the Council of Ministers if it is obliged to work in the full glare of publicity'. So, what is the real stance of the British Government? Are you in favour of transparency, or are you in favour of avoiding working in the full glare of publicity, as this answer suggests?

3-259

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I will answer the honourable Member by saying that, not least as befits the country holding the Presidency of the European Union, the answer will be provided in terms of the Presidency's proposals, because what matters is not the view of one country but the view of the Member States.

When we issue proposals in the coming days, setting out to partners the possible options for increasing transparency in the Council, I can assure the honourable Member, who has spoken with eloquence in terms of the importance he attaches to this issue, that we will be discussing this paper with the incoming Presidencies and also with the Council Secretariat. These options will be taken forward in COREPER, as I said previously, on the basis of the options paper at the Antici meeting later this month. That, I believe, is the constructive way forward to ensure that we get the outcome which so many here seek.

3-260

Richard Corbett (PSE). – Is the Presidency aware of the long history of this issue in that this Parliament has pressed for the Council to meet in public when acting as a legislature ever since it was first elected in 1979? Indeed, the British Presidency in 1976, when represented in the Energy Council by one Tony Benn, took the initiative of saying that Council should meet in public when acting on legislation.

Would he recognise that we have made a lot of progress together in our gradually evolving Constitution, in that the Council now at least publishes the results of all its votes on legislation and grants the public a right of access to documents, but that it would be worth going one last extra step and actually meeting and voting in public when adopting legislation?

3-261

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I defer to the honourable Member in terms of the detail of his historical understanding of this issue, reinforcing the longstanding interest that the Benn family has taken in this matter. It might be of interest to the honourable Member to be aware that this is a matter in which I have been in discussion with Tony Benn's son, because he is now one of the United Kingdom's representatives on the Council of Development Ministers and therefore has a direct interest in the position that we take in that and other Councils. I am glad to say that his observations reflect quite the weight of history that lies behind the important discussions that we are taking forward with Member States at the moment.

In answer to the earlier question, I would simply reiterate the point that our own Prime Minister made when he addressed the European Parliament early in the course of the British Presidency: it is that impulse that has driven us to take forward the discussions at COREPER and that we now anticipate we will take forward in the days ahead.

3-262

Timothy Kirkhope (PPE-DE). – Mr President-in-Office, I apologise to you and the Presidency itself for being late. I spoke with Mr Hilary Benn on Sunday about this very matter when we were at Remembrance Day in Leeds.

I should like to ask the President-in-Office what the position is regarding what I was told by Mr Blair – and indeed what I was told today by Mr Straw – concerning how we go forward with this issue of openness and transparency in terms of the Council. I was told by Mr Blair that it would be fine to go ahead as long as it was within the rules. I was told by Mr Straw this afternoon that two options were being considered. I would like to know whether those options are within the rules or whether we are looking at a change in the rules.

3-263

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – I am grateful to the honourable Member for reinforcing the contemporary nature of these discussions amongst British politicians. I cannot claim to have spoken to Hilary Benn in quite as recent days as he has, but I can assure you that, when I meet him at Cabinet tomorrow morning, I will search out what he told you at the Remembrance Service in Leeds on Sunday.

In relation to the point he makes, however, he will have to wait just a little while longer because, before he re-entered the Chamber this afternoon, I was sharing with other colleagues the process that we are taking forward now: as he knows, there was a discussion at Coreper earlier in the course of the British Presidency. It will not be discussed on 21 November at the General Affairs Council. We have instead decided to set out an options paper which will be issued in the coming days of our Presidency and will then be discussed at the Antici before discussion at COREPER II. COREPER I will also feed into this process. If it would be of help to the honourable Member, I shall certainly ensure that he receives a copy of the options paper when it is issued.

3-264

Presidente. – Pergunta nº 15 de Jonas Sjöstedt (H-0920/05)

Assunto: O acordo de pesca com Marrocos e o apoio do Conselho à ONU

Em resposta a uma anterior pergunta (H-0692/05²) relativa à conclusão de um acordo de pesca entre a UE e Marrocos que inclui os territórios ocupados do Sahara Ocidental, o Conselho declara que “apoia o processo da ONU”.

Em 11 de Outubro, a quarta comissão da Assembleia-Geral da ONU aprovou uma resolução relativa ao direito dos territórios não autónomos aos recursos naturais próprios. A resolução foi apoiada por 137 dos membros presentes, dos quais 22 países são inclusivamente membros da UE. A França e o Reino Unido abstiveram-se e a Dinamarca não esteve presente.

Tendo em conta a anterior referência do Conselho ao seu apoio ao processo da ONU e a resolução, apoiada pela maioria dos Estados-Membros da UE aquando da votação em 11 de Outubro na ONU, poder-se-ia concluir que o acordo de pesca negociado entre a UE e Marrocos não incluirá os territórios do Sahara Ocidental. Pode o Conselho confirmar que os portos e as águas do Sahara Ocidental não serão abrangidos pelo acordo de pesca?

3-265

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, I should like to refer the honourable Member to the Council's reply to his question H-0692/05 of 28 September.

In my reply, I stated that Article 2 of the Fisheries Agreement initialled on 28 July 2005 indicates that it applies ‘to the Moroccan fisheries zone under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Morocco’. This delimitation of the geographical scope of the agreement is identical to the delimitation in the previous agreement that expired in 1999 and does not in any way prejudice the issue of the status of Western Sahara. The initialled agreement is now in the ratification process, which is expected to lead to its formal conclusion in the first quarter of 2006.

3-266

Jonas Sjöstedt (GUE/NGL). – Jag vill tacka rådet för svaret. Problemet med svaret är att det innebär att EU har slutit ett fiskeavtal som betyder att EU kommer att fiska i Västsaharas vatten. Det är ett land som olagligt ockuperas av Marocko. Ingen av EU:s medlemsstater erkänner Marockos suveränitet över Västsahara. Det hjälper inte hur elegant man formulerar detta. Faktum är att ni har slutit eller är på väg att sluta ett avtal som indirekt godtar Marockos överhöghet över Västsahara genom att avtalet omfattar förhandlingar om det ockuperade landets naturresurser. Jag tycker att detta är djupt inkonsekvent och omoraliskt. Jag undrar därför om det inte finns en brist på samstämmighet i rådets politik på detta område.

3-267

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Let me assure the honourable Member that the political status of Western Sahara is being dealt with within the framework of the United Nations. The Council is offering the UN its full support in finding a satisfactory resolution to the question of Western Sahara, and hopes that a resolution of the situation will be forthcoming.

As I stated earlier, the fisheries agreement does not in any way prejudice the issue of the status of Western Sahara. As with the previous longstanding agreement, the new EU-Morocco fisheries agreement applies to ‘the Moroccan fisheries zone under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Morocco’. The fisheries agreement does not in any way prejudice that issue of the status of Western Sahara, as the honourable Member suggests.

3-268

Bernd Posselt (PPE-DE). – Herr Ratspräsident! Ich finde, man kann Marokko nicht einfach, wie der Kollege das getan hat, als Besatzungsmacht bezeichnen. Ich möchte Sie fragen, ob das Westsahara-Problem nicht vielmehr eine koloniale Hinterlassenschaft von uns Europäern ist, und ob wir nicht Verständnis für beide Seiten haben sollten – für die Marokkaner und andere Gruppierungen –, um hier eine echte Kompromisslösung herbeizuführen, die auch die Interessen Marokkos berücksichtigt.

3-269

Douglas Alexander, President-in-Office of the Council. – Let me assure the honourable Member that we are looking for a genuine solution but we recognise that this genuine solution – the political status of the Western Sahara – is being dealt with in the framework of the United Nations. The United Nations enjoys the Council's full support in seeking to find that genuine and satisfactory solution to the question of the Western Sahara. We certainly hope that a resolution of this situation will be forthcoming.

3-270

Presidente. – Às perguntas nºs 16 a 36 serão dadas respostas por escrito³.

3-271

2 Resposta escrita de 13.10.2005.

3 Ver Anexo "Período de perguntas"

13 - Declaração da Presidência

3-272

Presidente. – O Parlamento Europeu está preocupado com as informações vindas a lume sobre as violações dos direitos humanos que estão a verificar-se na Tunísia por ocasião da Cimeira Mundial das Nações Unidas sobre a Sociedade da Informação. Quando o Presidente visitou a Tunísia no ano corrente, e numa declaração feita em Setembro, manifestou a sua decepção relativamente à repressão e ao assédio contra as ONG e os meios de comunicação social na Tunísia, sublinhando que isto contradiz o espírito do acordo de associação UE-Tunísia.

A sociedade da informação representa uma oportunidade imensa para a liberdade de expressão e a troca pacífica de ideias, permitindo aproximar as pessoas para além das fronteiras e das culturas. Aquilo que deveria ter sido uma celebração de progresso transformou-se numa situação triste, manchada pelo assédio contra os defensores tunisinos e internacionais dos direitos humanos e os representantes dos meios de comunicação social e pelo entrave das actividades desenvolvidas através da Internet na Tunísia em prol da democracia e dos direitos humanos.

A delegação do Parlamento Europeu à Cimeira das Nações Unidas sobre a Sociedade da Informação (chefeada pela Sra. Trautman) não deixará por certo de expressar os nossos pontos de vista na própria reunião e na cimeira paralela de cidadãos que terão lugar esta semana. Lamentamos as acções das autoridades destinadas a impedir a realização deste significativo evento pacífico.

Como ficou claro na recente resolução do PE, apoiamos inteiramente todos aqueles que trabalham pacificamente para o desenvolvimento da democracia e do primado do direito na Tunísia.

(A sessão, suspensa às 19h05, é reiniciada às 21 horas)

3-273

ZA PŘEDSEDNICTVÍ: PAN OUZKÝ Místopředseda

3-274

14 - Normy humánního lovú určitých druhů živočichů do pastí

3-275

Předseda. – Dalším bodem pořadu jednání je zpráva Karin Scheele za Výbor pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin o návrhu směrnice Evropského parlamentu a Rady, kterou se pro určité druhy živočichů zavádějí normy humánního lovú do pastí (KOM(2004)0532 - C6-0100/2005 - 2004/0183(COD)) (A6-0304/2005).

3-276

Σταύρος Δήμας, Μέλος της Επιτροπής. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχήν θα ήθελα να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια για την πολύ ειλικρινή και επιμελή εργασία της και θα ήθελα να πω ότι η υπό συζήτηση πρόταση οδηγίας αποσκοτεί στη θέσπιση προτύπων για την εξασφάλιση σχετικά ανεκτών συνθηκών αιχμαλωσίας για τα ζώα που παγιδεύονται.

Η πρόταση αυτή υπαγορεύεται από την υποχρέωση εκπλήρωσης διεθνών δεσμεύσεων της Ευρωπαϊκής Κοινότητας έναντι του Καναδά, της Ρωσίας και των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών. Αυτές οι διεθνείς δεσμεύσεις και υποχρεώσεις απορρέουν από τη συμφωνία για τα διεθνή πρότυπα μη βάναυσης παγίδευσης που υπεγράφη το 1998 μεταξύ της Ευρωπαϊκής Κοινότητας, του Καναδά και της Ρωσικής Ομοσπονδίας, όπως επίσης και από μία άλλη συμφωνία ιδίου περιεχομένου η οποία υπεγράφη μεταξύ της Ευρωπαϊκής Κοινότητας και των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών υπό μορφήν συμφωνηθέντων πρακτικών.

Η συμφωνία με τον Καναδά και τη Ρωσία, η οποία έχει ήδη επικυρωθεί από την Ευρωπαϊκή Κοινότητα και τον Καναδά, θα τεθεί σε ισχύ αμέσως μετά την επικείμενη επικύρωση από τη Ρωσία, διαδικασία η οποία, σύμφωνα με επίσημη ενημέρωση προς την Επιτροπή, έχει ήδη δρομολογηθεί. Επομένως, εάν δεν θεσπισθεί σχετική κοινοτική νομοθεσία, η Ευρωπαϊκή Κοινότητα δεν θα είναι σε θέση να τηρήσει τις διεθνείς δεσμεύσεις της όταν θα ισχύσει η συμφωνία.

Το πεδίο εφαρμογής της προτεινόμενης οδηγίας είναι πράγματι περιορισμένο. Εν τούτοις, σε περίπτωση υιοθέτησής της θα παρέχει ένα πλαίσιο για τη θέσπιση κοινών προτύπων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για να περιορίζεται ο άσκοπος βασανισμός και η ταλαιπωρία των ζώων που έχουν παγιδεύτες. Τα προτεινόμενα πρότυπα βασίζονται στα αποτελέσματα σοβαρής επιστημονικής εργασίας στο πλαίσιο του Διεθνούς Οργανισμού Προτύπων και έχουν μάλιστα υιοθετηθεί από τη Διεθνή Ένωση Διατήρησης του Περιβάλλοντος.

Η πρόταση προβλέπει επίσης ότι τα κράτη μέλη δύνανται να διατηρούν σε ισχύ και να εφαρμόζουν αυστηρότερες εθνικές διατάξεις. Πέραν τούτου, το σχέδιο οδηγίας συμπληρώνει και δεν αφαιρεί από τα υφιστάμενα πρότυπα, βάσει της ισχύουσας κοινοτικής νομοθεσίας. Για παράδειγμα, η απαγόρευση στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση της χρήσης παγίδων με σιαγόνες, βάσει του κανονισμού 3254/91 του Συμβουλίου, θα εξακολουθεί να ισχύει και μετά την υιοθέτηση της νέας οδηγίας.

Πρέπει να τονίσω ότι, κατά τη διάρκεια της διαδικασίας, είμαστε διατεθειμένοι να εξετάσουμε τις σχετικές τροπολογίες ώστε να ληφθούν υπόψη οι ανησυχίες που εξέφρασαν διάφορες πολιτικές ομάδες και πολλές φιλοζωικές οργανώσεις και η Επιτροπή προτίθεται να εξακολουθήσει να εργάζεται προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση.

Η απόρριψη της πρότασης σημαίνει ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση θα παραμείνει χωρίς πρότυπα παγίδευσης στο άμεσο μέλλον, όπως επίσης και ότι η Ευρωπαϊκή Κοινότητα δεν θα είναι σε θέση να εκπληρώσει τις διεθνείς υποχρεώσεις της.

Τελειώνοντας, θα ήθελα να υπογραμμίσω ότι θα λάβω υπόψη την άποψη του Κοινοβουλίου και θα αξιολογήσω τις θέσεις που διατυπώθηκαν τόσο στο Κοινοβούλιο όσο και στο Συμβούλιο. Επ' αυτής της βάσεως, η Επιτροπή θα αποφασίσει για τις περαιτέρω ενέργειες περιλαμβανομένης της πιθανής απόσυρσης της προτάσεως. Παράλληλα, η Επιτροπή σχεδιάζει την κατάρτιση μελέτης με σκοπό να εκσυγχρονίσει την επιστημονική βάση για οποιαδήποτε πρόταση για τη θέσπιση προτύπων για παγίδευση. Θα περιλαμβάνονται βεβαίως και οι σχετικές διαβουλεύσεις με τα ενδιαφερόμενα μέρη.

Θα ήθελα, τέλος, να εκφράσω την επιθυμία να συνεχίσω στο μέλλον την καλή συνεργασία μαζί σας.

3-277

Karin Scheele (PSE), Berichterstatterin. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nach einer sehr angespannten Diskussion zur Chemikalienpolitik ist es auch wieder einmal ganz entspannend, ein Thema zu behandeln, zu dem es im Ausschuss für Umweltfragen, Volksgesundheit und Lebensmittelsicherheit bereits eine sehr breite Mehrheit gegeben hat und – wie ich annehme – auch morgen geben wird.

Der Kommissionsvorschlag von 2004 – und das wurde von Herrn Kommissar Dimas gesagt – ist das Umsetzungsinstrument des internationalen Abkommens. Im Umweltausschuss wurde mein Vorschlag, den Kommissionsvorschlag abzulehnen, fast einheitlich angenommen, mit 47 Stimmen dafür, 3 dagegen und 2 Enthaltungen. Die Gründe für meine Ablehnung sind folgende:

Da der Vorschlag unter das Kapitel Umweltpolitik fällt, ist die Europäische Union verpflichtet, den Gesetzesvorschlag auf die neuesten wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnisse zu stützen. Diese Grundlage fehlt. Es wurde nur das vor fast zehn Jahren ausgehandelte Übereinkommen fast wortgleich übernommen. Darüber hinaus bestehen rechtliche Unstimmigkeiten zwischen dem Vorschlag und anderen EU-Rechtsvorschriften, zum Beispiel der Richtlinie zum Schutz von Versuchstieren und der Habitat-Richtlinie. Der Kommissionsvorschlag erlaubt das Fangen und Töten von Tieren, die durch die Habitat-Richtlinie geschützt sind. Unter gewissen Voraussetzungen können Fangmethoden und Fallen nötig sein, das wissen wir alle, aber die Bezeichnung der Richtlinie als Festlegung von humanen Fangnormen haben wir von Anfang an als nicht passend dargestellt. Der Vorschlag ist generell sehr schwach und wird nichts ausrichten, um das Leiden von mit Fallen gefangenem bzw. getöteten Tieren zu verringern.

Ich glaube, und das hat auch der Herr Kommissar klar gemacht, um die starke Ablehnung des Europäischen Parlaments zu verstehen, muss man auch geschichtlich etwas ausholen. Das Europäische Parlament verabschiedete 1989 eine Entschließung, in der ein Verbot von Tellereisen in der Europäischen Union sowie ein Verbot der Einfuhr von Pelzen und Pelzwaren aus Ländern, in denen Tellereisen verwendet werden, gefordert wird. Als Reaktion darauf wurde 1991 eine Verordnung zu diesem Thema verabschiedet. Mit dieser Verordnung werden ab 1995 die Verwendung von Tellereisen und die Einfuhr von Pelzen von dreizehn namentlich aufgeführten Tierarten aus Drittländern verboten. Dieses Verbot gilt nicht, wenn eine der beiden Bedingungen erfüllt ist. Das ist auch der Grund, warum es zu diesen internationalen Abkommen gekommen ist. Es gelten angemessene Rechts- oder Verwaltungsvorschriften, die Tellereisen verbieten, es sei denn, die bei den genannten Tieren angewandten Fangmethoden erfüllen international vereinbarte humane Fangnormen.

Nach dieser EU-Verordnung wurde die Notwendigkeit, Fangnormen auf internationaler Ebene aufzustellen, vordringlich, um das Einfuhrverbot zu verhindern. Wegen Drohungen der USA und Kanadas, diese Einfuhrbeschränkungen bei der WTO anzufechten, wurde zwischen der EU, Kanada, Russland und den USA ein Übereinkommen ausgehandelt. Bisher haben allerdings nur die Europäische Union und Kanada das Übereinkommen ratifiziert. Die im Übereinkommen vorgeschriebenen Fangnormen spiegeln Normen, die in Russland, Kanada und USA bereits gelten und keinesfalls als human eingestuft werden können. Bereits 1997 verabschiedet das Europäische Parlament einen Bericht, in dem es die internationale Vereinbarung als völlig unzureichend in Bezug auf das Befinden der Tiere sowie auf die Umweltzielsetzung bezeichnet. Der Beitritt zu diesem Übereinkommen war für das Europäische Parlament völlig unannehmbar. Eine Vereinbarung, die nicht die geringste Garantie dafür bietet, dass die anderen Parteien die Verwendung sämtlicher Tellereisen innerhalb eines raschen und festgelegten Zeitplans einstellen, sollte nicht zur ernsthaften Erwägung vorgeschlagen werden. Dieser Bericht wurde 1997 mit einer großen Mehrheit in diesem Haus angenommen.

Das war der geschichtliche Rückblick. Ich hoffe, dass wir morgen eine breite parlamentarische Mehrheit für die Ablehnung eines aus meiner Sicht sehr schlechten Kommissionsvorschlags erhalten, und ich hoffe auch, dass die Kommission das nötige demokratische Verständnis beweist und diesen Vorschlag für eine Richtlinie zurückziehen wird.

3-278

Horst Schnellhardt, im Namen der PPE-DE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! Mein Dank gilt am Anfang der Berichterstatterin, Frau Scheele, für die sehr faire, ja schon angenehme Zusammenarbeit bei der Erstellung des heutigen Berichts, obwohl wir ja nicht in allen Fragen der gleichen Meinung sind. Im Ergebnis sind wir uns aber einig. Ich kann einfach sagen: Viele Wege führen nach Rom.

Der heutige Tagesordnungspunkt kennzeichnet die Besonderheit des Europäischen Parlaments. Wir beschäftigen uns mit der Umsetzung eines internationalen Übereinkommens zwischen Kanada, den USA, Russland und der EU, obwohl dieses Übereinkommen von diesem Parlament – die Berichterstatterin hat das schon gesagt – 1998 abgelehnt wurde. So etwas gibt es eben nur im Europäischen Parlament.

Für mich ist diese Situation nicht so problematisch, ich habe damals dem Übereinkommen zugestimmt bzw. ich habe damals gegen die Ablehnung gestimmt, weil ich eigentlich das Vertrauen hatte, dass die geforderten Standards in den beteiligten Ländern umgesetzt würden, und weil ich großes Interesse daran hatte, dass die Lebensgrundlage für die indigenen Völker in diesen Ländern erhalten bleibe und sie ihren Verdienst mit dem Handel von Fellen erzielen könnten.

Weil der Handel erleichtert wurde, ist das sicher auch zu vertreten. Aber eines wurde auch erreicht – und auch deshalb habe ich damals zugestimmt: Grausame tierquälische Fällen wurden verboten. Das waren, wenn man das Beispiel Tellereisen nimmt, teilweise die reinsten Folterinstrumente. Erreicht wurde dies dank langjährigen Drucks durch das Europäische Parlament, durch die Europäische Kommission, aber auch durch die Tierschutzorganisationen.

Die heute vorliegende Richtlinie der Europäischen Kommission beinhaltet alle Maßnahmen der Übereinkommen, die den Handel, d.h. in erster Linie den Import von Fellen in die Europäische Union, ermöglichen. Deshalb sind wir der Meinung, dass die Umsetzung der Richtlinie den Binnenmarkt betrifft und deshalb der Rechtsgrundlage Artikel 95 unterliegen sollte. Dass dies nicht der Fall ist, ist auch ein Grund, weshalb wir diesen Bericht ablehnen.

Ich möchte die Kommission auf meine Änderungsanträge aufmerksam machen, die wohl nicht die Mehrheit im Parlament fanden. Manchmal ist die Zeit für bestimmte Regelungen eben noch nicht reif. Ich habe vorgeschlagen, dass diese Vorschläge der Kommission in eine Verordnung münden, durch die die Mitgliedstaaten aufgefordert wären, die Übereinkommen umzusetzen, durch die sie also verpflichtet wären, mit allen Randerscheinungen – Berichterstattung usw. Ich denke, dass das ein guter Ansatz ist.

Ich stimme der Berichterstatterin auch darin zu, dass wir Verbesserungen bei den Parametern erreichen und auch die Forschung einfordern sollten. Doch dies ist Sache der Mitgliedstaaten, nicht der Europäischen Union. Die Bedingungen in den Ländern sind so unterschiedlich, da müssen wir die Subsidiarität schon beachten. Deshalb unsere Ablehnung des Vorschlags der Kommission.

3-279

Dorette Corbey, namens de PSE-Fractie. – Voorzitter, ik zal het proberen. We staan vandaag of eigenlijk morgen voor een heel vervelende beslissing. We gaan stemmen vóór verwerving van het voorstel van de Commissie, maar in mijn geval gebeurt dat bepaald niet van harte. Als Parlement hebben wij de plicht om onze bijdrage aan het wetgevingsproces te leveren en wij verwerpen morgen het voorstel zonder een duidelijke richting aan te geven hoe het dan wel moet. En dat is wat mij betreft een gemiste kans. Gebleken is dat vrijwel alle partijen ontvreden waren. Sommigen vonden het voorstel te ver gaan, anderen vonden het lang niet ver genoeg gaan.

Maar daarover zouden we dan wel moeten besluiten. Dan heeft de Commissie ook een duidelijke leidraad, als zij een nieuw voorstel maakt om het internationale verdrag te implementeren. Ik kan natuurlijk niet nalaten om nog een paar woorden over de muskusratten te zeggen. Natuurlijk moeten de Nederlandse dijken beschermd worden. We kunnen geen dierenwelzijn bevorderen, die ten koste van onze veiligheid gaat. Maar ik ben niet zonder meer een voorstander van verdrinkingsvallen en ik wil hier alsnog pleiten voor een bezinning op de vangst en de vangstmethode van muskusratten.

Voor mij zijn in ieder geval de volgende voorwaarden voor het gebruik van verdrinkingsvallen essentieel. Allereerst moet er wel degelijk sprake zijn van een plaag en daarmee ook van schade aan de dijken. Die schade is op een aantal plaatsen in Nederland duidelijk, in Friesland, in Zuid-Holland, maar in Brabant is die schade veel minder duidelijk. De tweede voorwaarde is dat preventie niet werkt of niet mogelijk is en de derde voorwaarde is dat de verdrinkingsval slechts gebruikt wordt als er geen diervriendelijker alternatieven vorhanden zijn. Europa zal op korte termijn geen werkbare richtlijn presenteren en dat is een teleurstelling, maar niet het einde van de discussie.

En dat hoeft wat mij betreft ook niet het pijnlijke einde van muskusratten te betekenen. Voorlopig is het aan de lidstaten zelf om hier werk van te maken. Dus maak werk van alternatieven en zorg voor zo min mogelijk dierenleed. Het verwerpen van deze richtlijn mag geen excusus zijn om in Nederland niet de discussie aan te gaan voor de bestrijding van muskusratten en wat dat betreft moet ik Karin Scheele bedanken, zij heeft in Nederland een enorme discussie losgemaakt die we zonder haar amendement niet gehad zouden hebben. Dus laten we de huidige situatie een positieve wending geven,

grijp de kans die het Europees Parlement vooralsnog laat liggen en maak van preventie een prioriteit. Ontwikkel de nodige alternatieven, dan kan Nederland een belangrijke bijdrage leveren aan een nieuw wetsvoorstel.

3-280

Jules Maaten, namens de ALDE-Fractie. – Voorzitter, mijn fractie steunt het voorstel van rapporteur Scheele tot verwerping van het voorstel van de Commissie. Ik vind dat zij overtuigenderwijs heeft aangetoond dat het hier gaat om een voorbeeld van slechte regelgeving. Het opstellen van normen waaraan de vallen moeten voldoen is bijvoorbeeld niet voorafgegaan door gedegen wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Er zijn criteria gesteld aan vallen en het testen van vallen en die zijn willekeurig. De duur van het lijden van dieren is natuurlijk heel moeilijk te meten. Wanneer treedt stress in en wanneer begint de doodsstrijd?

Bovendien, vooral bij vangst met behulp van levendvallen is er in het voorstel niets gezegd over de humaniteit van de alternatieve methoden die dan misschien gebruikt zouden moeten worden om dieren te doden. Dieren verdrinken dan vaak alsnog op een andere manier of worden doodgeknuppeld of maken elkaar af. Er is inconsistentie tussen dit voorstel en de Habitatrichtlijn. Bepaalde diersoorten die worden beschermd onder de Habitatrichtlijn - ik denk aan het explicet verbod op het vangen en doden van bijvoorbeeld de in het wild levende otter, de bever, de wolf en de lynx - staan ook in de bijlage bij het voorstel inzake humane vangstmethoden. Hoe valt dat met elkaar te rijmen? En ook andere dieren vallend onder dit voorstel, bijvoorbeeld de marter en de das, worden in bepaalde gebieden beschermd of geconserveerd.

Bij deze richtlijn speelt - en ook ik kan het niet laten om daar toch even iets over te zeggen - een kenmerkend Nederlands veiligheidsprobleem: de bescherming van de laag gelegen landsdelen tegen overstromingen door dijkdoorbraken. Door zijn leefwijze ondergraft de muskusrat dijken, dat is een reële bedreiging voor de veiligheid en de volksgezondheid. Het dier is in Nederland een uitheemse diersoort die natuurlijk op de meeste humane manier bestreden dient te worden, maar op dit moment is er geen bruikbare humanere bestrijdingswijze, die even effectief is als bestrijding met behulp van de verdrinkingsval. Een verbod op de verdrinkingsval - en ik kan raden dat het voorstel op een gegeven moment wel weer terug zal komen op zo'n verbod - maakt doelmatige bestrijding van muskusratten onmogelijk. De Nederlandse veiligheid en volksgezondheid zijn daarmee in het geding.

We moeten ook voor de muskusrat zoeken naar bruikbare humanere vangstmethoden, maar totdat geschikte alternatieven gevonden zijn, vind ik dat een duidelijke uitzonderingspositie voor Nederland of voor een situatie waar de veiligheid in het geding is, goed zou zijn.

Voorzitter, een laatste opmerking van wat meer algemene aard. We doen in de Europese Unie een beetje aan dierenbescherming à la carte. Er gebeurt veel op het gebied van bijvoorbeeld het terugdringen van dierenproeven, denk aan de cosmeticarichtlijn of REACH we nu over spreken. We doen iets aan internationale diertransporten. Het is allemaal heel belangrijk, maar het is ook erg willekeurig. Je moet je afvragen wat Europa op het gebied van dierenbescherming zou willen of moeten doen.

Willen we het kievitsei rapen in Nederland of het stierenvechten in Spanje of het vetmesten van Franse ganzen voor de foie gras verbieden, omdat die gebruiken dierenvriendelijk zijn of zijn dat nationale aangelegenheden en is er niet een toegevoegde waarde voor Europa om zich met dit soort zaken te gaan bemoeien. Het zou niet gek zijn als zowel wij hier in dit Parlement als de Unie er eens over zouden gaan nadenken wat we eigenlijk op gebied van dierenbescherming willen doen en wat niet, in plaats van hier en daar à la carte wat aan bescherming te doen.

3-281

Marie Anne Isler Béguin, au nom du groupe Verts/ALE. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je tiens également à féliciter notre rapporteur pour la clairvoyance qu'il a montrée dans ce dossier et nous soutenons tout à fait sa proposition de rejet. Nous pouvons d'ailleurs aussi prendre à notre compte son argumentaire. Néanmoins, je souhaite insister sur quelques points.

Tout d'abord, Monsieur le Commissaire, je voudrais vous dire que j'ai bien apprécié vos dispositions quant à la suite à donner à ce projet, compte tenu de la position du Parlement européen. J'aimerais souligner en fait combien la gestion par la Commission de cette question du piégeage sans cruauté s'est avérée incohérente. Il faut rappeler en effet que, en 1998, le Parlement européen avait rejeté les conclusions des accords tripartites avec la Russie, le Canada et les États-Unis, estimant qu'ils n'étaient pas suffisamment ambitieux pour être efficaces. Mais à la différence de ce qui se passe aujourd'hui, le vote de 1998 était sans conséquence, puisque le Conseil pouvait conclure des accords, même contre l'avis du Parlement. Or, cette fois, la Commission propose une directive européenne pour la mise en œuvre de ces mêmes accords, c'est-à-dire d'un projet qui n'atteint pas les objectifs qu'il s'était fixés. Pourquoi donc, dans de telles circonstances, le Parlement accepterait-il une proposition aussi faible? C'est la question que nous posons à la Commission.

Pour ce qui est du contenu aussi, cette proposition est, pour nous, inacceptable. Non seulement, elle est critiquée par les scientifiques – d'autres collègues en ont parlé – et par les associations de défense du bien-être animal, mais en outre, elle ne réduit en rien les souffrances des animaux piégés. À ce propos, je crois qu'il faut s'en remettre au développement qu'a fait Mme Scheele, qui explique précisément qu'on ne réduit en rien ces souffrances.

Enfin, le dernier point, essentiel: ce projet est inacceptable parce que, en fin de compte, il bafoue la législation européenne, puisqu'il inclut dans sa liste positive des espèces protégées par l'article 12 de la directive Habitat. Vous avez la loutre, le loup, le castor, le lynx. Et vous savez, Monsieur le Commissaire, je viens de France, combien il est difficile de faire appliquer la directive Habitat, d'obtenir la protection du loup et d'essayer d'expliquer les choses.

C'est donc pour toutes ces raisons que nous rejetons cette proposition et que vraiment, Monsieur le Commissaire, nous comptons sur vous pour servir de relais entre le Parlement et la Commission et obtenir que celle-ci retire ce projet.

3-282

Jonas Sjöstedt, för GUE/NGL-gruppen. – Herr talman! Detta direktivförslag från kommissionen är ingen riktig succé. Man kan säga att alla, från dem som sysslar med djurskydd till jägarna, är missnöjda med innehållet. I vår partigrupp delar vi den kritik som har framförts. Inte minst är det uppenbart att detta inte bygger på de senaste vetenskapliga rön som finns. Det borde denna typ av direktivförslag göra.

Det är därför dags att dra tillbaka förslaget och börja om från början. Som vi ser det, handlar det om att få en balans i förslaget. Djurskyddet måste komma i första hand, vilket kräver avsevärda förbättringar i förslaget. När detta regleras är det emellertid viktigt att man inte i onödan reglerar jaktregler i medlemsländerna utöver vad som krävs för att skydda djuren mot lidande. Det skall i huvudsak vara en nationell fråga även i framtiden. Vi hoppas att kommissionen kommer tillbaka med ett nytt förslag. Vi tackar föredraganden för arbetet och kommer att rösta för betänkandet som det är.

3-283

Johannes Blokland, namens de IND/DEM-Fractie. – Voorzitter, mijn fractie steunt dit voorstel tot verwerping van deze richtlijn, toch hebben wij hiervoor andere argumenten dan de rapporteur hanteert.

Ten eerste ben ik van mening dat deze richtlijn de effectieve bestrijding van plaagdieren in bepaalde lidstaten, in het bijzonder de muskusrat in Nederland, onmogelijk zou maken. Dat kan grote consequenties hebben voor de openbare veiligheid. En zolang hiervoor geen uitzondering in het voorstel is opgenomen, kan ik het dan ook niet steunen. Commissaris Dimas, u heeft uitgesproken de zorgen te begrijpen van veel organisaties. Begrijpt u ook de zorg uit Nederland voor de veiligheid van de burgers, als dijken worden ondermijnd door het graven van de muskusrat.

Mijn tweede argument voor verwerping betreft de rechtsgrondslag. Protocol 33 bij het EG-Verdrag geeft de EU alleen competentie op het gebied van dierenwelzijn, als dit plaatsvindt in het kader van het landbouw-, transport-, interne markt- of onderzoeksbeleid. Het richtlijnvoorstel is de implementatie van de internationale overeenkomst inzake humane vangstmethoden die is afgesloten in het kader van het gemeenschappelijk handelsbeleid. Aangezien het voorstel de standaarden van de lidstaten voor diervallen harmoniseert op de interne markt en geen direct milieudoel dient, kan alleen artikel 95 gezien worden als de juiste rechtsgrondslag voor dit voorstel. Graag zou ik van commissaris Dimas hier een reactie op vernemen.

3-284

Jean-Claude Martinez (NI). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, pour la troisième fois depuis 1991, soit depuis quinze ans, notre Parlement, toujours en séance de nuit, aborde la question des pièges et de leur barbarie à visage humain.

En 1991, par exemple, il s'agissait d'interdire les pièges à mâchoire et l'importation de fourrures de renards, de loutres, de lynx et de treize espèces animales en provenance du Canada ou des États-Unis. L'interdiction devait s'appliquer à partir de 1995. Cependant, en 1998, la Commission est venue nous expliquer qu'il fallait prolonger la vie des pièges à mâchoire dans l'intérêt des Indiens inuits et de leur chasse ancestrale, alors même que les trappeurs inuits en question sont des multinationales de la fourrure installées sur la Cinquième avenue, à New York.

Ici même, devant le commissaire irlandais Mac Sharry, je décrivais l'animal du Grand Nord, les os de la patte brisée, les tendons broyés et les artères sectionnées, qui s'arrache lui-même la patte et qui se traîne sur la neige rouge pour mourir vingt mètres plus loin sous les sapins, le tout au profit de l'industrie du luxe qui relève des Indiens, comme moi, qui m'appelle Martinez, suis génétiquement suédois.

Alors, ce soir, à la directive sur les pièges sans cruauté, censée permettre d'agir au nom de la gestion de la faune, de la protection des digues, des cultures et du respect des traités, je dis: Non! Non! Parce que, pour un rat musqué ou pour un blaireau qui créent un danger, on piège dix renards argentés qui créent un profit. Alors, Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, laissez-les vivre!

3-285

Richard Seeber (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident! Auch ich möchte mich bei der Berichterstatterin für den Bericht bedanken. Das Abstimmungsergebnis im Ausschuss war ja eindeutig. Ich glaube, wir alle begrüßen grundsätzlich Regelungen zum Schutz von Wildtieren. Deshalb wäre meiner Ansicht nach ein umfassender Ansatz wünschenswert. Betrachten wir nur die großen Unterschiede, die die Habitat-Richtlinie und die Vogelschutz-Richtlinie im Vergleich zum Schutz anderer Tiere aufstellen: Die sind nicht immer gerechtfertigt.

Es ist natürlich auch zu berücksichtigen, dass Tiere gefährliche Schäden anrichten können. Ich meine, da muss man eine Unterscheidung treffen und das menschliche Wohl einfach in den Vordergrund rücken. Denken wir nur an die einbrechenden Dämme, die uns unsere holländischen Kollegen so eindringlich geschildert haben.

Dies vorausschickend haben wir als Gesetzgeber zu überlegen, wie wir auf der Grundlage der gegebenen Kompetenzbasis das Richtige beschließen können. Nachdem es aber auch einen Streit um diese Kompetenzgrundlage gibt, ist diese Frage nochmals sehr eingehend zu prüfen, um rechtliche Sicherheit zu haben. Folgen wir der Europäischen Kommission und dem Rechtsausschuss des Europäischen Parlaments, so sind dies Artikel 175 und folgender.

Nachdem der vorliegende Vorschlag aber eben nicht die neuesten wissenschaftlichen Kenntnisse berücksichtigt, ist der Vorschlag meiner Ansicht in seiner Gesamtheit abzulehnen. Die Materie ist zu wichtig, um nicht das Beste sowohl für die Tiere als auch für die Menschen herauszuholen.

Weiters ist zu berücksichtigen, dass im Sinne der Subsidiarität natürlich auch den Mitgliedstaaten die Möglichkeit gegeben wird, strenge Tierschutzregeln zu erlassen, aber eben auch die Sicherheit von Menschen in den Vordergrund zu stellen.

3-286

Linda McAvan (PSE). – Mr President, I am not going to break the mould because I too support the idea of rejecting this proposal. As everybody else has said, it is hard to see any animal welfare benefits in what the Commission is proposing. I understand that the Commission's own Scientific and Veterinary Committee queried the proposal, and there are even some question marks about how it was consulted.

It is also perplexing – and I raised this in committee – to see a list of 19 species to be covered by the directive and then to discover that some of them were actually protected species in the European Union. It seems strange to describe how to trap animals that you are not allowed to hunt by law. I would appreciate the Commissioner's comments on that.

They say that you cannot please all of the people all of the time, but I am afraid that this proposal does not seem to please anybody at all. Therefore, I was pleased to hear that the Commissioner is prepared to listen to Parliament and to find an alternative way forward on this issue.

Mrs Scheele has done a very good job and we have a united front in Parliament, which is very different from the debate the Commissioner witnessed on REACH yesterday, the outcome of which we will see tomorrow in the vote.

3-287

Mojca Drčar Murko (ALDE). – Če je bil namen te direktive uvesti standarde humanega lova živali s pastmi, se namera ni posrečila. Ne upošteva najnovejših znanstvenih spoznanj, je v nasprotju z določenimi drugimi deli evropske zakonodaje in ne more olajšati trpljenja v pasti ujetih divjih živali. Upoštevajoč psihološko in vedenjsko razvitost sesalcev, je glede pasti, ki naj ujeto žival ubijejo, glavni pomislek ta, da je čas, ki mine do njene nezavesti ali smrti, občutno predolg.

Drži pa, da je mednarodni sporazum, ki je sklenjen med EU in Kanado ter Rusko federacijo, katerega okoljski del želi ta direktiva vnesti v evropsko zakonodajo, eden od prvih dveh, ki sta se izrecno posvetila vprašanju dobrobiti divjih živali. Vendar je omenjeni sporazum posvečen predvsem olajšanju trgovine s krvnimi.

Opozoriti želim na mnenja o členu 5, da sporazum celo zavira prizadevanja tistih držav, ki so že uvedle pravila lova nad mednarodnim standardi. Če sedanji standardi izhajajo le iz najnižjih skupnih imenovalcev, sporazum ne bo vzpodbil pogodbenih strank, da bi razmišljale o razvoju bolj humanih meril.

3-288

Jillian Evans (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I would like to echo the comments that have already been made by several other Members in support of the position of Mrs Scheele, the rapporteur, in her report. As we have heard, colleagues want to reject the Commission proposal for a number of different reasons; but we are in agreement about the rejection.

As has already been said several times, this proposal has been criticised by anyone who is involved in this area – by the scientists, by animal welfare groups, by pro-hunting groups – because it is not based on the latest scientific research evidence and it certainly does not prevent, or even reduce, the suffering of animals in traps. This Parliament has often shown its political will to protect animals and this weak proposal certainly does not achieve that. The standards here are not humane. We are not talking about a few animals, but about millions of animals that are trapped every year in the European Union.

There are many areas where the proposal falls short of what can be achieved or what could be achieved to improve animal welfare. For example, it allows traps that are not classed as humane to be used while better traps are developed, but no time limit is put on this. The priority is for trapping to continue. There are no safeguards, as we have heard already, to protect endangered species from being killed in traps in some areas where we know those species are found. The only way to do that would be to ban traps in those areas. So for these reasons, and for many other reasons, it is not acceptable and the Commission should produce a new proposal.

3-289

Hélène Goudin (IND/DEM). – Herr talman! Kommissionens förslag om fällfångster är ytterst bristfälligt. Förslaget innebär att fällor skall testas enligt strikta normer, att en speciell utbildning för fångstmän skall införas och att hemgjorda fällor endast undantagsvis skall tillåtas. Om detta förslag antas av Europaparlamentet, blir det praktiskt taget omöjligt att bedriva fällfångst i Norden. Det är glädjande att miljöutskottet förkastade kommissionens förslag. Jaktfrågor skall avgöras på nationell eller lokal nivå, inte i Bryssel.

Jag vill uppmärksamma ledamöterna på att utskottet för rättsliga frågor har lämnat ett yttrande om förslagets rättsliga grund. Detta yttrande har infogats i miljöutskottets betänkande och förordar att artikel 175 skall utgöra den rättsliga grunden för förslaget. Denna artikel gäller unionens miljöpolitik. Djurskydd för vilda djur är dock inte en del av EU:s miljöpolitik och ligger inte ens inom EU:s behörighet. Om artikel 175 utgör den rättsliga grunden, är risken stor att alltför ärenden som detta kommer att betraktas som EU-frågor och hanteras på EU-nivå.

Jag är överens med föredragande Scheele om att kommissionens förslag skall förkastas. Scheeles utgångspunkt är dock att förslaget inte är tillräckligt långtgående. Jag är av motsatt uppfattning. Självfallet behövs regler, även för fälljakten, så att bl.a. djurskydd garanteras. Dessa regler skall dock fastställas av medlemsstaterna och inte i Bryssel.

3-290

Christofer Fjellner (PPE-DE). – Herr talman, herr kommissionsledamot, kära kolleger! Jag har förstått att detta förslag lär komma att förkastas i morgon. Det beror bl.a. på att starka krafter här i parlamentet verkar vilja detaljreglera och nästan förhindra fällfångst som sådan. Det verkar nästan som om det slutliga målet är att det inte skall förekomma fällfångst i Europa. För dessa personer är detta förslag helt enkelt inte tillräckligt långtgående. Även om de ofta beskrivs som miljövänner är kraven som de ställer ofta allt annat än miljövänliga. Man bortser från att just fällfångst är en viktig del i vilt- och miljövård. Jag kan nämna ett exempel på det som jag hörde om häromdagen, nämligen att sjöfågelarter är beroende av att man i Finland fångar t.ex. mårdhundar som inte finns i den naturliga faunan utan har förts in.

Kommissionens förslag är enligt min mening inte för begränsat. Det går tvärtom egentligen alldelens för långt. Dessutom försöker kommissionen utöka befogenheten till frågor som medlemsstaterna egentligen hanterar bäst.

Jag har två argument som jag hoppas att kommissionen tar till sig för eventuella framtidens förslag. För det första tycker jag att vi skall ta fasta på de internationella avtal som finns och inte försöka bygga ut dem på ett sätt som riskerar att skapa nya handelshinder. Det är någonting som i slutändan bara drabbar enskilda näringsidkare och jägare och skapar problem. Dessutom tycker jag att det hade varit tillräckligt att kräva att medlemsstaterna själva genomför delar av detta avtal, i stället för att bygga ut det med utgångspunkt från kommissionen.

För det andra innehåller detta förslag mycket byråkrati som man skulle kunna göra sig av med. Medlemsstater som Sverige har väl fungerande system som innebär att alla fällor testas. För att slippa byråkratin borde man ha kunnat godkänna de resultat av tester som redan har genomförts av olika fällor. Jag hoppas att kommissionen tar till sig av dessa argument och inte bara lyssnar på argumenten från dem som vill förhindra fällfångst.

3-291

Robert Evans (PSE). – Mr President, the Commissioner spoke earlier on about our international obligations. I would argue that the so-called international agreement is at best ambiguous. I am no legal expert, but the Commission must agree that there are serious legal inconsistencies between this proposal and other EU policies, to which both Mrs McAvan and Mr Blokland, from different starting points, have drawn attention.

Mr Maaten mentioned the Habitats Directive. However, there is also the protection of laboratory animals in research. These and others are serious and sound policies for the protection of wildlife and animals that are sadly used in laboratories.

This is an important subject; it cannot be left merely to the luck of the toss. Air in the atmosphere and the air we breathe is rightly considered a subject necessary for environmental legislation at EU level. I would say to the previous speaker, Mr Fjellner, that this proposal falls into the same category of being important and necessary, but at the moment it fails to take account of many previous decisions.

As Mr Schnellhardt noted, we have to work with other countries in the world – the United States, Canada and Russia. However, for our own credibility, I would argue that we can do better than this and we have to do so.

I commend the rapporteur for her work and, speaking on behalf of this Parliament's Intergroup on Animal Welfare, I too call for withdrawal of this proposal, because, sadly, it will do nothing for the welfare of animals. In the light of what the Commissioner has heard tonight, I suggest that to avoid humiliation tomorrow, he withdraws it before it is put to the vote in plenary.

3-292

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). – Hr. formand! Jeg er naturligvis enig med både min egen gruppe og de andre, der har fremført argumenter imod Kommissionens forslag, og jeg skal ikke gentage disse argumenter her. Jeg har faktisk bedt om ordet for lige at minde om, at dyr, der lever i det fri, næsten ud fra enhver betragtning har et bedre liv end dyr, der bliver holdt i bure. Vi har set skrækkelige billeder fra Kina af bjørne, der holdes i bure for pelsens skyld, men det er jo ikke bare bjørnene, det går ud over. Vi har i Danmark store rævefarme, og ligegyldigt hvilken slags fældefangst man praktiserer, er rævefarme i hvert fald ikke at foretrække - rævefarme er det rene dyrplageri. Jeg mener, at vi må inddrage de andre dyr i denne diskussion i stedet for at se bort fra dette problem og kun interessere os for dyrplageri ved fældefangst. Jeg vil gerne understrege, at vi må udvide perspektivet for at undgå at legitimere brutal behandling af dyr på dyrefarme både i Kina og i Danmark.

3-293

Piia-Noora Kauppi (PPE-DE). – Mr President, Commissioner, I could not disagree more with the previous speaker. I think the farming of animals for fur in Europe is in much better shape than farming animals in China. Deer farming, fox farming and mink farming are totally different issues.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for Mrs Scheele's conclusion that the Commission proposal should be rejected. However, I do not agree with her reasons for doing so. Firstly, the legal basis of the Commission proposal is questionable. This proposal seeks to implement a trade agreement allowing the EU to comply with its international trade obligations, but its contents relate to the welfare of wild animals, for which the EU does not and should not have competence. The Treaty only empowers the EU to take responsibility for animal welfare in the context of agriculture, transport, internal market research and areas such as the welfare of farmed animals, fur farming included.

Secondly, the Commission has failed to provide an impact assessment of the proposed directive. The estimated cost of testing for a single type of trap varies from EUR 30 000 to EUR 100 000. Carrying out the testing by technical means would make the requirements more reliable, cheaper and easier to measure and standardise across the Member States. But there is a problem, as Mr Evans said. Laboratory animals are animals too and we have to take care of their welfare as well. Furthermore, the idea that home-made traps would require a special permit for each use is hallucinatory. How does the Commission think the permit requests of tens of thousands of Finnish trappers would be handled in Brussels?

Thirdly, like many of the previous speakers I would like to underline the detrimental effects of the proposal on the conservation of wildlife and nature. The raccoon dog, which is not a native species of Finland but is an extremely efficient predator of birds and other wildlife, can only be effectively managed by trapping. If the trapping were made as difficult as the proposal suggests, the loss of biodiversity would be enormous.

In general, it is essential to rely on local knowledge in applying trapping and hunting legislation. Only local people have sufficient knowledge of the local flora and fauna to help set up balanced legislation. The wrong kind of intervention at EU level can compromise an otherwise noble objective, as in all areas where subsidiarity should be upheld. I sincerely ask the Commission to withdraw this proposal in order to avoid humiliation tomorrow.

3-294

Hans-Peter Mayer (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kollegen! Ich fasse vieles zusammen: Fallenfang wird in der Europäischen Union hunderttausendfach praktiziert und dient hauptsächlich dem Management wild lebender Tiere und insbesondere der Schädlingsbekämpfung, z.B. im Fall der Bisamratte.

1998 hat die EU das Abkommen für internationale humane Fallenfangnormen mit Kanada, Russland und den USA abgeschlossen. Diese Länder sind Hauptexporteure von Pelzen und Fellen, und deshalb begründete die EU dies in zwei Beschlüssen zu Recht mit ihrer Zuständigkeit in der allgemeinen Wirtschafts- und insbesondere der Binnenmarktpolitik. Mit dem heutigen Gesetzesvorschlag wird versucht, dieses Abkommen in der EU umzusetzen. Die Kommission vertritt in ihrem Vorschlag inhaltlich eine durchaus noch diskussionsbedürftige Balance zwischen Einschränkung von vermeidbaren Tierleiden und der Notwendigkeit der Fallenjagd.

Allerdings konzentriert sich der Vorschlag auf die Rechtsgrundlage der Umweltpolitik. Die EU ist aber für das Wohlergehen von Tieren nur im Zusammenhang mit anderen Politikbereichen wie Landwirtschaft, Transport, Binnenmarkt oder Forschung zuständig. Sie hat daher keine allgemeine Kompetenz hinsichtlich des Wohlergehens wild lebender Tiere. Natürlich ist das Europäische Parlament – natürlich bin auch ich – für die Wahrung des Wohlergehens wild lebender Tiere. Aber dies ist Gegenstand der Gesetzgebung der Mitgliedstaaten. Das Europäische Parlament muss als europäischer Gesetzgeber die Subsidiaritätsrechte der Mitgliedstaaten achten und daher, unabhängig vom gut gemeinten Inhalt, diesen Gesetzesvorschlag ablehnen.

Herr Kommissar, die Europäische Union kann ihre Verpflichtung dadurch einhalten, dass die Mitgliedstaaten entsprechende Regelungen erlassen.

3-295

Σταύρος Δήμας, Μέλος της Επιτροπής. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατ' αρχήν θα ήθελα να πω ότι μέσα στις δημοκρατικές διαδικασίες είναι και η καταγήφιση προτάσεων και δεν το θεωρώ αυτό ταπεινωτικό ή μειωτικό. Είναι μέσα στις δημοκρατικές διαδικασίες τις οποίες και θα πρέπει να λαμβάνουμε υπόψη.

Όπως ανέφερα προηγουμένως, έχω λάβει υπόψη τη θέση της Επιτροπής Περιβάλλοντος σχετικά με την απόρριψη της πρότασης της Επιτροπής και άκουσα απόψε όλες τις διαφορετικές απόψεις που διατυπώθηκαν εδώ, απόψεις οι οποίες μπορεί μεν σε πολλές περιπτώσεις να ξεκινούνται από διαφορετικές αφετηρίες, κατέληγαν όμως σχεδόν πάντα στο ίδιο συμπέρασμα.

Η συζητούμενη πρόταση οδηγίας θα κάλυπτε ένα νομικό κενό δεδομένου ότι, αν εξαιρέσουμε τον Κανονισμό του Συμβουλίου του 1991, δεν υπάρχει άλλη νομοθεσία σχετικά με τα πρότυπα παγίδευσης σε επίπεδο Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, αλλά και σε εθνικό επίπεδο το υπάρχον νομικό πλαίσιο είναι πολύ περιορισμένο. Σε κάθε περίπτωση, η πρόταση αυτή θα προσέθετε στην υπάρχουσα νομοθεσία των κρατών μελών και δεν θα αφαιρούνται: όπου υπήρχε αυστηρότερη νομοθεσία, αυτή θα εξακολουθούνται να ισχύει.

Ωστόσο, δεδομένων των ανησυχιών σας και λαμβανομένης υπόψη της θέσης του Συμβουλίου, θέλω να σας ενημερώσω ότι η Επιτροπή θα εξετάσει πολύ προσεκτικά τα επόμενα βήματά της σχετικά με την πρόταση αυτή περιλαμβάνοντας βεβαίως και το ενδεχόμενο να την αποσύρει. Στο παρόν στάδιο πάντως, θα ήθελα να πω ότι χρειάζεται να εξετάσουμε όλες τις σχετικές παραμέτρους.

3-296

Předseda. – Rozprava je tímto uzavřena.

Hlasování proběhne ve čtvrtek.

3-297

15 - Vývoz zbraní

3-298

Předseda. – Dalším bodem je společná rozprava o:

- zpráva Raüla Romeva i Ruedy za Výbor pro zahraniční věci o šesté výroční zprávě Rady podle bodu 8 Kodexu EU o vývozu zbraní (2005/2013(INI)) (A6-0292/2005) a

- zpráva Čirtse Valdise Kristovskise za Výbor pro zahraniční věci o nešíření zbraní hromadného ničení: role Evropského parlamentu (2005/2139(INI)) (A6-0297/2005) a

- zpráva Joachima Wuermelinga za Výbor pro vnitřní trh a ochranu spotřebitelů o Zelené knize o veřejných zakázkách v oblasti obrany (2005/2030(INI)) (A6-0288/2005).

3-299

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), ponente. – Señor Presidente, en primer lugar quiero agradecer no solamente la presencia de mis colegas, sino también de la señora Comisaria, aunque tengo que lamentar la importante ausencia del Consejo, que había prometido su presencia, pero que, debido al cambio del orden del día a última hora, ha tenido que excusarse. Creo que no hay que atribuir este problema al Consejo, sino a la Mesa y lamento no tener en estos momentos la oportunidad de poder plantear este debate junto con el Consejo. Teniendo en cuenta que el mío es un informe de seguimiento de la acción del Consejo, esta ausencia es especialmente lamentable.

Sin embargo, el tema es importante, fundamental, como lo demuestra el seguimiento que numerosos sectores de la sociedad civil están haciendo tanto del control de armas como de su descontrol. Vender armas no es como vender neveras, camisetas u ordenadores, es una cuestión que tiene unas repercusiones muy graves a muchos niveles y, por lo tanto, las consecuencias de una venta masiva y descontrolada pueden ser nefastas.

Recordemos un dato importante: cada minuto una persona es víctima de un arma de fuego. Además, el gasto que supone ese tipo de exportaciones y ese tipo de compras, va en detrimento de otras inversiones que son, a menudo, mucho más necesarias para el desarrollo económico y social. Asimismo, dichas exportaciones y compras conllevan frecuentemente un efecto desestabilizador desde el punto de vista regional, porque suponen, de una forma también habitual, el inicio de una carrera armamentística que hace que, en definitiva, nos hallemos ante un problema de grandes dimensiones. Por todo ello, la transparencia y el control de ese tipo de exportaciones son fundamentales.

Los datos son claros. En el año 2003 el comercio internacional de armamento movió entre 34 000 y 43 000 millones de dólares y entre los principales exportadores destacan países europeos como Reino Unido, Francia, Italia y Alemania, de los que procedió el 25 % del total de las exportaciones mundiales. En el caso europeo, por tanto, tenemos una gran responsabilidad.

Entre los principales importadores, además, hay que destacar que China e India son dos de los países que más aceptan y compran ese tipo de producción.

En Europa tenemos un código de conducta aprobado en el año 1998 que es —venimos diciéndolo hace mucho tiempo— insuficiente. Es débil y no es jurídicamente vinculante. Por esto, ya en el informe que debatimos el año pasado y del que también me honré de ser ponente, planteamos la propuesta —que hemos recogido también en este nuevo informe de revisión— de convertirlo en jurídicamente vinculante. De hecho, en el informe que aprobó la Comisión de Asuntos Exteriores hace unas semanas se especificó de una forma clara la necesidad de fortalecer el código de conducta y de convertirlo en un texto jurídicamente vinculante.

Además de lo anterior, en este informe se plantean otras cosas también importantes: el hecho, por ejemplo, de que se sometan al código las transferencias de capacidad de producción y de que se establezcan mecanismos de especial vigilancia para aquellos casos en los que se ha decidido levantar el embargo de armas. Permítanme hacer en este sentido un inciso —con relación al caso concreto de China, recordemos que una vez más esta Cámara se manifiesta favorable a que no se levante en las condiciones actuales dicho embargo. En primer lugar, porque no se dan las condiciones suficientes y razonables para ello y, en segundo lugar, porque el hacerlo supondría mandar un mensaje claramente equivocado, no solamente a China, sino al mundo en general, sobre la seriedad con la que abordamos ese tipo de embargos—.

El informe también menciona aspectos que tienen que ver con el corretaje de armas, con la regulación de equipos de tortura, con el impacto de la ampliación y, también, con el papel que tiene que desempeñar la Unión Europea con relación a las Naciones Unidas.

En la Presidencia holandesa se nos prometió, y así lo celebramos, que habría una revisión del código y un endurecimiento del mismo, así como una conversión del mismo en posición común. Estamos a finales del año 2005, han pasado ya dos Presidencias más y todavía estamos esperando. Hay que reconocer que la Presidencia británica ha puesto mucho énfasis en que esto tenía que concluirse y esperamos que antes de que termine su mandato podamos verlo realizado, pero de momento estamos esperando.

Por último, hablando de Presidencias, quiero concluir mi intervención lamentando que entre las prioridades que ha manifestado la próxima Presidencia austriaca se dé una lamentable ausencia: no se menciona la cuestión de las armas ligeras.

Teniendo en cuenta la importancia de este tema, no solamente en esta Cámara, sino en la sociedad civil en general, creemos que se trata de una ausencia muy preocupante y que hay que recoger desde el punto de vista de la necesidad y del compromiso que el Consejo y esta Cámara han reiterado en favor de un Tratado internacional de armas.

Insisto en que este informe es un paso hacia adelante y espero que no perdamos más tiempo con este tema, pues no hay tiempo que perder.

3-300

Girts Valdis Kristovskis (UEN), *Referents.* — Augsti godātā komisāres kundze! Padomes, Komisijas pārstāvji! Kolēģi parlamentā! Šī vakara debates par masu iznīcināšanas ieroču izplatības draudu novēršanu ir apliecinājums Eiropas Parlamenta izpratnei par nepieciešamību aktīvi piedalīties mūsdieni civilizācijas lielāko apdraudējumu risināšanā. Jāatzīst, ka ziņojuma gatavošana bija politiski un tehniski sarežģīta, nēmot vērā masu iznīcināšanas ieroču (MII) radīto draudu globālo raksturu un īpašo specifiku. Taču Eiropas Parlaments ir spējis aptvert sarežģītu šīs tematikas aspektu.

Šajā sakarā kā ziņojuma sagatavotājs vēlos izteikt atzinību gan kolēģiem Parlamentā, gan arī Ārlietu komitejas speciālistiem, personālā pārstāvja un viņas biroja, kā arī Komisijas speciālistiem par to aktīvo un konstruktīvo līdzdalību ziņojuma tapšanā daudzu mēnešu garumā.

Manuprāt, būtiskākā atziņa ir bažas par to, ka atbildīgo starptautisko organizāciju un lielvalstu starpā diemžēl nepastāv vienota izpratne un saskaņota rīcība MII un ar tiem saistīto materiālu un tehnoloģiju izplatības ierobežošanas jomā. Tas ir satraucoši tāpēc, ka visietekmīgākās starptautiskās organizācijas un valstis vienlaicīgi atzīst, ka tieši MII, to izplatība, ir vislielākais potenciālais apdraudējums cilvēces drošībai. Pieaug noziedzīgu un teroristisku aprindu interesē par MII un materiāliem. Turklat šis apdraudējums kopš aukstā kara laikiem nevis samazinājies, bet gan palielinās. Tāpēc ziņojumā vērtēta ne tik vien Eiropas Savienības un tās dalībvalstu kopīgi realizētā MII izplatības un ierobežošanas politika, bet arī apskatīti ASV, Krievijas un citu līdzatbildīgo valstu rīcības aspekti.

Ziņojumā pausta neapmierinātība par starptautiskās sabiedrības nespēju panākt vienošanos Neizplatīšanas līguma pārskatīšanas konferencē Nujorkā šā gada maijā. Tas vērtējams kā nopietns trieciens multilaterālismam. Kā zināms, Eiropas Savienības Padomes un Komisijas piedāvātie vairāk kā četrdesmit situāciju uzlabojošie prioritārie pasākumi nesaņēma pienācīgu atbalstu. Tas apliecina interešu, taktiskās domāšanas un rīcības dažādību starptautiski ietekmīgo valstu starpā. Šāds uzticības trūkums neveicina daudzpusējo sadarbību, mazina Starptautiskās Atomenerģētikas aģentūras

un citu speciālo kīmisko un ieroču kontroles organizāciju darbību. To informācija nereti ir izšķirošā masu iznīcināšanas ieroču problemātikas turēšanai zem starptautiskas kontroles. Līdzīgi arī Eiropas Parlamenta Ārlietu komitejā ziņojuma apspriešanas laikā tika pausti dažādi viedokļi par starptautiski daudzpusēji veicamiem pasākumiem. Piemēram, par pašreiz aktuālo un politiski jutīgo Irānas kodolprogrammu.

Kolēģi, pieskaršos vēl vienam, manuprāt, īpaši aktuālam ziņojuma aspektam. Uzskatu, ka pašreiz Eiropas Savienības kopējās stratēģijas par MII izplatīšanu sekmes lielā mērā ir atkarīgas no Eiropas Savienības stratēģijas MII izplatīšanas ierobežošanai pieejamajiem finansiālajiem aspektiem. Ir jāapzinās, ka pašreiz mērķorientētas, iezīmētas finansējuma līnijas trūkums apdraud stratēģijas sekmīgu izpildi. Diemžēl ne Eiropas Parlamentā, ne arī citās Eiropas institūcijās pašreiz nav skaidrības par Padomes personālā pārstāvja noteikto prioritāšu, kā arī Komisijas astoņu globālās partnerības akceptēto programmu finansējumu. Tas ir absurdī, jo dažādajiem MII izplatības ierobežošanas, atbrūnošanās, ieroču iznīcināšanas iecerēto Eiropas Savienības programmu pasākumiem atbilstoši agrākajiem politiskajiem lēmumiem tuvākajos piecos gados būtu jāatvēl vairāk nekā 900 miljoni euro. Šis skaitlis, finansējums, uzrāda Eiropas Savienības agrāko gadu ambīcijas, taču ir laiks, kad jāparāda politiskā griba, lai pildītu agrāk uzņemtās saistības. Tas nozīmē, ka Komisijai un Padomei, pirmkārt, būtu jāspēj vienoties par mērķorientēta, efektīva finanšu instrumenta sagatavošanu MII programmas vajadzībām nākošās finanšu perspektīvas ietvaros, turklāt kā Kopienas budžeta, tā arī Eiropas Savienības Padomes kopējās ārējās drošības politikas finansējuma ietvaros. Uzrādītās problēmas apliecinā Eiropas Parlamenta kā budžeta institūcijas līdzdalības nepieciešamību Eiropas Savienības drošības stratēģijas konsekventā nodrošināšanā.

3-301

Joachim Wuermeling (PPE-DE), Berichterstatter. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Das Thema, mit dem sich mein Bericht beschäftigt, ist ganz grundlegend anderer Natur als die Vorstellung der Punkte, die wir eben gehört haben. Es geht nicht darum, wie wir mit Waffen international umgehen, es geht nicht um Rüstungsbeschränkung, sondern es geht darum, ob wir im europäischen Binnenmarkt eine Liberalisierung auch für die Anschaffung von Rüstungsgütern ermöglichen wollen.

Zunächst möchte ich den Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die an der Erarbeitung des Berichts mitgewirkt haben – als Berichterstatter im Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten, als Schattenberichterstatter im Ausschuss für Industrie, Forschung und Energie –, sehr herzlich für die Zuarbeit danken. Ich habe den Diskussionen und Gesprächen sehr wertvolle Anregungen entnehmen können, die sich dann auch in dem Bericht wiederfinden. Ich bedanke mich bei der Kommission für die sehr gute Kooperation, auch für die Bereitschaft, die Verabschiedung des folgenden Weißbuchs noch etwas hinauszuschieben, um unsere Stellungnahme abzuwarten. Ich bedanke mich auch bei den beteiligten Kreisen, die bei unserer Anhörung mitgewirkt und uns dabei geholfen haben, diesen Sektor aufzubereiten.

Es ist ein ausgesprochen delikates Thema, denn die Beschaffung von Rüstungsgütern betrifft sozusagen den Kernbereich der nationalen Souveränität. Deshalb hat ja zunächst der EG-Vertrag schon in den 50er-Jahren eine Ausnahmeklausel für die Wahrung von nationalen Sicherheitsinteressen vorgesehen. Doch sind wir in den vergangenen Jahrzehnten Schritt für Schritt, immer kontinuierlich, im Grunde auch sicherheitspolitisch immer enger zusammengerückt, und die Debatte um die beiden vorherigen Berichte zeigt ja, dass wir in diesen Bereichen im Grunde global einen gemeinsamen Politikansatz verfolgen.

Dennoch ist der Beschaffungsmarkt innerhalb der Europäischen Union nach wie vor völlig fragmentiert. Jeder hat seinen Haus- und Hoflieferanten. Da gibt es keinen Wettbewerb, sondern eine Zersplitterung, die dazu führt, dass unsere Industrie auch international nicht wettbewerbsfähig ist. Sie führt dazu, dass Rüstungsgüter zu sehr hohen Kosten eingekauft werden, die es vielleicht woanders günstiger gäbe, und insofern führt sie natürlich auch zur Belastung der Portemonnaies der Steuerzahler, die am Ende das alles bezahlen müssen.

Deswegen sind wir im Ausschuss für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz und parallel dazu im Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten zu der Meinung gelangt, dass es an der Zeit ist, hier einen mutigen Schritt zu wagen. Wir schließen uns dem Vorschlag der Kommission an, diese Ausnahmeklausel des Artikels 296 zu klären und zu präzisieren, eben weil wir feststellen, dass es viel Missbrauch gibt. Unter Berufung auf diese Klausel nimmt man praktisch den gesamten Bereich der Beschaffung von Rüstungsgütern aus dem Binnenmarkt aus. Wir haben einen schwarzen Fleck im Binnenmarkt, und das immerhin bei einem Marktvolumen von 160 Milliarden Euro im Jahr.

Wir wollen an die Bürgerinnen und Bürger das Signal aussenden, dass mit der gegenseitigen Öffnung der Beschaffungsmärkte auch das Vertrauen der Mitgliedstaaten untereinander dokumentiert wird. Wir wollen ihnen sagen: Lasst uns jetzt einen Schritt vorangehen, damit Staatsausgaben eingespart werden können, und lasst uns einen Prozess in Gang setzen, der zu einer stärkeren Wettbewerbsfähigkeit führt, der es womöglich auch einmal ermöglicht, sich ein bisschen aus bestimmten Abhängigkeiten von außereuropäischen Anbietern zu befreien! Ich verweise nur auf die gegenwärtigen Beschaffungsmaßnahmen für Flugzeugbetankung oder für Lenkflugkörper, wo wir im Großen und Ganzen auf die Zulieferung von anderen Märkten angewiesen sind.

Lassen Sie mich am Schluss ein kurzes Wort zu den Änderungsanträgen sagen, die eingereicht worden sind: Ich glaube, der Schlüssel zum Erfolg der großen Gemeinsamkeit über alle Parteigrenzen hinweg lag bei diesem Vorgang darin, dass wir von vornherein gesagt haben: Wir konzentrieren uns auf das Binnenmarktthema, und wir versagen es uns, die Diskussion mit allgemeinen sicherheitspolitischen, militärischen, friedenspolitischen Anliegen zu überfrachten. So ist es auch gekommen, dass Frau Beer von den Grünen und ich von der CSU zunächst einen mehr oder weniger identischen Bericht in die Beratungen gegeben haben. Mit diesen Änderungsanträgen, die eher etwas ideologischer Natur sind, würde davon abgewichen. Deshalb werde ich bis auf einen Änderungsantrag, den Änderungsantrag Nr. 5, keine Zustimmung empfehlen, bitte Sie aber ansonsten, diesem Bericht zuzustimmen.

3-302

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, the rapporteur Mr Romeva i Rueda should again be commended for putting together a report that challenges Member States to attain better, more stringent, harmonised controls on arms exports. Whilst the report's primary focus is on stimulating improvement in European practice, it also recognises the EU's potential to stimulate best practice in the European Neighbourhood and in the wider world.

It advocates an international arms trade treaty. The Commission strongly supports opening negotiations on a legally binding arms trade treaty. We believe this would be of great value, not least in reducing the spread of illicit small arms and light weapons, which help fuel human insecurity, crime and conflict around the world.

This is an area where the Commission does not take the lead but where we are fully associated under the CFSP.

The Commission is regularly involved, with other international organisations and NGOs, in dealing with the consequences of inappropriate or illegal arms sales. We are also contributing, through implementing specific projects, to reducing destabilising accumulations of weapons around the world. As the report points out, around half a million people die each year as a result of small arms violence. In the face of these sobering statistics we cannot be complacent.

Turning to the second part – the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction – I would first like to congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Kristovskis, on this very important work. It is now two years since the adoption of the EU strategy against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The non-proliferation regime is seriously challenged. The risk of terrorists acquiring weapons of mass destruction is considered by many a very serious threat. The European Union is defining its budgetary priorities for the coming years. All of this makes the report not only important but also very timely.

The area is not new to the Commission. As mentioned in the report, the Commission has long been engaged in cooperative assistance programmes to reduce the risks associated with WMD-related materials, equipment and technologies, particularly in the area of the former Soviet Union. The Commission has also gained experience by implementing EU joint actions on non-proliferation in Russia under the CFSP framework. These actions constitute the core of the Commission's contribution so far to the G8 global partnership against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

I, along with the rapporteur and the honourable Members of Parliament, very much regret that the negotiations on non-proliferation in New York were not very successful. This does not send a good signal to countries like Iran.

The EU strategy calls for the creation of a specific Community budget line in this domain. The Commission has responded to this call by inserting important non-proliferation objectives in its October 2004 proposal for the Stability Instrument. This and subsequent proposals are under consideration here and in the Council. A positive outcome to these negotiations is essential.

While the overall financial issues are being discussed, I would like to express my appreciation to Parliament for enabling, in agreement with the Council, the Commission to implement a series of pilot projects in this area. They help to define how Community instruments might best contribute to strengthening EU non-proliferation assistance.

In early December a high-level interparliamentary conference will take place in Brussels, where a series of independent studies on the way ahead will be presented and debated. I am grateful for the excellent cooperation with Parliament in organising this event. We hope to see many parliamentarians present on that occasion.

As requested in the report, the Commission stands ready to provide further information to Parliament on past and ongoing Community programmes supporting WMD non-proliferation and disarmament goals. It goes without saying that the Commission looks forward to continued good cooperation with the Council and Parliament in support of these overall objectives.

Let me now turn to defence procurement. The role of the European Parliament in such a sensitive debate is crucial, and I am glad that the Commission will now be able to take Parliament's contribution into account. As you know, in the next few weeks the Commission will adopt a communication on the results of the public consultation that has taken place over the last few months. It is very important that this communication adequately reflects the position taken by Parliament. I

warmly thank, on behalf of Commissioner McCreevy, all those who made this possible, in particular Mr Wuermeling, Mrs Beer and Mr Hökmark, who did a remarkable job in their respective committees.

The Commission, which was urged back in 2002 by the European Parliament to take initiatives in this field, is particularly happy with the content of this House's contribution. The ultimate objective of the Commission in this field is to open up defence markets, which are today, as the rapporteur said, highly fragmented, and to increase the efficiency of public spending by encouraging competition and transparency in these markets. This should benefit both buyers and taxpayers but also the European defence industry, which is suffering from a market structure which prevents it from competing in the global market place.

The public debate carried out over the last few months and the various contributions received show that the majority of the stakeholders share the same objective. Even Member States now seem convinced that something has to be done quickly in order to move things forward. The current negotiations within the European Defence Agency on a code of conduct clearly show the political will to put an end to a situation that is unanimously considered unsatisfactory.

The Commission is, therefore, ready to play its part in this process. In particular, it could clear up those issues where the consultation has shown that different interpretations of the existing rules have led to differences in implementation. This could be done easily and quickly, by means of an interpretative communication, under the Community's and the Commission's sole responsibility. But also – and perhaps more importantly – it could propose new, more flexible rules for the procurement of defence material, rules which better suit the specific nature of this material. This would be neither quick nor easy. It would require a new legislative proposal. At this stage, a specific directive on defence procurement seems to be, therefore, the most appropriate legal instrument, which could address all the important issues that national authorities need to take into account when they procure defence material, such as security of supply, confidentiality or particular urgency. The Commission will carry out the necessary preliminary assessments and consultations and the European Parliament will be closely involved in this process.

I thank you very much for your support and for your three very important reports.

3-303

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE-DE), föredragande av yttrande från utskottet för industrifrågor, forskning och energi. – Herr talman! Fru kommissionsledamot! Jag skall tala om försvarsupphandling och vill gärna rikta ett tack till Wuermeling för hans betänkande i denna fråga. Jag tycker att det är viktigt att slå fast att försvarsupphandling spelar en avgörande roll för att Europa skall kunna vara en del i det teknologiska och militära ledarskapet. Det är emellertid också avgörande för att vi skall kunna spela en roll när det gäller forskning och utveckling inom detta område. Det betyder att vi måste ha stora företag som kan fungera internationellt och ta fram de bästa produkterna. Det handlar om att få bättre valuta för pengarna, men det handlar också om att vara med och utveckla militär teknologi som gör det möjligt för Europa att hävda sig säkerhetspolitiskt och i samarbete med andra delar av världen.

En grundläggande fråga är hur vi skall kunna ha den industriella kapaciteten att vara med i täten när det gäller utveckling av modern teknologi. Europas problem är att vi har en fragmenterad marknad på grund av historiskt skilda säkerhetsintressen. Med minskande inköp, lägre försvarsanslag och, vilket är viktigt att komma ihåg, en kraftig ökning av behovet av forskning och utveckling betyder det att Europa är i en känslig situation om vi skall kunna vara någorlunda i balans med bl.a. utvecklingen i USA.

En av de mer avgörande uppgifterna blir därför att se till att vi, när det gäller den typen av försvarsupphandling som rymms inom ramen för artikel 296 i fördraget, kan få ett ökat samarbete när det gäller upphandlingen men också när det gäller öppen konkurrens bland producenterna. Om vi inte lyckas med detta, kommer vi inte att finnas med i konkurrensen och utvecklingen av den mest avancerade försvarsmateriellet. Den mest avancerade försvarsmateriellet omfattas nämligen av artikel 296, vilken tillåter undantag för medlemsländerna. För att kunna förändra denna situation är det allra första steget att få en gemensam uppförandekod och på längre sikt ett direktiv. Det är emellertid viktigt att detta arbete påbörjas, eftersom grundvalarna för europeisk försvarsindustri annars kommer att urholkas.

3-304

Girts Valdis Kristovskis (UEN), Attīstības komitejas atzinuma sagatavotājs. -Komisāres kundze, Padomes un Komisijas pārstāvji, kolēgi Parlamentā! Pirmkārt, vēlos uzteikt ziņotāja Raül Romeva i Rueda paveikto darbu, izvērtējot Eiropas Savienības Ieroču eksporta rīcības kodeksu. Tā kā man bija uzticēts veidot Attīstības komitejas viedokli šajā jautājumā, vēlos pateikties ziņotājam, ka varējām vienoties par būtiskāko Attīstības komitejas aspektu iekļaušanu ziņojumā. Attīstības komitejas vārdā izsaku pārliecību, ka bruņojuma eksports uz nabadzīgām, konfliktējošām valstīm ir nepieļaujams, jo veicina nabadzību un cilvēktiesību pārkāpumus. Ir paradoksāli, ja vienas un tās pašas valdības runā par nabadzības apkarošanu un tiesiskuma nostiprināšanu, tomēr vienlaicīgi pieļauj SALW tirdzniecību represīviem režīmiem un ekstrēmos militāros konfliktos esošām valstīm. Jāatzīmē, ka SALW tirdzniecības iespaids ir īpaši negatīvs uz attīstības politiku Kotonū līguma valstīs. Līdzīgu viedokli redzam Tūkstošgades ziņojumā. Tāpēc Attīstības komiteja aicina Padomi un Komisiju izveidot SALW vadlīnijas tieši attīstības valstīm, uzsver atbruņošanās, demobilizācijas un reintegrācijas pasākumu nepieciešamību, aktualizē jaunu pēcembargo instrumentu pasākumu kompleksa izveides nepieciešamību, aicina

Eiropas Savienības dalībvalstis, Padomi, Komisiju stimulēt Āfrikas Savienību un Āfrikas reģionālās institūcijas, apstiprināt reģionālās un nacionālās bruņojuma eksporta kontroles prasības saskaņā ar Eiropas Savienības kodeksa standartiem. Akcentēta nepieciešamība Ieroču eksporta rīcības kodeksu padarīt juridiski saistošu. Vēl Attīstības komiteja izsaka nepieciešamību juridiski saistoša starptautiskā bruņojuma tirdzniecības līguma izveidē. Ceru, ka DEVE viedoklis, kas tika piedāvāts pirmo reizi, ir būtisks piensums, apliecina patiesību, ka drošība ir pirmsais priekšnoteikums attīstībai.

3-305

Jas Gawronski, a nome del gruppo PPE-DE. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Commissario, in base alla misura operativa n. 8 del codice che stiamo esaminando, ogni anno il Parlamento e il Consiglio sono tenuti a riesaminare questo documento.

Si tratta di una misura fondamentale che in futuro dovrebbe costituire lo strumento principale per l'introduzione di modifiche al codice e che ha già permesso di migliorarlo, rendendolo uno strumento dinamico in grado di adattarsi di volta in volta ai problemi e ai cambiamenti legati all'esportazione delle armi nell'Unione europea. Basti pensare all'ingresso nell'Unione europea di dieci nuovi paesi che, grazie a questo meccanismo di revisione, hanno potuto apportare il loro valido contributo.

Lo sviluppo più importante introdotto dalla sesta relazione riguarda la possibilità di trasformare il codice in posizione comune, rendendolo così legalmente vincolante. Occorre che il Consiglio proceda senza indugio in questa direzione, perché una politica di controllo dell'esportazione delle armi, basata su un codice comune giuridicamente vincolante, può svolgere un ruolo fondamentale nella lotta al terrorismo e nella prevenzione dei conflitti.

Il secondo nuovo elemento positivo è il *Tool Box*, destinato ai paesi nei confronti dei quali è appena stato revocato l'embargo. A tale proposito, ritengo sia giusto che nella relazione venga ribadita la coraggiosa opinione del Parlamento europeo, che è contrario all'abolizione dell'embargo nei confronti della Cina, fino a quando in questo paese non si registreranno sostanziali miglioramenti per quanto riguarda il rispetto dei diritti umani, delle libertà civili, religiose e politiche.

Ci sono ovviamente alcuni aspetti della relazione in merito ai quali avremmo auspicato progressi più concreti, ad esempio per quanto riguarda lo scambio di informazioni e il sistema di notifica di rifiuto. Tuttavia, i risultati positivi raggiunti finora ci fanno ben sperare per il futuro.

3-306

Jan Marinus Wiersma, namens de PSE-Fractie. – Voorzitter, het is jammer dat we op dit late uur nog moeten debatteren over een aantal onderwerpen die eigenlijk heel erg belangrijk en ook zeker zeer urgent, met name als we praten over de problemen met het non-proliferatiestreven en het non-proliferatieverdrag. Daarom vind ik het ook jammer dat het voorzitterschap vanavond niet aanwezig is, met name omdat de momentele voorzitter van de Europese Unie ook een erkende kernwapenmogendheid is. Maar misschien kan doorgegeven worden dat bij zulke debatten een presentie van het voorzitterschap zeer gewenst is.

Actie om de verspreiding van massavernietingswapens tegen te gaan is de jongste periode weer zeer urgent. Het aantal staten dat over kernwapens beschikt, lijkt juist te groeien en dat is een slecht voorbeeld voor andere landen en tegelijk - de commissaris zei het al - wordt het risico reëel geacht dat terroristen de hand leggen op massavernietingswapens of nucleair materiaal. Een versterking van het internationale kader om deze risico's het hoofd te bieden is hard nodig. Maar net nu zien we een tendens om ontwapeningszaken buiten internationale kaders te regelen. De internationale gemeenschap, inclusief Europa, is er dit jaar niet in geslaagd het non-proliferatieverdrag bij te stellen, te vernieuwen, sterker te maken, terwijl de Verenigde Staten het ontwapeningsbeleid steeds meer op eigen houtje willen voeren, met name als het gaat om het tegengaan van verspreiding van kernwapens.

Beide zijn zeer kwalijk voor de geloofwaardigheid en de effectiviteit van het mondiale non-proliferatie regime dat nog altijd een essentiële pijler van ons beleid is. Het is daarom van het grootste belang dat we die trend counteren en meer greep krijgen op de verspreiding van massavernietingswapens, maar ook van nucleaire technologie en nucleair chemisch en biologisch materiaal; hetzelfde geldt eigenlijk ook voor de export van conventionele wapens.

De Europese Unie zal de kar moeten trekken, als het gaat om de toekomst van het non-proliferatieverdrag, maar doet overigens ook op veel andere punten goed werk zoals het recente voorstel, de recente lobby voor een internationaal wapenexportverdrag. Tegelijk zitten er meer contradicties, tegenstellingen in het internationale regime, waarbij ook Europese landen betrokken zijn. De erkende kernmachten in de wereld hebben een extra grote verantwoordelijkheid. Zij oefenen de meeste druk uit op landen die uit het internationale systeem willen breken en tezelfdertijd overwegen zij modernisering van het kernarsenaal en weigert een van hen zelfs pertinent het verbod op nucleaire kernproeven te onderschrijven.

Europa is enerzijds een van de drijvende krachten - dat is een andere tegenstelling - achter het internationale non-proliferatieregime. Het is één van de absolute prioriteiten in de *European Security Strategy*: onder Europese leiding wordt

getracht een vreedzame uitweg te zoeken rond Iran; tegelijk investeren wij veel minder in het opruimen van oude nucleaire arsenalen dan de Amerikanen. Terecht roept het verslag van onze collega Kristovskis dan ook op die politieke prioriteit te ondersteunen met voldoende middelen.

Tot slot, de PSE-Fractie hecht zeer sterk aan de internationale rechtsorde. Wij hebben in de Commissie een uitvoerig debat gehad over de paragrafen in het verslag van Kristovskis over het gebruik van het geweld ter voorkoming van non-proliferatie, de verspreiding van kernwapens. Wij vinden nog steeds dat de passage in het verslag te weinig recht doet aan onze opvatting over de internationale rechtsorde en de rol van de Verenigde Naties daarin. Als die paragrafen zo blijven en als het Parlement morgen besluit om die passage te ondersteunen, dan sluit ik niet uit dat onze fractie zich bij de eindstemming over dit verslag van stemming zal onthouden.

3-307

Alexander Lambsdorff, im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich hätte mir, wie auch Kollege Wiersma, gewünscht, die Debatte würde zu einer etwas zivileren Tageszeit stattfinden, denn als Mitglied sowohl des Ausschusses für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz als auch des Ausschusses für auswärtige Angelegenheiten halte ich sie für besonders wichtig. Wir wissen ja alle, dass sich die Mitgliedstaaten, was Rüstungsfragen betrifft, im Augenblick den Regeln des Binnenmarkts entziehen, indem sie nach Artikel 296 des EG-Vertrages ein essenzielles nationales Interesse zur Beschaffung von neuen Waffensystemen geltend machen, dieses jedoch nicht auf wirkliche Waffensysteme begrenzen, sondern inzwischen bei der Beschaffung aller Rüstungsgüter praktizieren.

Da jedoch bei genauerer Betrachtung nur etwa 4 % unter Artikel 296 fallen, ist es nötig, bei den anderen 96 % einen Weg zu finden, mehr Transparenz bei der Vergabe öffentlicher Aufträge zu erreichen. Die Kommission hat dankenswerterweise die Initiative ergriffen, und der Berichterstatter, Joachim Wuermeling, hat sich in seinem Bericht für die Erarbeitung einer auslegenden Mitteilung zu Artikel 296 und einer Richtlinie über öffentliche Aufträge in sicherheitsrelevanten Bereichen ausgesprochen. Ich empfehle die Unterstützung des Berichts namens meiner Fraktion, wobei wir die Option eines *code of conduct* als zusätzliches Instrument zur Schaffung von mehr Transparenz nicht ausschließen wollen.

Die Vorteile einer einheitlichen Auftragsvergabe in der gemeinsamen europäischen Verteidigungspolitik liegen auf der Hand. Momentan betragen die europäischen Ausgaben für Verteidigung etwa 160 Milliarden Euro. Wir müssen eine höhere Effizienz der Ausgaben erreichen. Das sind wir den Steuerzahldern schuldig. Anbieter können Größenvorteile erzielen, wenn die nachgefragte Menge groß genug ist. So könnten erhebliche Steuermittel eingespart werden. Gerade auch in der kostenintensiven Forschung wird gemeinsames Vorgehen in Zukunft immer wichtiger.

Zudem ist es von essenzieller Bedeutung, auch gemeinsame technologische Standards anzustreben, damit Einsatztruppen unterschiedlicher Staaten miteinander kooperieren können. Nicht zuletzt tragen gemeinsame Verteidigungsstrukturen auch zu einer verstärkten politischen Integration und größerer Solidarität in der Europäischen Union bei.

Ich empfehle also die Unterstützung des Grünbuchs, wobei alle drei vorgeschlagenen Instrumente zur Verbesserung der Transparenz angewendet werden sollten. Der Kommissionsvorschlag geht in die richtige Richtung, um eine neue strategische Positionierung Europas in der Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik zu erzielen. Eine solche ist auch nötig, denn die Zahl unserer außenpolitischen Aufgaben wird steigen, nicht sinken. Wir leben in einem veränderten Sicherheitsumfeld mit neuen Bedrohungen, Terrorismus, instabilen Staaten, Verteilungskämpfen um natürliche Ressourcen, religiösem und politischem Fanatismus. Kein EU-Mitgliedstaat kann diesen Herausforderungen alleine begegnen. Das Stichwort heißt Europäisierung. Nur in einer außenpolitisch geeinten Europäischen Union, die ihre Fähigkeiten voll nutzt, am gleichen Strang zieht und die strukturelle Fragmentierung überwindet, wird dies gelingen. Denn auch die Kosten für Einsätze werden steigen, insbesondere wenn es weiterhin einen zersplitterten Rüstungsmarkt der EU-25 geben wird. Bessere, einheitlichere Politiken sind nötig, um dem entgegenzuwirken, auch um zu einer besseren Interoperabilität der europäischen Truppen zu gelangen. Hier gibt es bisher noch gravierende Unterschiede. Ziel muss es sein, dass unsere Soldaten gemeinsam operieren.

Laut Eurobarometer befürworten zwei Drittel der europäischen Bürger eine stärkere Zusammenarbeit innerhalb der EU im Sicherheitsbereich. Ein funktionierender Rüstungsmarkt ist für unsere Sicherheit eine notwendige Voraussetzung. Deshalb begrüßen wir die Initiative der Kommission und den Bericht des Berichterstatters. Im Übrigen bin ich der Meinung, dass wir diese Debatte in Brüssel und nicht in Straßburg führen sollten.

3-308

Raül Romeva i Rueda, en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE. – Señor Presidente, quisiera utilizar esta nueva oportunidad para referirme, en concreto, al informe de mi colega señor Kristovskis.

Creo que el tema de las armas de destrucción masiva realmente merece una atención especial, sobre todo por algo que ya se ha dicho: si queremos ser creíbles en la esfera internacional, especialmente en esta materia, tenemos que empezar a dar ejemplo desde la Unión Europea.

En el informe se manifiesta de una forma clara la necesidad de acentuar el papel del desarme nuclear y de hacer que la petición del Tratado de No Proliferación sea un éxito. Creo que es una cuestión en la que hay que insistir cada vez más.

Pero, en segundo lugar, hay que recordar también otro punto: hay algunos países de la OTAN, entre ellos el Reino Unido y Francia, que, obviando este hecho, están iniciando lo que podría ser una nueva carrera armamentística desde el punto de vista nuclear. Hay que advertir de que esto representa un riesgo que hay que frenar, por lo que es necesario, al menos desde ese punto de vista, ser coherentes.

Y, por último, quiero recordar y, en todo caso, llamar la atención de esta Cámara sobre un hecho: las recientes noticias de que tropas estadounidenses han utilizado fósforo blanco en las calles de Faluya. Si es así, creo que es una vulneración clara de unos principios claves que hay que respetar y que, precisamente, este informe requiere que se tengan en cuenta.

³⁻³⁰⁹

Tobias Pflüger, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Die Nacht ist sozusagen Waffenstunde im Europäischen Parlament. Auf unserer Tagesordnung stehen drei Berichte: Romeva í Rueda zu Waffenexporten, Kristovskis zu Massenvernichtungswaffen und Wuermeling zum europäischen Rüstungsmarkt. Alle drei enthalten reichlich Sprengstoff und alle drei haben viel miteinander zu tun.

Aus der Sicht meiner Fraktion ist der Bericht zu den Waffenausfuhren im großen und ganzen und in der Grundlinie positiv zu beurteilen. Es bleibt zwar einiges weiterhin verbesserungswürdig, wie z.B. genauere Kriterien, aber aus friedenspolitischen Gründen wäre mir natürlich ein völliges Verbot von Rüstungsexporten am liebsten. Vergessen wir nicht, dass Produktion, Export und Einsatz von Waffen und Rüstung zusammengehören und die Voraussetzung für Krieg sind. Rüstungsexporte sind friedensgefährdend. Umso wichtiger ist es, dass es endlich eine Rechtsverbindlichkeit des Verhaltenskodex gibt, die ja in diesem Bericht gefordert wird, und die offensichtlich alle hier im Parlament begrüßen würden.

Raül Romeva hat dankenswerterweise einen Änderungsantrag meiner Fraktion übernommen, der es möglich macht, dass sich diese Rechtsverbindlichkeit auch auf *Dual use*-Güter bezieht. Die seit einem Jahr vorhandene Europäische Rüstungsagentur fördert nach Auffassung von Rüstungsexperten nicht nur Rüstungsexporte, sondern sie macht auch die Kontrolle deutlich schwerer. Deshalb haben wir in unserem Änderungsantrag die Abschaffung der so genannten Verteidigungsagentur beantragt. Ich möchte insbesondere an meine grünen und sozialdemokratischen Kollegen appellieren, sich der Linken Fraktion anzuschließen, und statt einer Aufrüstungsagentur eine Agentur für die Kontrolle von Rüstungsexporten auf den Weg zu bringen.

Beim Bericht Kristovskis ist die Sache wieder eine ganz andere. Eigentlich sollte er eine Bekämpfung der Weiterverbreitung von Massenvernichtungswaffen zum Thema haben. Was hier aber vorliegt, ist ein Brandbericht, der sich selbst auf den Völkerrechtsbruch des Irak-Kriegs positiv bezieht. Ich appelliere an Sie, diesem Bericht nicht zuzustimmen – und sich nicht nur zu enthalten, wie wir es soeben von den Sozialdemokraten gehört haben – und auch nicht in puncto Iran weiteren verschärfenden Änderungsanträgen der UEN-Fraktion – der Kollege Kristovskis angehört – zuzustimmen.

Mein Appell richtet sich an die konservative Fraktion, sich nicht einer Interpretation anzuschließen, in der die Rede davon ist, der Iran habe in puncto Massenvernichtungswaffen seit 17 Jahren nur Misstrauen gesät und verdient; das ist einfach so nicht wahr. Der Bericht scheint den Krieg gegen den Irak geradezu als Blaupause für einen Angriff gegen den Iran zu nehmen, obwohl mittlerweile nicht einmal mehr der ehemalige US-Außenminister Powell behauptet, der Irak hätte damals Massenvernichtungswaffen besessen, und sich inzwischen für seinen Auftritt vor dem UN-Sicherheitsrat schämt.

Was die Frage der Massenvernichtungswaffen des Westens angeht, ist der Bericht in der im hiesigen Hause üblichen Weise scheinheilig. Wir haben deshalb folgende Punkte beantragt: Dass die US-Atomwaffen aus Europa abgezogen werden müssen, dass die französischen und britischen Atomwaffen eingemottet werden müssen, und dass Deutschland endlich auf sein Potenzial zur Urananreicherung im Forschungsreaktor Garching verzichtet.

Zum letzten Bericht. Herr Wuermeling, Sie sagen, unsere Industrie ist international nicht wettbewerbsfähig. Gleichzeitig behaupten Sie, die Berichte hätten miteinander nichts zu tun. Wenn es um Wettbewerb geht, dann geht es wohl um Wettbewerb im Export und deshalb muss dieser Artikel 296 fallen. Ich glaube, dieser Bericht zum Grünbuch Rüstungsindustrie ist einfach sehr offen und ehrlich. Es geht um enge Zusammenarbeit mit der NATO und den USA, und unsere Fraktion wird auch bei diesem Bericht mit Nein stimmen.

³⁻³¹⁰

Gerard Batten, on behalf of the IND/DEM Group. – Mr President, in these three reports we have another proliferation of crackpot ideas from the European Parliament, but they do show where this place and the European Union intend to head. They call for the rejection of a new generation of nuclear weapons, for progressive and significant steps towards nuclear disarmament by Britain and France and for the harmonisation of arms exports – all this when the world is growing more dangerous and not less so.

The incompetent left-wing utopian dreamers who predominantly make up this deeply stupid and corrupt place do enough damage with their legislative efforts without meddling in defence issues. National governments might one day, eventually, be able to undo the EU's idiotic policies on agriculture, fishing, commerce and finance, but if the EU manages to take control of defence there may be consequences that cannot be undone.

All these reports are building blocks for a common European security and defence policy. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that a harmonised defence procurement policy appears in one of these reports, despite being an element of the failed European Constitution.

Britain's armed forces are being merged into a European army. Britain is sleep-walking towards the day when we will wake up and find that we have no independent military and defence capabilities. If the day ever dawns when Britain's national defences are controlled by the European Union, then God help us. Yes, may He help us, you bunch of buffoons.

3-311

Marios Matsakis (ALDE). – Mr President, I feel deeply offended by the previous speaker. I do not know why he was allowed to continue to say those absurdities to this House and to us. I feel personally offended and I ask you to take action.

(Applause)

3-312

President. – It was my personal problem if I thanked the previous speaker. I promise to refer the matter to the Bureau for a decision.

(Applause)

3-313

Ryszard Czarnecki (NI). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wojna często toczy się nocą, my w Parlamencie Europejskim też nocą walczymy o pokój, *signum temporis* – znak czasu.

Dwa lata temu wydatki na cele wojskowe osiągnęły kwotę 956 miliardów dolarów, w zeszłym roku te wydatki przekroczyły bilion dolarów. Wracamy do poziomu rekordowych sum wydawanych w okresie zimnej wojny. Rocznie wydatki militarne rosną o ok. 10% - 11%, jest to prawdziwa spirala zbrojeń. Należałoby się zastanowić, czy przysłowie: "chcesz pokoju, szukuj się do wojny" jest dobrą odpowiedzią na problemy XXI wieku. Czy nie jest tak, że jak powiedział przedstawiciel Watykanu na 59. Zgromadzeniu Ogólnym Narodów Zjednoczonych – "coraz większe pokładanie ufności w broni dużego i małego kalibru nie tylko nie zapewnia nam bezpieczeństwa, lecz coraz bardziej nas go pozbawia"? Należy popierać inicjatywę ONZ dotyczącą budowania kultury pokoju oraz promowaną przez Papieża Jana Pawła II cywilizację miłości.

Gratuluję posłowi sprawozdawcy, ministrowi Kristovskis za rozsądne, będące owocem kompromisu sprawozdanie. Istotny szczególnie jest zapis o ryzyku rozprzestrzeniania, pochodzącej z okresu zimnej wojny, broni biologicznej, chemicznej i jądrowej. Ważne jest też przypomnienie pochodzącego sprzed 38 lat zakazu prób broni jądrowej w kosmosie.

Kończąc, dobrze, że podkreślamy, że nawet uzasadnione użycie siły wojskowej musi być zgodne z Kartą Narodów Zjednoczonych oraz poprzedzone użyciem wszelkich środków politycznych i dyplomatycznych. Parlament Europejski nie czyni cudów, ale dziś choć trochę może zwiększyć szanse na pokój.

3-314

Gitte Seeberg (PPE-DE). – Hr. formand! Det er tre vigtige betænkninger, vi debatterer her i aften. Som skyggeordfører for PPE-Gruppen på betænkningen om masseødelæggelsesvåben synes jeg, at betænkningen er blevet god, solid og velafbalanceret. Det er blevet en meget omfattende betænkning, men emnet er jo også meget vigtigt. Ordføreren har gjort et flot stykke arbejde.

I den tid, vi lever i, hvor truslen ikke kommer fra den kolde krig, men fra slyngelstater og terrororganisationer, er det af helt afgørende betydning, at der føres kontrol med, hvem der besidder disse våben, og at de ikke falder i de forkerte hænder. Vi hverken kan eller skal afskaffe atomvåben. Atomvåben indgår som en del af NATO's forsvarsstrategi, og det er en af grundene til, at den kolde krig forblev kold. Men vi skal til stadighed arbejde for, at lande, der ikke må have atomvåben, opgiver udviklingen heraf. Jeg tænker her selvfølgelig især på Iran og de problemer, der er omkring Nordkorea. Vi skal også arbejde for, at lande, der ikke lovligt har atomvåben, dvs. Pakistan, Indien og Israel, bliver parter i NPT. Der skal være sammenhæng mellem midler og mål. Hvis EU's strategi for ikke-spredning af masseødelæggelsesvåben fortsat skal have gennemslagskraft, er det nødvendigt at prioritere FUSP og særlig at prioritere netop dette område højt også i fremtiden.

Jeg vil til slut gerne udtrykke min glæde over Romevas betænkning. Navnlig glæder det mig, at Parlamentet står sammen om at anbefale, at våbenembargoen over for Kina ikke ophæves. Lad os hver især arbejde for, at dette også bliver holdningen i vores respektive hjemlandes regeringer.

3-315

Ana Gomes (PSE). – Quase cinco biliões de dólares é o valor dos contratos de transferência de armas em 2004 para países em desenvolvimento assinados pelos quatro principais exportadores europeus, segundo dados de um recente relatório do Congresso americano. Um aumento que representa um valor cinco vezes superior ao de 2003, o que prejudicará o desenvolvimento ao fazer proliferar conflitos em África e outros continentes, ninguém sabe.

É esta a realidade que exige, mais do nunca, a aplicação de regras estritas e eficazes na exportação de armas. A Europa não pode promover a construção com a ajuda ao desenvolvimento, ao mesmo tempo que potencia a destruição com a exportação desregulada de armas convencionais.

Daí defendemos - como o excelente relatório do Deputado Romeva faz - a urgência de tornar este código de conduta juridicamente vinculativo para todos os Estados-Membros. E é por isso, também, que nos congratulamos - como a Sr.^a Comissária, que saúdo, o fez - pela decisão do Conselho de pugnar na ONU por um verdadeiro Tratado universal que aponha as regras comuns ao comércio global de armas.

O embargo de armas à China, que repetidamente tem ameaçado Taiwan, não deve ser levantado enquanto a China não prestar contas pelos prisioneiros e desaparecidos de Tiannamen e melhorar os direitos humanos em geral.

Quanto ao relatório Wuermeling, este inclui um aspecto fundamental para o futuro do projecto europeu de defesa e da política externa comuns, que se encontra reflectido na alteração 6 do meu Grupo. Nenhuma potência mundial tem mercados de equipamento de defesa totalmente abertos. Os Estados Unidos protegem as suas indústrias de defesa com um "Buy American Act". Aqui temos muito a aprender com os nossos amigos americanos.

É fundamental introduzir a preferência europeia na aquisição de equipamento de defesa por parte dos Estados-Membros. Trata-se de garantir a sobrevivência de um dos sectores que contribuem significativamente para o sucesso da Estratégia de Lisboa, para a inovação tecnológica e para a autonomia estratégica da União. Não tenhamos ilusões, não sejamos ingénuos: aviões não são bananas, tanques não são frigoríficos. Não tratemos este assunto como se fosse uma mera questão de mercados. O Parlamento tem de assumir a liderança neste debate que é, acima de tudo, político e estratégico e o que propomos é um primeiro passo nessa direcção.

Finalmente, quanto ao relatório do Deputado Kristovskis - que também saúdo -, julgo que não é possível ter uma estratégia coerente e eficaz de não proliferação se os cinco Estados nucleares autorizados, incluindo dois Estados-Membros, continuarem a não cumprir os seus compromissos de desarmar progressivamente, nos termos do artigo 6º do NPT e a negligenciar, ou reagir contra, potências que se tornaram nucleares fora do NPT, como Israel, a Índia e o Paquistão. E isto é tanto mais grave quanto, para além de mais Estados, também actores não estatais e terroristas procuram deitar mãos a essas armas ilegais.

3-316

Marios Matsakis (ALDE). – Mr President, Commissioner, the most dangerous weapon of mass destruction is the nuclear bomb. This bomb, this weapon, has been used twice by the USA, killing hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians in a split second. It has also been used by Britain, France, Russia and China in nuclear tests, causing immense environmental damage.

These countries, along with Israel, India and Pakistan, belong to the fearful nuclear club of eight that holds the whole world to ransom. They terrorise the entire international community with their warmongering irresponsibility, threatening each other with deadly nuclear games of annihilation, and they violently insult our intelligence by trying to force upon us their view that nuclear suicide is a form of deterrence.

The governments of these countries, using a logic intelligible only to single-minded warlords ready to sacrifice the whole of humanity in their quest for short-term economic profit, are spending astronomical amounts of money in building a nuclear arsenal capable of destroying the world many times over – and all that we can manage to do is to pass resolutions on ineffective strategies calling for non-proliferation.

Why do not we call loudly and clearly on the nuclear bomb countries to get rid of their stockpiles of weapons now? Why do we tolerate in our European Community nuclear-bomb disaster countries like Britain and France? Why do we not pass resolutions or take measures against these two countries? And why should a small country like mine, Cyprus, live with the threat of a nuclear disaster because Britain wants to store, against our wishes, nuclear bombs in its colonial British bases on the island?

The answer is, in my view, shamefully simple: we lack political courage. So, we choose to be hypocrites instead – and life goes on as usual.

3-317

Eva-Britt Svensson (GUE/NGL). – Herr talman! Wuermeling hävdar i sitt betänkande att det inte handlar om utrikes-, säkerhets- eller försvarspolitik i allmän mening utan enbart om upphandling av varor och tjänster, men naturligtvis finns det ett samband mellan försvarsupphandling och försvarspolitik. En gemensam marknad för försvarsupphandlingar är ytterligare ett led vid sidan av inrättandet av Europeiska försvarsbyrån i den militära upprustning som ivrigt påhejas av den europeiska försvarsindustrin.

Under förevändning av ökad ekonomisk effektivitet och minskad bönda för de europeiska skattebetalarna, argumenterar föredraganden för en harmonisering och standardisering i enlighet med vedertagna Nato-normer. Om inte detta är ett inlägg i försvarspolitisk debatt, undrar jag vad det är. För mig är det tydligt att det handlar om en utökad, intensifierad militarisering. Jag kunde säga med George Orwells nyspråk att krig har blivit till fred.

I stället för allt tal om ökade resurser till forskning och utveckling av nya vapen, borde EU – vilket jag anser att EU måste göra – och medlemsstaterna satsa resurserna på forskning om freds- och konfliktlösning. Det är genom nedrustning och avmilitarisering som vi bygger fred, inte genom ytterligare militarisering och vapen.

3-318

Andreas Mölzer (NI). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin! Einerseits haben wir große Mächte, wie etwa Russland, die ihre Waffenarsenale abbauen, andererseits nimmt die Zahl jener Staaten, aber leider auch die Zahl krimineller Organisationen zu, die über das notwendige Wissen verfügen, um Massenvernichtungswaffen herzustellen. Allein im Jahr 2004 haben bekanntlich Geheimdienste weltweit über 300 Fälle von illegalem Umgang mit Nuklearmaterial registriert. Je weiter verbreitet das notwendige Know-how ist, desto schwieriger wird es, dem mit Hilfe herkömmlicher Methoden beizukommen.

Der Irakkrieg und das Stillhalten gegenüber Nordkorea haben bei so mancher Regierung den Eindruck erweckt, dass nur atomare Aufrüstung einen hinreichenden Schutz gegen etwaige Militärinterventionen darstellt. Aufgrund der Tatsache, dass etwa Israel über Nuklearwaffen verfügt, glaubt man beispielsweise im Iran, ebensolche Waffen entwickeln zu müssen. Gleichzeitig steigt damit auch die Gefahr, dass Terroristen diese Waffen erhalten; ein striktes Einschreiten gegen diese Entwicklung ist hier gefragt.

Wenn wir den Verhaltenskodex für Waffenverkäufe verschärfen und damit verhindern können, dass EU-Staaten Waffen an Drittländer verkaufen, welche diese gegen die eigene Bevölkerung oder zu Aggressionen nach außen einsetzen, setzen wir damit zweifellos ein wichtiges Zeichen. Allerdings darf dieser Verhaltenskodex kein zahnloser Tiger sein, sonst gefährden wir die Sicherheit unzähliger Menschen und geben uns überdies der Lächerlichkeit preis.

3-319

Karl von Wogau (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, verehrte Kollegen! Wenn Sie mich fragen, ist diese Debatte, die wir heute führen, eine verpasste Gelegenheit.

Zunächst einmal zur Tageszeit: Es war eigentlich vorgesehen, dass diese Debatte heute um 11.00 Uhr unter Anwesenheit des Rates stattfinden sollte. Sie findet jetzt kurz vor Mitternacht statt, und zwar nach einer sicherlich faszinierenden Debatte über die Fangnormen für bestimmte Tierarten.

Zum Zweiten ist die Überschrift falsch. Es geht nicht um Waffen. Es geht um die Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik der Europäischen Union. Wenn wir beispielsweise über die Frage beraten, wie wir dem Iran gegenüber handeln sollen, dann ist das keine Frage, bei der es um Waffen geht, sondern es geht um Politik.

Drittens bedauere ich sehr stark die Abwesenheit des Rates. Denn das, was die europäische Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik ausmacht, ist die enge Verzahnung von ziviler und militärischer Krisenbewältigung. Das kann nur bewältigt werden, wenn Kommission und Rat gemeinsam handeln, und ich weiß, wie schwierig das ist. Wenn der Rat nicht einmal anwesend ist, wie sollen wir dann über diese Fragen diskutieren?

Es ist auch deshalb eine verpasste Gelegenheit, weil gerade im Bereich der Sicherheit und Verteidigung große Chancen bestehen. Selbst in Anwesenheit eines Verfassungsvaters wie Elmar Brok erlaube ich mir zu sagen, dass die europäische Verfassung zurzeit blockiert ist. Zurzeit sind wir auch in Bezug auf die finanziellen Fragen blockiert.

Aber wir sind nicht blockiert in Bezug auf die Weiterentwicklung der Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik der Europäischen Union, denn gerade in jüngster Zeit haben wir die Verteidigungsagentur verwirklicht, die ja lediglich im Entwurf der Verfassung vorgesehen war. Sie ist bereits verwirklicht. Wir haben in Bosnien-Herzegowina die Verantwortung für die Sicherheit übernommen. Dort stehen Soldaten unter europäischem Kommando. Wir haben die gegenseitige Beistandsverpflichtung verwirklicht, die ebenfalls auch erst im Verfassungsentwurf vorgesehen war.

Das heißt, in diesem Bereich gehen die Dinge vorwärts, und ich bin davon überzeugt, dass wir uns auf dem Weg zu einer europäischen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungsunion befinden. Das ist auch das Ziel, das wir gemeinsam anstreben. Es

handelt sich hier um eine Debatte, die wir nicht unter Ausschluss der Öffentlichkeit führen dürfen, wie dies heute Abend der Fall ist.

Noch ein Wort an den Kollegen Lambsdorff. Ich halte es für richtig, dass wir diese Debatte in Straßburg führen, denn Straßburg ist der Sitz des Europäischen Parlaments.

3-320

Manuel Medina Ortega (PSE). – Señor Presidente, quiero empezar sumándome a la protesta del señor Matsakis. En los veinte años que llevo en este Parlamento, nunca había visto a un diputado comportarse con tanto desprecio hacia esta institución y hacia los miembros que la componen. Por tanto, pido que se adopte una medida eficaz contra este señor, para que un incidente de este tipo no se vuelva a repetir.

Como ha dicho el señor von Wogau, no se trata de un debate sobre armas; es un debate más amplio, es un debate sobre política exterior y de seguridad común, aunque yo solamente tendré ocasión de referirme al informe del señor Wuermeling, sobre la contratación en materia de defensa.

Yo creo que la Comisión tiene razón al señalar que el artículo 296 del Tratado de la Comunidad Europea, que constituye en este momento un obstáculo constitucional para el desarrollo de un mercado común –diríamos– de la defensa, puede ser, de alguna forma, superado partiendo de la jurisprudencia del Tribunal de Justicia en casos recientes, como el caso Johnston, o el caso Comisión contra España, de 1997.

Pero las limitaciones constitucionales siguen existiendo. Es decir, en materia de política exterior y de defensa, sigue habiendo un amplio grado de soberanía estatal.

Por tanto, en esta materia, tenemos que actuar con una gran prudencia, desde el punto de vista jurídico y desde el punto de vista político. En tanto no se llegue a adoptar la Constitución Europea, lo que espero que se pueda hacer en breve, tendremos que conformarnos con los instrumentos jurídicos que tenemos y, con esos instrumentos jurídicos, lo que se puede hacer es poco, pero me parece muy bien que la Comisión oriente su trabajo, primero hacia una Comunicación y, eventualmente, hacia una propuesta de Directiva, como sugiere el señor Wuermeling.

Pero también tenemos que ser prudentes desde el punto de vista político, porque el objetivo de un mercado común de la defensa europea no puede ser transformar la Unión Europea en un complejo industrial militar, como ocurre en alguna potencia exterior.

Las armas son peligrosas. Yo tengo alguna formación militar; lo que me sorprendió es que, la mayor parte del tiempo, a mí no me enseñaban a matar, sino, al contrario, a protegerme de las armas. Las armas no son juguetes. No las podemos utilizar, por ejemplo, para el desarrollo económico o para el desarrollo de la industria. La finalidad de las armas tiene que ser proteger a los ciudadanos europeos y, en todo caso, también proteger a aquellas naciones amigas, pacíficas y democráticas que las necesiten para su propia defensa, pero no para hacer negocio con ellas o convertir Europa en una especie de gran plaza industrial que acabe, al final, volviéndose contra nosotros.

Creo que las propuestas de la Comisión son positivas, que estas propuestas llevarán a la creación de ese mercado común de la defensa, pero que ese mercado común de la defensa debe ser un instrumento para la consecución de la paz en Europa y también de la paz en el mundo.

3-321

Luca Romagnoli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, la relazione evidenzia l'impegno dell'Unione a promuovere l'universalizzazione degli accordi multilaterali per la non proliferazione e contro lo sviluppo di armi di nuova generazione.

La relazione chiede che vengano elaborati principi sanzionatori da applicare ai paesi che non adempiono alla risoluzione 1540 del Consiglio di Sicurezza delle Nazioni Unite. Tuttavia, per quanto sia vero che gli Stati membri dell'Unione europea sono parti contraenti degli accordi multilaterali di non proliferazione, è altrettanto vero che due Stati membri sono Stati nucleari, che la Turchia, paese candidato all'adesione, è uno Stato nucleare e che, cosa ancora più grave, armi tattiche statunitensi sono dispiegate nei territori di molti Stati membri, tra cui la Germania, l'Italia, la Grecia e i Paesi Bassi.

Mentre per quanto riguarda Israele, India e Pakistan, che non aderiscono al Trattato di non proliferazione, sono state spese poche parole nei cento punti della risoluzione in esame, per quanto riguarda il programma nucleare civile dell'Iran, si ignorano i legittimi interessi economici e di sicurezza regionale di questo grande paese e si chiede al governo di fornire garanzie verificabili riguardo al carattere pacifico di ciascuno dei suoi programmi nucleari.

Si tratta di una risoluzione ridicola, che pretenderebbe addirittura che l'Unione europea e la NATO convincessero l'amministrazione statunitense a desistere dai suoi programmi e che esprime compiacimento per l'enorme quantità di denaro dei contribuenti europei, pari a centinaia di milioni di euro, che si intende spendere per la strategia di riduzione di armi di distruzione di massa.

La relazione proposta rappresenta una clamorosa beffa rispetto al buon senso ed è pertanto assolutamente insostenibile.

3-322

Elmar Brok (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die drei Berichterstatter Wuermeling, Romeva i Rueda und Kristovskis sprechen wichtige Bereiche an, die wir noch sehr viel stärker im Zusammenhang sehen müssen und nicht so isoliert in drei Berichten, da sie nur dem Äußeren nach widersprüchlich sind, in Wirklichkeit aber zusammenhängen.

Wir leben in einer Welt, in der die Bedrohung durch Terroristen, die auch in den Besitz von schmutzigen Waffen kommen können, heute gefährlicher ist, als jemals zuvor. Wenn wir einmal annehmen, dass der Iran nicht davon abgehalten werden kann, Atomwaffen zu produzieren – er produziert bereits Raketen von 3 000 km Reichweite – werden wir eine Region haben, die sich über die Landmasse von Iran, Pakistan, Indien, China, Russland erstreckt und somit eine einzige große – die größte – Region der Welt darstellt, die über Atomwaffen verfügt.

Wir müssen uns überlegen, wie wir unsere Sicherheit als kleiner Teil dieser Welt gewährleisten wollen. Das können wir nur durch die kollektive Sicherheit im transatlantischen Bündnis und dies bedeutet auch, dass wir Europäer uns hier nicht ausklinken können, weil wir dann nämlich erpressbar wären, aus mancherlei Gründen und von mancherlei Regionen dieser Welt.

Zum Zweiten müssen wir deutlich machen, dass wir nur dann, wenn wir eine eigene Rüstungsproduktion haben, auch in der Lage sind, industriepolitisch Akzente zu setzen, dass damit Arbeitsplätze verbunden sind, aber dass wir dadurch auch unsere Unabhängigkeit haben, denn wenn dieser industriepolitische Ansatz nicht vorhanden ist und wir keine eigene Waffenproduktion haben, sind wir auf Zukauf aus anderen Gebieten der Welt angewiesen und jederzeit erpressbar, weil wir nicht das machen können, was wir möchten und damit auch keinen Beitrag zu unserer eigenen Sicherheit leisten. Zumindest wird das sehr viel teurer, weil dann nämlich nicht die Synergieeffekte genutzt werden, die über diesen europäischen Ansatz gegeben sind.

Deswegen ist es notwendig, dass die Europäische Union und die Kommission für die Forschung und andere Bereiche mehr Geld zur Verfügung gestellt bekommt, damit wir in der Lage sind, unsere eigene Sicherheit zu gewährleisten sowie bündnisfähig und gleichzeitig unabhängig und nicht erpressbar zu sein.

Dies alles muss eingebunden werden in einen *code of conduct*, der uns die Glaubwürdigkeit verschafft, dass wir gegen die Verbreitung von Massenvernichtungswaffen vorgehen. Ich bin der Auffassung, dass dieser *code of conduct* rechtsverbindlich sein soll. Viel lieber wäre es mir noch, wenn die Ausnahme im Vertrag gestrichen würde, dass nämlich Waffenexporte nicht – wie sonst der gesamte Handel – unter die Zuständigkeit der Kommission fallen – was sowohl im Hinblick auf die Kontrolle als auch im Hinblick auf die Handlungsfähigkeit der Europäischen Union insgesamt eine der Schwachstellen ist. Hier sollten die entsprechenden Ansätze gefunden werden.

Ich möchte uns deswegen – um Geld zu sparen, um die Sicherheit unserer Bürger zu gewährleisten und um gleichzeitig dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass es eine friedlichere Welt gibt – einladen, hier mehr Akzente zu setzen.

3-323

Richard Howitt (PSE). – Mr President, firstly I welcome the report on the code of conduct and arms sales and draw to the House's attention the fact that many of the demands we made in our previous annual debates on this subject have been realised: in particular the new trade regulation on torture equipment, the common position on brokering, and the new obligation to stop exports if there is a risk to international humanitarian law. Most of all I welcome this year's commitment to make the code legally binding.

Could the Commissioner comment tonight on the fact that practice sometimes falls short? Why is it that Austria, Luxembourg and Greece, for example, do not produce their annual reports? This year information has been published that shows that France has exported bombs and grenades to Burma and Sudan, and Italy has exported firearms to China and to Colombia? Will she comment on the position of our arms exports to Colombia, a country where there is now ample evidence of human rights abuse by the Colombian military?

Many speakers tonight and some of the amendments have referred to the UK position. I am proud that my own country, in its previous Presidency, oversaw the agreement of the EU code of conduct on arms sales and in this Presidency has overseen agreement by the European Union, for the first time, to support an international arms trade treaty. We take seriously our obligations as a nuclear weapons power. The UK Government has reduced the stockpile of nuclear warheads by more than 70%, has reduced the number of warheads on each Trident submarine, from 94 to 48, and has dismantled all of the WE-177 nuclear bombs.

At the Non-Proliferation Treaty conference on 5 May the British Government spokesman said: 'we recognise that we have particular obligations as a nuclear weapons state under Article 6 of the Treaty. We reaffirm our unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear arsenals, leading to nuclear disarmament'.

Like everyone else here tonight, I share the concerns about the failure to come to a strong consensus as an outcome of the NPT conference earlier this year. But I believe it is wrong to focus on individual countries, whether it be the UK or France. We should ensure that all nations undertake their obligations under that Treaty.

We should welcome the fact that there was an EU-agreed common position in advance of the NPT review conference and take up the mantle of issues, where we, as the EU, should take a lead, such as withdrawal from the Treaty, the universalisation of rigorous safeguard standards through the IAEA additional protocol, and also the question of the transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technologies.

3-324

Geoffrey Van Orden (PPE-DE). – Mr President, Madam Commissioner, in discussing defence matters we are entering into important and sensitive areas of national sovereignty. Many of us feel that the EU's defence ambitions are wholly misplaced. If you want to empower the European Union as a global actor or if you believe in an integrated European State or, indeed, a European Defence Union, as we heard earlier, then you will have a different view.

We are opposed to EU meddling in defence, both in principle and in terms of its practical consequences. However, we recognise that there are areas in which a multilateral approach can be beneficial, and this is particularly true in relation to non-proliferation and arms export controls.

Turning firstly to defence procurement, the Wuermeling report is driven by a very strong integrationist impulse. It even poses the question, in paragraph 12, as to 'what extent any meaningful distinction at all can still be drawn between national and common European security interests'. Certainly the report seeks to entrench the European Commission's role in defence procurement and wants such matters dealt with under EU rather than national legislation.

We already have a situation where the British defence procurement market is open to foreign competition in a way in which the market in France, for example, is not. We see British defence companies – important national strategic assets – being taken over by foreign firms.

While British Conservatives are most supportive of measures to strengthen a genuine single market in most sectors, defence should continue to be the exception and should be safeguarded.

On the subject of WMD, we attach enormous importance to combating proliferation and to strengthening the security of component materials. At the same time, the UK's independent nuclear deterrent force continues to be a vital element of our defence strategy and one which has not lost relevance in spite of the changed security environment in which we live.

The British Government must not only take the necessary decisions to maintain our nuclear capability; it must also be prepared to adapt our weapons and the doctrine for their use.

On the subject of arms exports, while we welcome calls for better verification of the end-use of exported goods and the maintenance of the arms embargo on China, we continue, however, to have difficulty with the idea of a legally binding code of conduct. This would extend judicial authority into areas that are more properly the preserve of government and would further extend the reach of EU institutions, including the European Court of Justice. Tonight we have a dangerous mixture under discussion.

3-325

Helmut Kuhne (PSE). – Herr Präsident! Lassen Sie mich zunächst noch etwas zu Herrn Batten sagen. Es ist schon interessant, ihm als Vertreter einer Liste zuzuhören, auf der er zusammen mit zwei Leuten kandidiert hat, die innerhalb der letzten Wochen ganz kurz hintereinander öffentlich des Missbrauchs der Sekretariatszulage überführt wurden. Wir sollten in diesem Haus und in unserer Öffentlichkeitsarbeit mit dieser Heuchlertruppe wesentlich offensiver umgehen, als wir das bisher getan haben.

Nun aber zur Sache. Es ist nicht sinnvoll, wenn in drei wichtigen Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union etwa an dem Projekt des *unmanned air vehicle* verschiedene Firmen in getrennten Projekten arbeiten, die nichts miteinander zu tun haben, und sozusagen mehrfach verdienen. Das hat der europäische Steuerzahler nicht verdient. Es ist auch nicht sinnvoll, wenn drei wichtige Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union getrennt voneinander elektronische Identifizierungssysteme für Infanteristen entwickeln und nicht hinreichend klar ist, ob etwa die Soldaten ein und derselben europäischen *battle group* sich im Einsatz gegenseitig identifizieren können, wenn sie verschiedenen Nationen angehören. Wir sollten uns auch weiterhin darüber im Klaren sein, dass selbst in zehn Jahren die Armeen in der Europäischen Union noch über 23 verschiedene Typen gepanzerter Fahrzeuge verfügen müssen. Was das unter Einsatzbedingungen in Bezug auf Kompatibilität und Nachschubprobleme nach sich zieht, kann jeder verstehen.

Ich möchte aber auch vor einer Illusion warnen: Ein gemeinsamer Markt für Verteidigungsgüter wird nicht kommen, wenn unter Marktbedingungen operierende Unternehmen mit staatlich gestützten Unternehmen konkurrieren müssen. Das ist ein Aspekt, der in der heutigen Debatte bisher nicht angesprochen wurde, und ich möchte auch Herrn Wuermeling die

Anregung geben, ob es nicht sinnvoll wäre, sich diese Implikation der Debatte um den Artikel 296 einmal näher anzusehen und daraus für die Zukunft Schlussfolgerungen zu ziehen.

3-326

Othmar Karas (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, meine Damen und Herren! Vor allem mit dem Grünbuch der Kommission und dem Bericht Wuermeling entsprechen wir den Wünschen der Bevölkerung, der Bürger Europas. Auf die Frage, welche Ziele die Europäische Union sich geben soll, sagen die Bürger: sie soll eine Verteidigungs- und Sicherheitsunion werden. Wenn wir die Bürger fragen, was sie wollen, dann sagen sie: eine gemeinsame Außenpolitik mit einem Gesicht und einer Person und nicht 25 nationale Einzelinteressen.

Wenn wir uns das veränderte Sicherheitsumfeld ansehen, dann müssen wir uns schon die Frage stellen: Schafft es jeder Mitgliedstaat für sich allein, bei der herrschenden Grundstimmung und bei der derzeitigen finanziellen Situation der Mitgliedstaaten für ausreichende Sicherheit zu sorgen? Nein. Daher benötigen wir auf diesem Gebiet mehr Europa, nicht zwingend mehr Geld. Wenn wir aber mehr Europa brauchen, aber nicht mehr Geld haben, dann müssen wir etwas an unserem Verhalten ändern.

Wir wollen eine gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, wir wollen eine Weiterentwicklung der EU zur politischen Union, wir wollen einen starken Binnenmarkt und wir wollen die Reduzierung der Abhängigkeit von den Vereinigten Staaten. Was ist daher zu tun? Wir benötigen gemeinsame technologische Standards in Europa auf diesem Gebiet, um die Kooperation möglich zu machen und zu stärken. Wir müssen gemeinsame Verteidigungsstrukturen schaffen, die zu einer verstärkten politischen Kooperation, Integration und Solidarität zählen.

Wir müssen natürlich angesichts der Feststellung "mehr Europa, aber nicht mehr Geld" die Ressourcen im Verteidigungsbereich effizienter nutzen, die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit der Europäischen Union stärken, die militärische Ausrüstung verbessern und die Kosten senken, die Ausstattung und Ausbildung europäisieren, die Kooperation verbessern und damit zu einer Effizienzsteigerung beitragen.

Diese Debatte zeigt, dass wir mehr Europa brauchen; vielleicht ist auch deshalb der Rat nicht anwesend, weil vor allem die großen Mitgliedstaaten – ich denke an das Vereinigte Königreich und Frankreich – zwar viel vom Gemeinsamen reden, aber zu den Stolpersteinen auf dem Weg zu einer stärkeren Kommission auf diesem Gebiet gehören.

3-327

Joel Hasse Ferreira (PSE). – Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, Senhora Comissária, há uma necessidade de garantir nos processos produtivos na área da defesa a segurança dos trabalhadores e dos cidadãos, bem como a eficiência das próprias empresas e isso passa também por regras claras de *defense procurement*.

Existe a obrigação de informar as populações europeias sobre o interesse em se dispor de empresas de defesa modernizadas e eficientes, articuladas com o tecido inovador de pequenas e médias empresas que trabalhem com tecnologias aplicáveis nas áreas civil e militar, assim como é importante a coordenação estratégica das indústrias de defesa existentes nos vários Estados da União utilizando a Agência Europeia como um dos *pivots* da inovação tecnológica e do aperfeiçoamento dos produtos e dos processos nas várias empresas europeias dos sectores ligados à defesa.

Em qualquer caso, não podemos deixar que se estabeleça alguma vez na Europa da União um complexo militar industrial condicionando os poderes políticos, o tipo de complexo de cuja poderosa influência se queixou o General Eisenhower quando saiu da Presidência norte-americana. Os contratos têm de ser bem claros. Regras límpidas e entendíveis de *defense procurement* podem ajudar muito neste domínio.

Até porque, se assim não for, a concentração empresarial será centrada nestas indústrias impedindo na prática o funcionamento da livre concorrência no próprio mercado interno europeu. Assim como é de facto urgente a necessidade de impulsionar pequenas e médias empresas inovadoras na participação, à medida das suas competências, no processo produtivo global na área das indústrias de defesa.

Senhor Presidente, caros Colegas, Senhora Comissária, a terminar lembrava a necessidade de a União Europeia procurar manter uma coerência permanente entre a sua política externa e as regras de comércio internacional, nomeadamente a respeito de embargos. Ninguém entenderá que as indústrias de defesa dos Estados da União alguma vez apoiem na prática a eclosão ou a manutenção de guerras ilegítimas ou de regimes ditatoriais. Não é essa a vocação da Europa, não pode ser essa a prática da União Europeia.

3-328

Zuzana Roithová (PPE-DE). – Dámy a pánové, stojíme na historické křížovatce, když chceme nabourat zaběhnuté praktiky národních států obchodování se zbrojným materiálem. Zelená kniha o veřejných zakázkách v oblasti obrany i budoucí směrnice proto potřebují silnou politickou podporu, neboť mají prolomit tabu, jakým je dnešní uzavřený zbrojní trh v Evropě. Cílem není nic menšího než zásadní omezení výjimek ze všeobecných pravidel hospodářské soutěže, z nichž dnes těží některé národní monopoly na úkor občanů. Primární právo článek 296 umožňuje členským státům využívat až

zneužívat výjimky, takže zbrojní trh je díky účelovým bariérám prakticky uzavřený, monopolní a obtížně kontrolovatelný, neboť je utajený i tam, kde proto vůbec není žádný bezpečnostní důvod. Neprůhlednost veřejných zakázek, roztríštěnost výzkumných programů a nedostatečná standardizace, to vše je příčinou nízké kvality a chudé interoperability a tudíž neefektivity národních obranných systémů. Je tedy dost důvodů pro uvolnění zbrojního trhu o velikosti 160 miliard euro také proto, že většina členských států Unie obtížně plní i své povinnosti v rámci společné obranné politiky NATO.

Získá-li návrh Komise i podporu celé přetadvacítky, měli bychom se dočkat spolupráce členských zemí v inovativních strategických, snížení nákladů a také nových příležitostí pro podnikání nejen mezi velkými koncerny, ale také pro malé a střední výrobce a dodavatele logistického vybavení. Zásadní podmínkou pro liberalizaci zbrojního trhu však je, pro mne a řadu poslanců, závazné a důsledné dodržování kodexu chování Unie při vývozu zbraní. Můj požadavek byl vtělen do textu zprávy s cílem omezit nemorální vývoz zbraní z pokročilých demokracií do zemí rozvojového světa. Jde o podmínu *sine qua non* a žádám Komisi, aby zajistila vysokou kontrolovatelnost. Vede mě k tomu varující zkušenosť z transferu z České republiky před deseti lety. Jsem také hluboce zklamána ignorováním tohoto zasedání ze strany Rady.

3-329

Proinsias De Rossa (PSE). – Mr President, I too wish to express my concern at what Mr Batten said, and urge that action be taken to have him withdraw those insulting remarks relating to Members of this House.

Commissioner, the European Code on Arms Exports has a number of shortcomings, the most glaring of which is the fact that it is not legally binding. There is also, however, a need for clarification of the language and the application of the code. There is a need for its scope to be broadened, and indeed there is a need for greater transparency and accessibility of information in relation to, in particular, the annual reports and the denial notifications.

A number of Members have mentioned that some EU Member States are actually in breach of the code, while declaring themselves determined to prevent the export of equipment which might be used for internal repression or international aggression, or indeed contribute to regional instability. They have allowed arms and security equipment to be transferred for illicit end use.

Finally, on 20 September, in reply to a question I put to you, you indicated that you intend to draft a communication on small arms and light weapons before the end of 2006. Might I suggest that it would be more appropriate to have that communication published and debated in this House before the middle of next year, which is in fact when the United Nations are holding a conference on small arms and light weapons.

3-330

Andreas Schwab (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zu dieser späten Stunde diskutieren wir über die Frage, ob wir in Europa Wehrtechnik brauchen, und was wir tun können, um eine gemeinsame europäische Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik wahr werden zu lassen.

Zunächst möchte ich zu dem, was die Kollegen von der anderen Seite des Hauses in Frage gestellt haben, sagen – und dabei dem Kollegen Brok ausdrücklich beipflichten –, dass die Wehrtechnik in der Europäischen Union deshalb notwendig ist, weil wir uns in Europa in unserer Sicherheit nicht von Dritten abhängig machen und uns nicht erpressbar machen dürfen. Es ist auch von Kollegen angesprochen worden, dass die Menschen in Europa ein verstärktes gemeinsames Vorgehen der Mitgliedstaaten im Bereich der Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik erwarten. Das eine oder andere ist dabei schon gelungen. Die Mission in Bosnien ist erwähnt worden. Viele andere Dinge sind auch gelungen. Allerdings muss man ganz ehrlich sagen, dass der Weg zu einer tatsächlich gemeinsamen Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik – so wie sie sich die Bürger und Bürgerinnen vorstellen – noch ein weiter ist.

Deshalb begrüße ich ausdrücklich, dass der Vorschlag der Kommission mit ihrem Grünbuch zum Markt für Verteidigungsgüter und der Bericht des Kollegen Wuermeling in die richtige Richtung weisen. Sie verpflichten die Mitgliedstaaten dazu, durch die gemeinsamen Vorschriften für die Beschaffung von militärischen Verteidigungsgütern einen wichtigen Schritt zur Entwicklung gemeinsamer Verteidigungsstrukturen sowie zu einer stärkeren politischen Integration zu setzen. Die höhere Effizienz der erheblichen Ausgaben für Verteidigung, die dadurch entstehen, führt automatisch zu einer weiteren Vereinigung des europäischen Marktes und dient daher *expressis verbis* dem Steuerzahler.

Ich möchte gerne zur Frage, wie dieser gemeinsame *code of conduct* ausgestaltet werden kann, einige Überlegungen vortragen. Die Kommission hat schon im Jahr 1958 Materialien und Regelungen entwickelt, die als Auslegungsgrundlage des Artikels 296 herangezogen werden könnten. Diese sind bisher leider nie veröffentlicht und auch nie angewandt worden. Aber es würde sich sicherlich lohnen, nachzuschauen, was damals als erachtenswert angesehen wurde. Die Schaffung eines *code of conduct* muss sicherstellen, dass kein Widerspruch zwischen Entscheidungen der Europäischen Rüstungssagentur auf der einen Seite und der Kommission auf der anderen Seite entsteht. Hier ist sicherzustellen, dass eine optimale Koordination zwischen der Kommission und der Verteidigungsagentur gelingt.

3-331

Simon Coveney (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I want to use this debate as an opportunity to highlight the impact that small arms and light weapons are having on the human rights of so many people. It is not the so-called weapons of mass destruction that are currently causing the vast majority of tragedies and conflicts across the globe. It should perhaps be small arms and light weapons that are considered to be the weapons causing the most mass destruction.

I am impressed with and support the report before us on EU arms exports and I want to congratulate the rapporteur for the job that he has done. The EU voluntary code of conduct has had some success in ensuring standards. However, the end goal must be to bring about an acceptance for a legally binding code and this Parliament should be consistent in calling for that.

Time and time again, the EU is happy to take the high moral ground on human rights issues and on calling for adherence to international standards and law. We must show leadership and lead by example on the trade in arms to have credibility to bring about change outside the Union in arms trade standards. We should not fear a legally binding code but see it as an opportunity for the EU as regards raising standards in arms export policy. The four major EU arms suppliers have dramatically increased their share of arms sales to the developing world in the last year.

In 2004, USD 4.8 billion of business was done, which is more than 22% of total arms sales. When one considers that almost half a million people are killed every year by small arms, then the significance of the small arms trade becomes clear.

I support the concept of the creation of a so-called blacklist of countries that should not have arms sold to them from the EU. The criteria for such a list should be applied equally, however, on a set of standards based on human rights violations and instability.

Finally, I want to urge the Commission to use all opportunities available to it to promote an acceptance for an international small arms treaty in order to move forward a common standard approach for arms sales internationally. Too many rogue states, irresponsible governments, military dictators and gangland-style leaders have easy access to weapons that are used to brutal and corrupt effect, resulting in a spiral of demand for small arms and light weapons in the many small-scale conflicts that persist.

The fact that the developed world continues to tolerate the sale of weapons to such people should be a cause for serious and continuing concern in this House.

3-332

Girts Valdis Kristovskis (UEN), *Referents.* – Cienījamie kolēgi! Nēmot vērā to, ka šeit Parlamentā, debatējot par manu ziņojumu, radās zināmas domstarpības, un lai meklētu kompromisu, tad es piedāvāju 34. pantā zināmas izmaiņas. Un tātad aiz vārdiem *takes note* būtu jāievieto:

3-333

‘... as stated by Hans Blix, that the credible threat of the use of force has played an important role in facilitating the disarmament work of UNSCOM and UNMOVIC.’

3-334

Un pēc tam es vēlētos pārējo panta daļu svītrot. Līdz ar to, manuprāt, tas varētu būt priekšlikums, lai arī sociālisti, kuri izteicās, ka atturēsies, varētu balsot par šo pantu.

3-335

President. – Thank you, but you will have to bring that up as an oral amendment during the vote tomorrow.

3-336

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, even though it is late I think it was a very interesting discussion. I agree that this discussion could have been much broader. We have spoken on rather specific topics, but some of you have said very clearly that there are many more dimensions, taking in a common foreign and security policy and a common security and defence policy. I shall now make a few specific remarks.

Firstly, on arms exports, the Commission can only agree with the substance of the discussion today. We are probably already one of the regional actors with the strictest arms controls in the world, but progress has to continue, to strengthen the rules and their implementation. Making the code of conduct a common position will be a major step at European Union level. In fact the code of conduct on exports of military equipment that was adopted in 1998 contains many common criteria against which applications for export licences are assessed.

As is stated in the code of conduct, the decision to transfer or deny a transfer is at the discretion of individual Member States and the Commission is therefore not in a position to comment on alleged circumventions of the code of conduct with regard to any country. I say that specifically regarding the question on Colombia. One of the most important criteria is

always the human rights question. It is one criterion among others, such as regional peace, security and stability, but it is for the Member States to comment on that issue.

A reinforced code of conduct which has already been finalised at technical level and which will be introduced at an appropriate moment will increase the scope of controls. The reinforced code of conduct will go beyond physical exports of goods and technology. It will include brokering and transfer of intangible technology, and it will also contain more explicit language on reverse engineering and on unintended technology transfer. Moreover, the criterion on human rights will be further strengthened.

The European Union is now trying to come up with an arms trade treaty. This is at the instigation of the British Presidency. Such a treaty on conventional weapons would be based on states' existing responsibilities under international law and would establish transfer criteria that are consistent with internationally accepted standards of human rights and humanitarian law. It should be legally binding, be a separate and self-standing initiative, cover all conventional arms transfers, set out the principles defining illegal transfers, include monitoring, and be broadly based.

On weapons of mass proliferation, it is now two years since we developed a fully fledged strategy against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Commitments have been made both by the European Union and the G8 global partnership. In this context, it is critical to ensure that financial means will be available for the future. The combination of the CFSP and Community tools would allow the European Union to maintain better visibility and also more credibility. However, a lot has to be done, as I said earlier, for instance, within the framework of the United Nations, where we were very disappointed at the last negotiations on weapons of mass destruction.

On the third issue – defence procurement – let me again thank all of you, and the rapporteur in particular, who supported this report and therefore the proposals put forward by the Commission. The political sensitivity of this file cannot, and should not, be underestimated. However, I agree with Mr Wuermeling when he points out that it mainly concerns the internal market. The report correctly focuses on this issue and on the objectives that are pursued by the Commission with its initiatives.

As I have said, more efficient public spending on defence will contribute to the prosperity of the Union, because it means that taxpayers' money could be reduced. This will be done within the limits of our Community competence and also in full respect for the prerogatives and the sovereignty of our Member States. As usual, we will continue to work very closely with the European Defence Agency, as suggested in the Wuermeling report.

I am glad that the Commission and Parliament share the same views, not only on the objectives to be pursued but also on the measures to achieve them.

In conclusion, let me say that I am looking forward to discussing these and other questions again, in the high-level interparliamentary conference in early December in Brussels.

I also thank Mr Brok and Mr von Wogau for this initiative. It is highly welcome. Perhaps we could also pursue a more ambitious security policy goal, which has been lacking so far.

3-337

Předseda. – Společná rozprava je uzavřena.

Hlasování proběhne ve čtvrtek.

Písemné prohlášení (článek 142)

3-338

Francesco Musotto (PPE-DE), per iscritto. – L'approccio ideato dall'Unione Europea sulle armi di distruzione di massa è stata definito, ora dobbiamo convincere anche gli altri popoli della sua validità. L'UE deve impedire il fallimento delle future conferenze sul Trattato di non Proliferazione, e deve necessariamente battersi per l'adesione di tutti i Paesi al Trattato, per il suo rispetto, per la riqualificazione dei meccanismi di verifica, con il pieno supporto dell'autorità dell'ONU e con l'ausilio di sanzioni ove necessario.

Chiediamo, una strategia che coinvolga tutti i Paesi dell'Ue, più incisiva, che sanzioni duramente le attività che contribuiscono alla proliferazione e rafforzi il divieto sulle armi chimiche e biologiche. Una strategia che veda maggiormente coinvolto il Parlamento Europeo, al fine di imporre un codice che regoli le esportazioni di armi e norme più chiare sugli appalti pubblici militari.

Ribadiamo inoltre la necessità di una moratoria sulle munizioni ad uranio impoverito.

Il deciso impegno del Parlamento Europeo contro l'uso delle armi di distruzione di massa è determinato dalla consapevolezza che tale impiego causa non solo la perdita di vite umane, ma soprattutto la scomparsa di quei valori etici, patrimonio dei popoli dell'Ue, che sono alla base della nostra storia e che motivano l'esistenza e il futuro della nostra Comunità.

3-339

16 - Pořad jednání příštího zasedání: viz zápis

3-340

17 - Konec zasedání

3-341

(Zasedání skončilo ve 23:45.)