

СРЯДА, 23 ЮНИ 2010 Г.
MIÉRCOLES 23 DE JUNIO DE 2010
STŘEDA 23. ČERVNA 2010
ONSDAG DEN 23. JUNI 2010
MITTWOCH, 23. JUNI 2010
KOLMAPÄEV, 23. JUUNI 2010
TETAPTH 23 IOYNIQY 2010
WEDNESDAY, 23 JUNE 2010
MERCREDI 23 JUN 2010
MERCOLEDI' 23 GIUGNO 2010
TREŠDIENA, 2010. GADA 23. JŪNIJS
2010 M. BIRŽELIO 23 D., TREČIADIENIS
2010. JŪNIUS 23., SZERDA
L-ERBGHA, 23 TA' ĠUNJU 2010
WOENSDAG 23 JUNI 2010
ŚRODA, 23 CZERWCA 2010
QUARTA-FEIRA, 23 DE JUNHO DE 2010
MIERCURI 23 IUNIE 2010
STREDA 23. JÚNA 2010
SREDA, 23. JUNIJ 2010
KESKIVIIKKO 23. KESÄKUUTA 2010
ONSDAGEN DEN 23 JUNI 2010

PRZEWODNICZY: JERZY BUZEK
Przewodniczący

1 - Wznowienie sesji

(Posiedzenie zostało otwarte o godz. 15.05)

2 - Przyjęcie protokołu poprzedniego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

3 - Oświadczenia Przewodniczącego

Przewodniczący. – Chciałem przekazać Państwu krótką informację. Dziś rano wróciłem z dwudniowej oficjalnej wizyty w Rosji. Była to pierwsza wizyta przewodniczącego Parlamentu Europejskiego w tym kraju od 12 lat. W Moskwie spotkałem się z prezydentem Miedwiediewem, przewodniczącym Dumy Borysem Gryzłowem, przewodniczącym Rady Federacji Siergiejem Mironowem oraz ministrem spraw zagranicznych i ministrem ds. energii. Rozmawialiśmy o stosunkach Unia Europejska-Rosja w ramach partnerstwa dla modernizacji, a także o negocjacjach nowego porozumienia między Unią a Federacją Rosyjską. Szereg innych spraw zostało także poruszonych, m.in. sprawa praw człowieka. Spotkałem się również z przedstawicielami organizacji społecznych, w tym Memoriału (laureta Nagrody Sacharowa 2009).

Podczas gdy byłem w Moskwie, nastąpiła eskalacja sporu gazowego między Białorusią a Rosją, o czym Państwo wiecie. Przekazałem władzom rosyjskim wyrazy zaniepokojenia tą sytuacją i wezwałem do wywiązywania się przez strony konfliktu ze swoich zobowiązań umownych dotyczących dostaw gazu do Unii Europejskiej. Zwróciłem także uwagę, że w odpowiednich umowach między Białorusią i Rosją powinny zostać zawarte odpowiednie klauzule, które gwarantują dostarczanie gazu do Unii Europejskiej. Gwarancja dostaw jest dla nas sprawą najważniejszą. Także Rada i Komisja analizują obecnie tę sprawę, być może przedstawiciele obu instytucji będą mogli przedstawić nam najnowszą ocenę sytuacji jeszcze podczas tej sesji. W każdym razie ta sprawa rozwija się na bieżąco, co kilka godzin docierają do nas nowe informacje w tej sprawie.

3-008

4 - Powitanie

3-009

Przewodniczący. – Chciałbym Państwa poinformować, że członkowie delegacji Parlamentu Indonezji zajęli miejsca przeznaczone dla gości oficjalnych. Chciałbym ich serdecznie powitać, a szczególnie przewodniczącego Jego Ekszelencję Kemala Azisa Stamboela. Delegacja Parlamentu Indonezji gości dzisiaj w Parlamencie w związku z siódmym posiedzeniem międzyparlamentarnym Parlamentu Europejskiego i Parlamentu Indonezji. Jak Państwo wiecie, to jest rozwijające się społeczeństwo i gospodarka. Odgrywa istotną rolę w świecie, w szczególności w Stowarzyszeniu Narodów Azji Południowo-Wschodniej (ASEAN). Był to pierwszy kraj, z którym Unia Europejska podpisała w listopadzie 2009 r. umowę o partnerstwie i współpracy. Z wielką przyjemnością pragnę dzisiaj powitać ich wśród nas.

3-010

5 - Skład grup politycznych: Patrz protokół

3-011

6 - Skład Parlamentu: Patrz protokół

3-012

7 - Skład komisji i delegacji: Patrz protokół

3-013

8 - Utworzenie europejskiego systemu szybkiego ostrzegania (SARE) przed pedofilami i osobami molestującymi seksualnie (oświadczenie pisemne): Patrz protokół

3-014

9 - Konkluzje ze szczytu Rady Europejskiej (17 czerwca 2010 r.) (debata)

3-015

Przewodniczący. – Kolejnym punktem porządku dziennego są oświadczenia Rady Europejskiej i Komisji Europejskiej w sprawie konkluzji ze szczytu Rady Europejskiej w dniu 17 czerwca 2010 roku.

3-016

Herman Van Rompuy, President of the European Council. – Mr President, this was the first meeting of the European Council since I became its President that was not dominated by immediate urgency. It was a normal meeting and the decisions we took were of considerable significance, not least in terms of dealing with the ongoing economic situation and looking beyond the crisis at how we can improve Europe's long-term economic performance.

We recently showed strong political determination in safeguarding the stability of the euro. I was happy to note at this meeting a similar resolve to enhance our long-term economic strengths and a commitment to a new European strategy for jobs and growth, including the Europe 2020 Strategy. Building on the work of the Commission and of the sectoral councils, we endorsed the five headline targets with which you are now familiar and which we consider to be crucial for increasing Europe's economic growth-rate – in itself essential if we are to maintain our European way of life with an ageing population and if we want to remain a world player.

I know that some in this house and elsewhere have expressed misgivings and asked whether the Europe 2020 Strategy can produce better results than the previous Lisbon Strategy, generally held to have been insufficient. My firm belief is that it can.

We have deliberately chosen to focus on a smaller number of targets rather than the plethora of targets that got lost in the Lisbon Strategy. They are vital targets and incorporate the social, environmental and educational dimensions that your Parliament has rightly insisted on. We will focus relentlessly on those targets with ongoing work and annual reviews. There will be national breakdowns of targets, and not just Europe-wide aggregates, thereby providing realistic yardsticks to measure national performances.

Above all, I have sought to achieve a situation where our Member States have a sense of ownership of the process, so that they do not consider this to be something adopted in Brussels – and subsequently ignore – but consider it to be an inherent part of their own economic strategy.

I count on the European Parliament to keep up the pressure for implementing the EU 2020 Strategy. It has to be a vital part of how we assess the state of our Union. I was pleased that, when your President addressed the Heads of State and Government at the start of last week's meeting of the European Council, you drew attention to Parliament's support for the Europe 2020 Strategy. That was very welcome.

At the same time I know that there are some in this Chamber and elsewhere who have expressed concerns about the method being used to implement the strategy. Is it, as some have claimed, too much of an intergovernmental working method?

I would simply point out that improving Europe's economic performance requires the use of a range of instruments, some of them a European competence and others a national competence. At a European level we can, and do, adopt common legislation for our common market on the regulation of financial services, on competition policy, on trade, on consumer protection and on other matters. We can also make use of the EU budget, in particular the structural funds and the research programmes. The role of the Commission is pivotal in all of this. However, key aspects of our economic performance remain essentially a national competence, not least education.

If we are to be successful we need to mobilise all levels of government in a common endeavour. According to the Treaty – and I quote Article 121 – 'Member States shall regard their economic policies as a matter of common concern and shall coordinate them within the Council ...'. This coordination is to be based on the European Council's conclusions and involves all the institutions with an input from both the Commission and Parliament.

We are currently increasing the scope of this coordination just as we are increasing the scope of what we do through EU legislation, such as the banking legislation. Both coordination of national policies and common action at EU level are required.

The task of the European Council – bringing together as it does both the leaders of the national governments and the President of the Commission – is to determine the guidelines and political direction of both these elements. Those who are seeking to pit the Commission and Member States against each other do the Union a disservice.

I might add that it is also somewhat facile to equate the European Council with simple intergovernmentalism. It is now an EU institution. It operates within the framework of the carefully balanced architecture of the Union as a whole, described in the Treaties. It includes among its members the President of the Commission. It now has – in its own President – someone chosen to work in the interests of the Union as a whole and who is not simultaneously representing a national government.

In any case we should not assume that heads of national governments are not capable of perceiving the wider common interest or that they are unaware of the fact that their own national interest is indeed to have a well-functioning Union.

Coming back to our meeting of last week, the European Council also took a decision which in my opinion is of equal importance to the Europe 2020 Strategy. This was the decision to establish a scorecard and a system of surveillance to better assess competitiveness developments and imbalances so that we can detect unsustainable or dangerous trends at an earlier stage.

Such imbalances have not been focused on in the past, partly because they were not identified as one of the Maastricht criteria. Yet they are of vital importance. Indeed the current situation facing a number of our Member States can be traced back to these imbalances. The euro was a victim of its own success. We forgot that the common currency needs convergence and reforms. Errors were made at all levels of governance over the last ten years, and let us be honest, it is a collective responsibility.

Regarding the financial sector: our priority is to have a solid and healthy banking system. We have called upon the European Parliament and the Economic and Financial Affairs Council (Ecofin) to rapidly adopt the legislative proposals on financial supervision to ensure that the European systemic risk board and the three supervisory authorities can begin working from the beginning of next year. Your contribution, the contribution of Parliament, is vital and your responsibility is great in this matter.

We also agreed that stress tests of the banks would be published at the latest in the second half of July. We ask the Commission to quickly make proposals on naked short selling and credit default swaps. The European Council agreed that Member States should introduce a system of levies and taxes on financial institutions and we agree to explore and to develop with our G20 partners the possibility of introducing a global, financial, transaction tax. Indeed we agreed a

common position on a number of other items that will be dealt with at the G20 Toronto Summit where Mr Barroso and I will have the honour of representing the Union.

We also reconfirm the European Union's position on achieving the Millennium Development Goals, in particular our development aid targets, by 2015. Despite the economic crisis we also reaffirmed our willingness to progress further on climate change. We agreed, subject to certain conditions, to commence the accession negotiations for Iceland to join the European Union and welcomed Estonia's application to join the euro zone, both signs of confidence in the future of our Union.

We adopted a declaration on Iran which underlined our deep concerns about its nuclear programme and asked the Foreign Affairs Council to adopt at its next meeting measures to implement UN Security Council sanctions and to accompany them with further measures. In doing so we proved that the Union can have a common position on one of the most delicate issues in world politics today.

The second part of the meeting focused on the issue of economic governance and better coordination of economic policy. I reported back on the work undertaken so far by the Task Force that the European Council asked me to chair. A high degree of convergence is already emerging and I intend to complete the work of this Task Force by October at the latest. I will be meeting your delegation before and again after the summer break in order to ensure Parliament's contribution is fully integrated into our work.

The European Council welcomed my progress report and agreed on a first set of orientations. It approved the provisional conclusions and the stricter supervision of the budgets and competitiveness. There was agreement that we need to strengthen both the preventive and the corrective arms of the Stability and Growth Pact; the system of sanctions for sealing the pact needs to be reviewed so as to have a coherent and progressive system. There was agreement on the European Commission's idea of the 'European semester', whereby Member States will present their stability and convergence programmes by the Spring of each year, thereby enabling a common review of the underlying assumptions and trends affecting national budgets for the coming years – of course taking account of national budgetary procedures.

On this point, I should emphasise that it was never suggested that Finance Ministers should have to submit their national budget to the Commission for approval prior to submitting it to their national parliaments. No-one would endorse such an infringement of parliamentary competences.

The work of the Task Force is not finished. Other ideas from the Commission, of course, from the Central Bank, from your Parliament and from Member States from whom we have had nearly a dozen written contributions, are still to be discussed. Some ideas might require Treaty change – but that is a more lengthy and cumbersome procedure. We will give priority to those proposals that can be enacted more speedily and more easily.

Anyway, there seems to be an emerging consensus that we do not need to create new institutions for our economic governance but to make better use of those that we already have. While specific decisions will sometimes be necessary at the level of the euro zone countries – and when required I will convene a euro zone summit as I have done twice already – it is at the level of the whole of our Union that the main aspects of our economic governance must be decided. Whether we are in the euro zone or not we are economically interdependent and share the common ownership of the world's largest market. That is the level at which the bulk of European decisions must be taken through the institutional structures and procedures of our Union.

In this context, in accordance with the Treaty, the European Council intends to fulfil its role of setting political directions and priorities for the Union including economic strategy and governance.

The economic challenges facing Europe remain immense. We were very close to the edge of the precipice just a few weeks ago and we have not yet reached safety. We were right to provide the fiscal stimulus at the depth of the recession, but we must be careful not to reach a situation where fiscal deficits and accumulated levels of debt become unsustainable and begin to be themselves a threat to our economic recovery.

The measures taken by the Member States to reduce their deficit will not have a profound deflationary effect for the Union as a whole if they restore confidence in the economy, thereby stimulating both consumption and investment. On the other hand, failure to correct unsustainable deficits would ultimately lead to a fatal loss of credibility and confidence with lasting economic damage.

The measures taken are differentiated according to the varied situations of each Member State and they are gradual. Indeed, rather than the absolute level it is the direction and its sustainability that are important. Provided we persevere I have every confidence that Europe will turn the corner.

I consider this meeting of the European Council to have been a further important step in combating the crisis which started as a financial crisis and became an economic, budgetary and nearly a monetary crisis. We are drawing lessons from all of this and correcting the course step by step. I am confident that we will succeed.

3-017

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission*. – Mr President, only a week ago we met in Strasbourg to prepare for the European Council and the G20 Summit in Toronto. In front of this House I said that in the face of the current economic problems growth is the answer and that this growth has to be smart, sustainable, inclusive, that it must build on fiscal consolidation and structural reforms and that, for this to happen, we need to advance on several fronts at once, namely: by adopting the Europe 2020 strategy; by rapidly concluding the remaining work in financial market regulation and supervision; by coming forward with ambitious measures to enforce our economic governance in Europe; and finally by entering the G20 meeting in Toronto with a strong and united European Union position.

I am glad to say that this was the path taken by the European Council last week and that happened largely on the basis of proposals put forward by the Commission. The European Council reached exceptionally substantive conclusions as we took decisions on strategic orientations which point to the future and offer a vision. The result of the last European Council went beyond simply adding up national approaches. It delivered a true European perspective in three areas in particular: economic governance, financial regulation supervision and, of course, in everything that has to do with our future European strategy for growth and jobs, Europe 2020.

First, economic governance. Though this is still work in progress, the outline of what is needed is now clear. You know that the Commission set out some ideas in its communication of 12 May: a European semester to bring together surveillance of structural and fiscal policies; making the provisions on debt work effectively; more creative use of carrots and sticks to help the Stability and Growth Pact head off future problems and correct them when they arise; ensuring that national budgetary frameworks are set up in the right way to respect Treaty obligations; broadening economic surveillance to tackle macroeconomic imbalances and comparing those problems in the internal market so as to cover the full range of key issues and not just look at the budgetary dimension.

We now have a European consensus that this is the way forward. The next steps are for the Task Force chaired by the President of the European Council to take this consensus and translate it into detailed action. With this in mind, the Commission will next week put on the table some ideas for concrete further action and we are already working on the detailed proposals. We will have these on the table by the end of September because I believe time is also extremely important here.

The second key area where we reached important agreement was financial services. We all know that the job here is not complete and we all know how important it is to have the right regulatory basis for sound responsible financial services, to give confidence that we have the bulwarks in place against future pressures.

Here of course the role of Parliament is essential. As I did with Heads of State and Governments last week in the European Council, I would likewise appeal to you to make every effort to ensure that the proposals on financial supervision are adopted before the summer break so that the new arrangements can be in place for next year. The same urgency is there for alternative investment fund managers and capital requirements.

I was delighted that the European Council took up the target in our 2 June communication to have the next phase of financial services proposals agreed by the end of 2011. Issuing these proposals will be a major focus of the Commission's work this autumn and I am sure that Parliament will be ready to give the speedy attention needed to this very important initiative.

I also believed that it was particularly important for the European Council to agree on a proposal for an effective and coherent approach on the stress testing of banks. Making the results public on a bank-by-bank basis is the right way to use transparency to fuel confidence and prevent the speculation which distorts the markets. We will know exactly what problems still exist and exactly how they will be tackled, and, as I said in the European Council, the Commission will stand ready to make whatever examination may be needed under our state aid rules in case interventions are necessary.

Another central strand of our action, and I think probably one of the most important conclusions of this European Council, was of course Europe 2020. This has now been accepted by the European Council as a European Union strategy for economic growth for the long term in the sustainable and inclusive way we proposed just a few months ago and to which this House has given substantial input.

I am reassured that it has been possible for this approach to be agreed so quickly and in particular that we have been able to agree the five headline targets, including on education and fighting poverty. I would like to underline this point because, as you know, it was not evident at the beginning that the Member States should also agree to share their action in terms of what are mainly national competences but which we can put together in a coordinated manner at European level.

With this, the 27 Heads of State and Government have made far-reaching commitments. There should be full comprehension of the fact that leading a European Member State is also leading one part of the European Union and that there should be no contradiction between the important tasks of leadership. The strong and positive political impetus given by this Parliament was extremely helpful in reaching this positive result and I want to thank you once again. I also want to thank the President of Parliament because, in the first part of the work of the European Council, he made it clear with strong European conviction how important it was to reach agreement on those matters.

Let me thank this House for the very substantial input which you are giving to the strategy and which, of course, I hope we will continue to give in the future because, as you know, work is far from complete. We still have to define some of the most important and critical issues regarding the implementation of this strategy.

In fact we now face the hard work of putting the strategy to work: engaging people at all levels of society and in all parts of the economy. That is why I have welcomed since the beginning the idea that our Member States should also have ownership of the strategy. It could not and should not be seen only as a strategy from Brussels or from Strasbourg. It is important that it is seen as a true strategy that mobilises our society.

The Commission will be coming forward with the flagship initiatives to drive the European dimension of the strategy, and working closely with Member States to develop the national reform programmes. The success of the strategy will also rely heavily on the work of Parliament in your own constituencies, with civil society, with national parliamentary colleagues and with the social partners and with society at large. This will be a real common effort for the coming months and years. This comprehensive economic approach gives us the strongest of platforms for the G20 meeting this week, a clear and united position which can offer the kind of leadership we have been able to offer to the G20 since 2008.

In a joint letter, signed by Herman Van Rompuy and myself, we have highlighted to all our G20 colleagues what are the priorities, what is the programme of the European Union in this meeting. It is the first time the European Union, separately from its Member States, has put together a position regarding our priorities for global action and I think this should be welcome. We have action under way and we have a clear timetable for the future. That is the challenge we can take to partners worldwide. Some of the matters are extremely controversial for some of our colleagues at the G20: for instance the issue of the bank levy and the financial protection tax. But it was in fact important that, at European level, we have reached a consensus on those matters.

In conclusion, the success of last week's European Council shows how the European Union is most effective when it concentrates on the priorities. When we face a new challenge we should resist the temptation to rush to set up new mechanisms, new structures, those kinds of institutional debates that never end. We should rather have confidence in the institutions we have, give them our support, and have confidence in our ability to deliver in just the way we saw last week.

Before concluding, let me congratulate Parliament, the Council and the High Representative for the successful outcome of the negotiations on the External Action Service. The Commission very much welcomes an agreement which clearly makes provision for a service which is part of the Community system and largely follows the proposals that Catherine Ashton has put forward in agreement with the Commission, working alongside the institutions and with the same rules of accountability as any other part of the European public service.

I would like also to tell you that the Commission worked hard with this House and the other institutions to ensure that the European External Action Service will be up and running as soon as possible. This was one of the important innovations of the Lisbon Treaty; we now have to make it a reality. The European Parliament can count on the Commission to defend Community matters, as being the best way to deliver the results our citizens expect to see. I believe this European Council did indeed represent very important progress for our European project.

(Applause)

3-018

Corien Wortmann-Kool, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, geachte voorzitters, de EVP-Fractie is blij dat de Europese Raad onder uw voorzitterschap belangrijke stappen vooruit heeft gezet naar de noodzakelijke verbetering van het Europese economisch bestuur en een gezamenlijke inzet in de G20. Want de crisis dwingt ons om eindelijk werk te maken van het creëren van een meer solide basis voor het voortbestaan van de euro. Begrotingstekorten moeten worden aangepakt, om zo het vertrouwen van de financiële markten en ook het vertrouwen onder onze burgers terug te winnen.

Het Parlement steunt de versterking van de preventieve arm van het stabiliteits- en groeipact. Europese stresstest, het instellen van sancties. Maar het zal wel aankomen op een concrete uitwerking in de *task force*, want de intergouvernementele methode zal ons niet uit de crisis helpen. Wat ons betreft, moet de naleving gestoeld zijn, ingebed zijn in een communautaire *governance*-structuur. Geen nieuwe instituties, en dat krijgt gelukkig ook geen steun in de Raad, maar een sterke en onafhankelijke rol van de Commissie.

Het is goed, commissaris Barroso, dat u in de komende maanden met nadere voorstellen komt. In het Parlement vorige week zei u dat de Commissie de economische regering van Europa is. In de plenaire vergadering kreeg u daar applaus voor. Maar daarbij past dat u ruimhartig en ook ambitieus van uw institutionele recht van initiatief gebruikmaakt. Versterken van de concurrentiekracht in de 27 lidstaten, dat is exact wat we met de Europese 2020-strategie willen bereiken. Met een sterk midden- en kleinbedrijf als onze banenmotor. Met de inhoud zit het ongeveer wel goed, maar mijn punt van zorg blijft hoe lidstaten afgerekend kunnen worden op hun inzet, en dat is cruciaal voor succes.

Onze fractie roept u op om met meer concrete uitwerking te komen op dat punt in de *task force*. Want als dat niet goed geregeld wordt, dan dreigen we uiteindelijk toch nog in een soort Lissabon-strategie te eindigen die niet succesvol was. Dat is niet in het belang van onze burgers, hun banen en de economische groei.

Voorzitter, u riep ons op om snel te besluiten over het financieel toezichtpakket. Maar u weet dat het probleem niet hier in dit Parlement ligt. Het probleem is de Raad, want de Raad is nog steeds niet bereid om het verslag-de Larosière ook echt in daden, in wetgeving om te zetten. Er is echt te weinig voortgang gemaakt onder het Spaans voorzitterschap, dus u doet er goed aan uw collega's in de Raad op te roepen om óók compromisbereid te zijn, net als het Parlement. Want dat is cruciaal om de datum van 1 januari te halen.

3-019

Marita Ulvskog, för S&D-gruppen. – Herr talman! Hela 14 000 fat olja per dag sprutar i dag rakt ut i Mexikanska golfen. Nu sprider sig oljan längs USA:s stränder. Den närmar sig Mexicos stränder. I norra Europa finns det människor som i dag oroar sig för att den s.k. loopen utanför Floridas kust ska föra oljan vidare med Golfströmmen också till vår del av världen.

Så ser det nämligen ut. Vi är oerhört sårbara, och ingen lever på en egen ö i denna värld. Allt hänger ihop. Därför är det så viktigt att vi inte förlorar frågorna om omställning till förnybar energi, till en annan sorts samhälle, dvs. det som vi talar om så ofta här och ibland lyckas få breda majoriteter för när vi ska fatta beslut om resolutioner. Samtidigt blir det fortfarande alldeles för lite gjort. Vi får inte tappa fokus på detta på grund av den ekonomiska krisen. Vi löser inte den ekonomiska krisen om vi inte samtidigt löser de frågor som handlar om vår sårbarhet när det gäller miljön.

Sårbarheten är också väldigt tydlig när det gäller finansmarknadens sätt. Det är de som regerar. Det är de som reagerar. Så har det varit i årtionden när så många av dem som sitter i de politiska grupperna här har tyckt att det har varit helt okej, och att det är bra att marknaden har så mycket makt. Nu börjar vi äntligen fatta beslut som innebär att vi får regleringar av finansmarknaden. Det är kolossalt viktigt! Vi ser vilka konsekvenser det har fått i många av EU:s medlemsländer, där fria, oreglerade marknadskrafter, dvs. det som så många tillbad fram till helt nyligen, ställer till med enorma problem. Då blir sårbarheten tydlig igen när det gäller hur detta hanteras innan vi har finansmarknadsregleringarna på plats, med drakoniska besparingar i de offentliga finanserna, som innebär att man till och med riskerar återhämtningen på grund av den ekonomiska krisen.

Krisen kan förvandlas till en djupgående recession. Jag tycker att det ser oerhört bekymmersamt ut i en del av våra medlemsländer, där man tar i på ett sätt som inte bara skapar sociala konflikter och slår ut människor, utan där man faktiskt riskerar att skada dem man ger sig ut för att vilja rädda.

Det var mycket intressant att lyssna till Herman Van Rompuy. Mycket var bra av det som sades, men det är mycket arkitektur och väldigt lite människa. Det sociala Europa är också en del av kampen för att göra någonting åt finansmarknaden och kampen för miljön. Människor far illa. Massarbetslösheten fortsätter att växa. Det måste vi lägga vår mesta energi på att åtgärda.

3-020

Guy Verhofstadt, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, let me first say that it goes without saying that the Member States of the Union have to play an important role, a vital role, in the economic strategy of the Union and of the euro zone in the coming years.

But the most important question today is another one, namely who will carry out the control and who will do the sanctioning if some of the Member States are not fulfilling the conditions – that is the key question. Will the control be in the hands of the Member States themselves, of the Council? Will the Member States be sanctioning themselves or will it be an independent institution, a *communaute* European Union institution? That is today's key question.

And I have to tell you that I do not think that there is anyone here in this House who believes that the Member States should sanction themselves. They did not do so in the past; why should they do it in the future? Let me give you some examples. The Lisbon Strategy failed because there was no system of an independent institution controlling the Member States on applying this Lisbon Strategy.

And the same applies to the Growth and Stability Pact. What happens in the Growth and Stability Pact? When it is the small countries that are not fulfilling the conditions then we experience a Greek Tragedy. And when it is the large

countries that are not fulfilling the conditions, as Germany and France did, they simply adapt the Stability and Growth Pact.

So if the Member States cannot do the job, it is an independent *communautaire* institution which has to do it, we are convinced of that. We have two resolutions on this that have been adopted, mostly unanimously, and a few days ago the President of the European Central Bank, Mr Trichet, gave exactly the same analysis here in this Parliament.

Well, should it be the European Parliament, the Commission, the President of the European Central Bank? We think that it is for the European Central Bank, or the European Commission – Trichet even proposed another institution, though I do not think that we need new institutions for that – but anyway under the *communautaire* method the European institutions have to fulfil that role.

That does not mean that the Member States do not play a role; no, they have to implement this whole strategy in daily politics, in the daily strategies that they develop in their own countries and that is what we need. We need that in the Growth and Stability Pact. We need it in the Euro 2020 Strategy and we need it also in the new competitiveness strategy that we are to develop in the next month.

My second point is about financial supervision. What is the problem here? The problem is that the European leaders will go to the G20 and they will not be able to announce an agreement on financial supervision.

The reason is very simple, the reason lies with the Ministers of Finance, of the European Union, of Ecofin who in December went back on the good proposals of the Commission based on the de Larosière report. That is the problem. It is not here that the message has to be given; we have to give the message to the Ministers of Finance. They have to go back on their proposals and go in the direction of the Commission.

The proposals of the Commission and de Larosière are based on a European supervisory authority for the banks. That is the main proposal. And what the Ministers of Finance did, in the Ecofin in December of last year, was simply a little bit of coordination between national supervisors – national supervisors which did not work in the financial crisis. There was not one national supervisor which raised the alarm with the politicians at the moment of the financial crisis and now they are explaining that it is a good system, that they have simply to coordinate themselves.

So what we need is that from the Council, from the European Council, pressure should now be put on the Member States themselves to go in the direction of a European supervisory authority based on the proposals of de Larosière.

3-021

Rebecca Harms, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, Herr Ratspräsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich möchte zunächst einmal sagen, dass ich doch etwas bestürzt war, dass Sie hier unterstrichen haben, wie normal der Gipfel der letzten Woche war. Das ist die Fortsetzung der falschen Methode der letzten Woche. Wir sollten uns nicht vormachen, dass wir bei der europäischen Zusammenarbeit Normalität erreicht haben, wenn ein Gipfel auf sechs Stunden begrenzt wird, damit der Euro nicht durch ein falsches Wort oder einen falschen Satz weiter zum Absturz gebracht wird. Das war die Botschaft, die auf den Fluren des Ratsgebäudes unterwegs war, und es sollte nicht Ihre Aufgabe sein, uns bei der gegenwärtigen Lage Sand in die Augen zu streuen, dazu sehen wir eigentlich klar genug.

Kollege Verhofstadt hat schon gesagt, dass es mit der europäischen Wirtschaftsregierung nicht gut läuft und dass man das an bestimmten Punkten auch erkennen kann. Das möchte ich unterstreichen. Die Finanzaufsicht und der Bericht Larosière sind erwähnt worden. Herr Barroso, Herr Van Rompuy, wie finden Sie das denn eigentlich, dass wir uns nach einem Jahr Debatte jetzt über eine Aufsicht geeinigt haben, dass sich aber der Rat jetzt einfach weigert, der Aufsicht auch Zugriffsmöglichkeiten zu geben? Dass das auf die Ebene der Mitgliedstaaten gegeben werden soll, ist einfach absurd. Das ist einfach etwas, wo man von Ihnen, gerade wenn wir Ihnen hier auf der europäischen Ebene solche Unterstützung geben, mehr erwarten kann.

Wir könnten die Debatte über die Regelungen, die das Europäische Parlament gern erreichen würde, fortsetzen: für das Verbot von gefährlichen Produkten, die auf dem Finanzmarkt gehandelt werden, zumindest für das zeitweilige Aussetzen des Handels. Wir könnten weiter diskutieren über den Umgang mit Hedgefonds und Steueroasen, wir könnten diskutieren über Managergehälter und die wahnsinnig gefährlichen Boni, die gezahlt werden. In allen Bereichen finden im Moment die Trilogie statt, und in allen Bereichen der Finanzmarktaufsicht blockiert entweder der Rat oder es blockieren Rat und Kommission zusammen.

Herr Barroso, Sie haben sich bei uns bedankt, dass wir Sie als Parlament in der letzten Woche so geschlossen unterstützt haben. Ich halte das für richtig, diesen Einsatz des Parlaments für die *méthode communautaire*, aber wenn ich mir dann wieder anschau, was mit der Finanztransaktionssteuer los ist: Ich möchte ja gerne glauben, dass dies jetzt im Rahmen der G-20 durchgesetzt wird, ich möchte es gerne glauben! Ich bin gespannt, wie Sie aus Toronto zurückkommen. Wenn Sie zurückkommen und nicht liefern können, Herr Barroso, dann sorgen Sie endlich dafür, dass Ihr verantwortlicher

Kommissar – es gibt ja angeblich eine einheitliche europäische Position dazu, das ist uns von Herrn Juncker und während des Gipfels immer wieder so gesagt worden –, endlich eine ordentliche Vorlage für die Einführung der Finanztransaktionssteuer in der Eurozone liefert.

Das ist möglich, und wenn Sie es nicht tun, dann haben Sie einen Gipfel mal wieder nur dafür verwendet, die europäische Öffentlichkeit, was dieses gute Instrument angeht, an der Nase herumzuführen. Also es steht nicht gut um die gemeinsame Politik in diesem Bereich.

Was ist mit Europa 2020? Gerade wenn man jetzt nach Griechenland oder nach Spanien guckt: Eine gemeinsame Strategie, die Orientierung für das Erreichen von nachhaltiger Entwicklung und nachhaltigem Wachstum geben würde, die wäre schon gut. Nur, was haben wir jetzt? Wir haben im Grunde schönere Worte als in der Lissabon-Strategie, aber für die schöneren Worte – nachhaltige Entwicklung, das kann man ja heutzutage hier gar nicht mehr oft genug sagen – fehlen uns so wie in der Lissabon-Strategie sämtliche Instrumente und im Grunde auch das Geld.

Was mir als Grüner besonders auffällt, ist, dass es nach wie vor kein Bewusstsein dafür gibt, dass Ressourceneffizienz, Energieeffizienz, ehrgeiziger Klimaschutz wirklich ein Innovationsmotor sein können und müssen. In Deutschland jubelt man im Moment über die Erholung der Automobilindustrie, weil die Chinesen so besonders viele große PS-starke Spritschlucker aus Deutschland kaufen. Und das vor dem Hintergrund der Ölkatastrophe, das angesichts des vorhergesagten Scheiterns von Cancun. Meine Güte, in Europa hat bisher doch noch keiner verstanden, was nachhaltige Entwicklung eigentlich heißt!

3-022

Timothy Kirkhope, on behalf of the ECR Group. – Mr President, the European Council rightly focused on the reform of Europe, something which my group is dedicated to, but I first want to say something about Iran.

Iran ought rightfully to be one of the most respected powers in the Middle East. It has a long history and a talented and innovative people and we would much like to be able to work with Iran in tackling some of the global issues which are most pressing at this time. Recently I met with Iranian representatives who suggested what some of these issues might be.

But sadly Iran is in the hands of those who seem to care little about the aspirations of their own peoples or the concerns of their neighbours in the Gulf. It has recklessly pursued a nuclear energy programme that has rightly provoked suspicion and alarm. If it were to develop nuclear energy in an open and transparent manner, no-one should question its right to do so. But by trying to develop these nuclear capabilities in secret, there can be little doubt that their motives and ambitions are a danger.

So we welcome the steps the leaders of the European Union have taken to increase pressure on them to cooperate with the global community. If not, measures to restrict trade, banking, transport and the oil and gas industry will sadly have to be taken.

We also welcome the agreement on Europe 2020, which we hope will merit its description as a centrepiece initiative of the Commission. There is still much work to be done in practice and we do not yet agree with every detail. But if words can be turned into action, this will be a positive development for the European Union: a single market to be re-launched and extended; trade both within the EU and beyond must be encouraged and facilitated; unnecessary and bureaucratic barriers must be swept away; the burdens on our businesses and entrepreneurs must be reduced; heavy-handed regulation must be replaced by smart regulation or indeed simply less regulation.

For the sake of both the euro and the economic future of all Members of the European Union, budget deficits in all our countries of course have to be reduced. In the United Kingdom we have now joined others who are taking these painful but necessary steps. Our emergency budget yesterday was dramatic, but as the Chancellor Mr Osborne said, unavoidable. Only by reducing the weight of public debt and securing long-term low interest rates will the private sector be able to invest and expand, creating jobs and generating growth. It is the private sector which can best restore that growth and prosperity.

We welcome the fact that the European Council focused on immediate practical steps to support the euro. My own country is not of course a member of the euro zone and will not join. But we have every reason to want it to be successful. But the ECR believes the measures necessary to improve the governance of the euro do not require further centralisation and we would oppose measures to shift more power from the Member States to Brussels. Nor could we support steps that would force non-euro zone members to support financially the euro zone, as it is of course primarily the responsibility of the euro zone members to support their system. But we stand ready to support initiatives which respect the Treaty obligations of our respective Member States.

Mr President, we live in an increasingly competitive era. The period of the economic pre-eminence of Europe and the United States is clearly drawing to a close. Our system of free market economics, liberal democracy and social protection for the most vulnerable faces challenges from others who espouse a more authoritarian brand of capitalism. We therefore

urgently need reform to ensure we can continue to enjoy and develop our 'free' form of life. Trying to escape this need by blindly clinging to a status quo would certainly end in our ruin.

3-023

Lothar Bisky, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Die Ergebnisse der Tagung des Europäischen Rates vom Donnerstag vergangener Woche müssen sich an den globalen und an den europäischen Herausforderungen messen lassen. Sind sie in der Lage, die Ursachen der beispiellosen Krisensituation der europäischen Finanzmärkte von Anfang Mai zu beseitigen oder Schritte in die richtige Richtung einzuleiten? Welche Vorschläge unterbreiten sie den europäischen Bürgern und den Finanzmärkten zur Behebung der Fehlfunktion des Systems?

Der Rat erklärt vollmundig, die Verursacher der Krise, die Banken, sollen an den Kosten beteiligt, ihre Tätigkeit muss stärker reguliert werden. Das kann ich nur begrüßen, allein mir fehlt inzwischen der Glaube. Denn Sie beschließen erstens eine internationale Bankenabgabe, für die es selbst in der EU keine einhellige Zustimmung gibt und die von einigen G-20-Ländern rundweg abgelehnt wird. Eine Durchsetzung dieses Beschlusses scheint völlig unrealistisch zu sein.

Denn für die Einführung einer allgemeinen Finanztransaktionssteuer gibt es zweitens lediglich einen Prüfauftrag. Ich bezweifle, dass das die Akteure des globalen Finanzmarktes wirklich beruhigen oder von Spekulationen gar abhalten kann oder die G-20 zu einem diesbezüglichen Beschluss veranlassen wird.

Drittens sind die strengeren Maßnahmen gegen Defizitsünder in einer Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise eher dazu geeignet, den Aufschwung zu drosseln, den Konsum der Bürger einzuschränken und insbesondere die sozial Schwachen zu zwingen, den Gürtel enger zu schnallen. Damit ist eine weitere Schrumpfung der Einnahmehasis des Staates vorprogrammiert. Das erfordert wiederum neue Sparmaßnahmen, was die Finanzierbarkeit der gerade verabschiedeten Strategie Europa 2020 insgesamt in Frage stellt.

Und viertens, die Möglichkeit einer Stärkung der Einnahmehasis der Staaten über eine EU-weite Finanzmarkttransaktionssteuer, über Eurobonds, Ökosteuern, Anhebung der Besteuerung hoher Einkommen und Vermögen, sozial gerechte Verteilung der Belastungen wird nicht in Angriff genommen. Das finde ich schon bemerkenswert.

Fünftens untergräbt die Krise die demokratischen Grundlagen unserer Gesellschaft. Dazu tragen die Auflagen der EU für Länder in der Krise weiter bei. Sozialabbau, Kürzungen bei Löhnen und Renten, Erhöhung des Rentenalters, Abbau öffentlicher Dienste, all das führt dazu, dass die soziale Schere sich immer weiter öffnet und die Zahl der Armen immer weiter steigt. Das kritisiere ich!

3-024

Nigel Farage, on behalf of the EFD Group. – Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Van Rompuy for his speech. I think it gave us a great insight as to why so much is failing inside the European Union today.

Mr Van Rompuy, you said the summit had happened, that the euro crisis had gone away, that we had stepped back from the edge of the precipice, and then you gave us the gem, the quote of the day. You said that the euro had been a victim of its own success.

Well at least that will bring a smile to the faces of millions of people tonight when they see the news. You must be indeed a modern day Walter Mitty, a dreamer! You have been warned from the start that there were several countries that would not fit into the euro zone. You knew they cheated and lied and they bent the rules and yet you carried on with this political project, like Icarus, heading towards the danger despite the fact that you had been warned that things would not work.

And I really was amazed last week when you admitted to me face to face that there is no Plan B, there is no contingency plan to help countries like Greece and Spain and Portugal, which at some point will have to leave this currency, there is no plan to help them refloat their own national currencies. Just how much do these countries have to suffer in the pursuit of this euro dream? Just how much unemployment does there have to be? What level of civil disorder is acceptable to hold together a currency that simply cannot work? And I wonder for how much longer will the Germans go on paying the enormous bill?

The extraordinary thing is that you and everybody in this room thinks you are doing this to be good Europeans. Well I would put it to you that this place has nothing to do with Europe at all – that there is no such thing as a European identity. Indeed the strength of Europe is its diversity of language, of culture and of states. Ironically it is us – the EU sceptics – who will turn out to be the good Europeans.

(Applause from the right)

3-025

Barry Madlener (NI). – Voorzitter, ik wil als eerste hier mijn blijdschap tonen over de uitslag van de verkiezingen in Nederland, want mijn partij, de Partij voor de Vrijheid, is gestegen van 9 naar 24 zetels. Dus na het succes van de Europese verkiezingen hebben we nu ook de nationale verkiezingen met glans gewonnen.

Want Nederlanders willen minder immigratie, willen meer veiligheid en willen ook vooral minder Europa. De interne markt van Europa werkt prima, maar het rondpompen van geld van "goede" naar "zwakke" staten moet stoppen. Dit schijnparlement, meneer Verhofstadt, meneer Schulz en meneer Barroso, is dus ook helemaal niet nodig, want het verspilt alleen maar geld.

En de stoere taal die u hier heeft over het ingrijpen, dat had u jaren geleden moeten doen, toen Griekenland met valse cijfers is gekomen. U heeft u jarenlang laten bedriegen, want u was blind. Blind voor uw eigen uitbreidingsdrift. Weet u, Voorzitter, dat zijn jullie nog. Kijk eens even naar het lijstje van landen dat nu op de deur klopt om lid te worden: Albanië, Kosovo, Bosnië, Turkije.

En vandaag praten we hier ook over IJsland, een failliet land. Een land dat de gruwelijke jacht op walvissen wil blijven toestaan en een land dat volgens de voorlopige conclusies van het onderzoek de Nederlandse Bank heeft bedrogen. Herinnert u zich dat Griekenland hetzelfde heeft gedaan? U weigert op te treden. U zegt tegen IJsland "kom maar binnen u mag blijven jagen op walvissen, u mag bedriegen met de cijfers, en dat u failliet bent, dat doet er niets aan af". U bent blind van uitbreidingsdrift en u doet daarmee onze burgers groot verdriet.

(Spreker stemt in met het beantwoorden van een vraag krachtens artikel 149, lid 8 van het Reglement.)

3-026

Miguel Portas (GUE/NGL). – Estive a ouvir o Sr. Deputado, com toda a atenção, a sustentar que este Parlamento não é um Parlamento, mas um "pseudo-Parlamento". Gostava de saber, então, o que é que está aqui a fazer e quais os contribuintes que lhe pagam o salário.

3-027

Barry Madlener (NI). – Voorzitter, daar kan ik heel helder over zijn. Wat wij hier doen, is mensen zoals u bestrijden en zorgen dat de Europese burgers de waarheid horen over dit geldverspillende Parlement. Wij zijn erop uit dat uw constante uitbreidingsdrift een halt wordt toegevoerd. Daarom hebben wij de verkiezingen gewonnen, en de volgende keer zullen wij nog groter worden.

3-028

Herman Van Rompuy, Président du Conseil européen. – Monsieur le Président, chers collègues, je n'ai pas de problèmes majeurs avec certaines critiques. J'ai un problème avec l'approche générale, je vais m'expliquer.

Quand j'étais ici en février, quand on parlait des résultats du premier Conseil européen informel, il y avait de forts doutes qu'on réussirait à créer un plan de soutien financier pour la Grèce et que ce pays serait capable de prendre les mesures nécessaires pour corriger ce qui allait mal dans le passé. Pourtant, quelques semaines après, nous avons adopté un plan de 110 milliards d'euros et la Grèce a fait un effort de 10 points au moins du PIB pour rectifier le tir budgétaire. On n'y croyait pas, mais cela s'est fait.

Si on avait dit, il y a quelques semaines, qu'on créerait un plan de sauvetage potentiel de 750 milliards, dont 500 milliards qui viendraient de l'Europe ou de l'Union européenne en général, on ne nous aurait pas crus, mais cela s'est fait. Certains ont dit: "Les pays de la Méditerranée ont une autre culture, ils ne sont pas capables de prendre vraiment des mesures de réforme, c'est peine perdue!"

Quand je vois ce qui se passe maintenant dans ces pays, dans des circonstances douloureuses - dont personne ne se réjouit -, je dis qu'il y a un changement de culture profond.

J'entends des critiques sur le climat, alors que l'Union européenne a le programme le plus ambitieux du monde en la matière. On a même donné une base légale à notre programme 20-20-20. Tout le monde nous envie. Or, quand j'entends les critiques, j'ai l'impression qu'on ne fait rien. Cela me gêne. Je ne dis pas qu'il faut pécher par une sorte d'optimisme béat, mais ce qui me gêne, c'est que chaque réalisation est considérée comme "*too little, too late*" et superflue.

Quand je vois les résultats des derniers mois, je me réjouis aussi des effets positifs qu'a eus notre action. On parle de meilleure gouvernance... Bien sûr que l'euro nous a beaucoup aidés dans la crise financière! Je ne peux pas m'imaginer une seule seconde quelles seraient les conséquences de cette crise financière si nous n'avions pas à notre disposition cette monnaie commune à 350 millions de personnes!

(Applaudissements)

Je ne peux pas m'imaginer combien notre situation, notamment monétaire, serait instable si nous n'avions pas eu l'euro. Nous en serions revenus à la crise des années 30, avec les dévaluations compétitives avec cette politique funeste de "*Beggar my neighbour*". Nous n'en sommes pas arrivés là grâce à la stabilité monétaire de l'euro.

Bien sûr, il y a des problèmes, il y a des divergences au sein de la zone euro, et on doit s'y attaquer. Je n'étais pas là les dix premières années de notre siècle, j'étais ailleurs. Mais qui, dans cet hémicycle et en dehors, dans toutes sortes d'institutions, même de services d'études, qui a pointé les problèmes très graves de balance de paiement et de compétitivité? Pas grand monde. Maintenant, on fait le procès du passé.

Nous devons en tout cas rectifier le tir. C'est notre responsabilité collective. Pour que l'euro soit une monnaie stable, il faut que le développement économique et la politique économique soient plus convergents et que nous mettions fin aux divergences et quant au développement et quant à la politique. C'est le travail que nous sommes en train de faire.

On a parlé des sanctions. Moi, je persiste à croire qu'il y a beaucoup d'autres moyens que les sanctions. Les gouvernements n'agissent pas en premier lieu par peur de sanctions. Mais puisque l'on parle de sanctions, nous allons, dans la *task force*, travailler à la concrétisation des sanctions, non seulement dans la branche corrective, pour ceux qui sont au-dessus des 3 % de déficit, mais aussi dans la branche préventive, pour ceux qui sont en deçà du seuil des 3 % mais qui ne respectent pas leurs plans à moyen terme et dont la dette est trop élevée et n'évolue pas dans la bonne direction ni à une cadence suffisante.

Nous allons donc introduire, dans la mesure où le traité nous le permet, des sanctions qui vont au-delà du pacte de stabilité et de croissance que nous connaissons maintenant. Nous allons les introduire dans la branche préventive et les renforcer dans la branche corrective. On ne peut pas inventer des sanctions qui n'ont pas de base dans le traité. Je n'y peux rien. On aurait dû y penser à l'époque!

Nous allons également introduire, chers collègues, pour la première fois parce que cela n'existe pas, des mécanismes pour corriger les déséquilibres, notamment entre les balances de paiement, et les divergences de compétitivité. C'est la première fois qu'on y travaillera. Nous n'avons rien fait jusqu'à présent. Nous allons innover avec cette *task force* grâce aux idées et aux initiatives ou aux propositions que la Commission nous fera d'ici quelques semaines dans le domaine crucial de la compétitivité.

Je récuse donc vraiment cet euroscepticisme à l'envers qui veut que, quand il y a des résultats, quand il y a des plans, quand il y a des programmes, quand il y a des intentions, on les démolit à l'avance. On fait des progrès dans la gouvernance de toutes les institutions, pas à pas, d'une façon graduelle, mais on y arrivera, j'en suis tout à fait certain.

Quant à la surveillance financière, bien sûr qu'on en parle au Conseil européen. On en parle aussi avec les ministres des finances. Et, ici, au Parlement européen, on peut en parler aussi. Ce n'est pas un péché. Ce n'est pas dans un mauvais esprit, ce n'est pas pour faire la leçon à qui que ce soit, mais on doit en parler.

Je ne fais pas de caricatures. On pourrait dire: "Ce sont les propositions du Conseil, ce n'est que de la coordination", et on balaie tout d'un revers de la main. Cela, c'est de la caricature, et je ne participe pas à la caricature. Je dis simplement que, dans ce domaine crucial – il y en a d'autres aussi dans le monde financier –, on doit pouvoir travailler ensemble, le Conseil – ce n'est même pas le Conseil européen – et le Parlement européen, pour faire en sorte que, le 1er janvier – et c'est la date ultime –, les nouvelles institutions puissent démarrer. On en a grandement besoin.

Et même dans le domaine financier, là aussi, l'Europe mène le jeu. Vous croyez vraiment qu'au G20, on applaudira si les États membres de l'Union, le président Barroso et moi-même proposons une taxe bancaire? Vous croyez vraiment qu'on va applaudir? Là aussi, nous sommes innovateurs, nous sommes pionniers. Vous croyez vraiment que, quand nous parlerons de la taxe sur les transactions financières, nous serons applaudis? Là aussi, nous serons pionniers.

Donc dans pas mal de domaines – le domaine écologique, le domaine financier, et d'autres –, nous prenons des initiatives courageuses et nous les défendons aussi sur le plan mondial. Sur certains dossiers, comme la taxe bancaire – on l'a dit aussi dans cette enceinte –, s'il n'y a pas d'accord sur le plan mondial, on agira sur le plan européen. Certains États membres prennent d'ailleurs déjà des initiatives et je suis fier et content que, du temps où j'étais Premier ministre, mon pays était pratiquement le seul et le premier en Europe à prendre l'initiative d'une taxe sur les institutions bancaires.

Je vous ai bien écoutés, je vous ai bien entendus, mais je dis que mon approche est une approche positive. Certains d'entre vous nous incitent à être plus positifs tout en nous critiquant. Cela ne me pose pas de problème, mais je voudrais en tout cas souligner ce que nous avons réussi à faire dans des circonstances extrêmement difficiles, les trois ou quatre premiers mois de cette année, et nous continuerons. Je suis également sûr que, d'ici quelques mois, certains de ceux qui sont critiques maintenant, s'ils ne nous applaudissent pas, nous donneront néanmoins raison.

(Applaudissements)

3-029

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – Mr President, regarding the specific question that was put to me in terms of the financial supervision package: this financial supervision is indeed a flagship of European reform because the whole set of new arrangements depends on the new architecture.

For instance we have proposed that the credit rating agencies can be under the oversight of one of those new institutions. That is why it is so important to come to an agreement on this supervisory architecture that the Commission has put forward as a proposal following the report that I asked the high level group chaired by Mr de Larosière to present to us.

I would like once again to thank the European Parliament for being very supportive and for your ambition. This has helped us to make sure that the Council moves from its December position on some key points, some points that have been considered very important by the European Parliament.

But now everyone needs to compromise and this is the important question to address in the European Union. Because if we always stay at the position of considering that others are not doing enough we will not move forward. We need a compromise. And I believe that a deal can be done and that it will follow in many areas the European Parliament's concerns, for instance on key issues like certain products and transaction bans to protect consumers, dispute resolution powers for the authorities that include addressing direct decisions to financial companies – this would be a big move for the Council and the Commission supports it – and principles for the resolution of crisis and deposit guarantee schemes and a very comprehensive and strong review course. I think there is already an opportunity to close the deal in the coming days.

Tomorrow there will be a trilogue that is very important. Things will not get easier if there is a delay. Most likely some of those reservations will become entrenched, and it will become even more difficult. But I think that it is not in the interests of anyone who wants a real European architecture to postpone it, if only because – let us be frank – a full second reading will make it almost impossible to have the new authorities operating from 1 January 2011. So – that is why urgency is so important here – the idea is to have the new system start in 2011, with the new European 2020 strategy with the newest possible economic governance and hopefully with a lot already done in terms of financial service regulation supervision.

That is why I would like to ask you to listen to me, as I have of course asked the President of the European Parliament – this was immediately after his very interesting contribution – and also the Member States. I once again ask the European Parliament, in the spirit of compromise, to make an effort to achieve it.

Of course the Commission has made the proposal so we are very happy with it but the Community method is also about compromise. The Community method is not just about stating positions, it is also in the end about compromise.

(Interventions from the floor by Rebecca Harms and Guy Verhofstadt saying that the Council should make a proposal)

That is why the Commission is urging the Council to move. We have tabled an informal full compromise text today and will continue to put friendly constructive pressure on all the parties to come to an agreement.

3-030

Othmar Karas (PPE). - Herr Präsident! Herr Ratspräsident Van Rompuy! Wir beurteilen heute nicht die letzten Monate - bleiben wir beim Thema -, wir beurteilen heute die Ergebnisse der Ratssitzung. In welcher Zeit leben wir eigentlich? Ich hätte mir heute ein bisschen mehr Selbstkritik in Bezug auf unsere tatsächlichen Schwächen erwartet, mehr Aufrichtigkeit im Umgang mit dem, was derzeit passiert.

Die konkreten Ergebnisse des Ratsgipfels entsprechen den Ankündigungen von Sanchez-Garido in Straßburg nicht. Der Rat setzt die Ankündigungen von Absichtserklärungen fort, statt Nägel mit Köpfen zu machen. Wir starren hier ständig auf den Rat! Ich erwarte vom Rat kein *leadership* in allen Fragen! Aber ich erwarte vom Rat, dass er nicht verzögert, nicht blockiert, die Kommission unterstützt und den Ankündigungen möglichst rasch Taten folgen lässt.

Meine Damen und Herren, ich halte auch nichts von der Methode des Briefschreibens. Das sind Scheinaktivitäten. Wir bekommen vierundzwanzig Stunden vor dem Gipfel Briefe von Merkel und Sarkozy, wir bekommen jetzt einen Brief von Barroso und Van Rompuy an sich selbst gerichtet. Wir bekommen einen Brief von Obama, einen Brief aus Kanada! Wir wollen Taten und Projekte und keine Briefe. Schreiben Sie weniger Briefe, setzen Sie nach den verbalen Initiativen konkrete, nachhaltige Taten.

Europa 2020: Machen Sie aus der Strategie ein Instrument und ein konkretes Projekt für Wachstum und Beschäftigung. Die Bankenabgabe ist nicht konkret beschlossen. Wir haben kein Projekt gegenüber G-20. Die Transaktionssteuer ist in den Raum gestellt, es gibt kein europäisches Projekt. Die Finanzmarktaufsicht wird im Trilog blockiert, die Hedgefonds-Regelung wird im Trilog blockiert, die CRD III-Regelung wird im Trilog blockiert, und in Basel unterstützen im Moment die Staaten der Europäischen Union eine Kapitaldefinition, die die Amerikaner gegenüber Europa bevorzugen. Setzen wir Taten, und machen wir aus den Ankündigungen Realitäten!

3-031

Pervenche Berès (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, fort heureusement, la stratégie 2020 a retenu l'objectif de la réduction de la pauvreté. Notre inquiétude, c'est que les stratégies de consolidation budgétaire, ici ou là, aillent beaucoup trop loin et minent les bases d'une réduction de la pauvreté, en sapant les modes de financement des services publics, qui sont un élément absolument clé d'une telle stratégie.

À propos de la gouvernance économique, Monsieur le Président, il ne s'agit pas de critiquer tout ce que fait le Conseil européen. Il s'agit d'engager un débat fructueux, et à cet égard, nous avons deux ou trois propositions importantes à vous faire.

La première est que, vous l'avez dit, les questions macroéconomiques, les questions de déséquilibre sont aujourd'hui majeures. Ma grande crainte, notre grande crainte, c'est qu'un débat qui commence en martelant le besoin de renforcer les conditions d'application du pacte de stabilité donne satisfaction à certains et épuise la matière première de ce que devrait être aujourd'hui la discussion, à savoir les outils, les méthodes, les capacités de réduire ces divergences qui, aujourd'hui, minent la solidité de la zone euro et qui permettent à *Citygroup* de considérer que la zone euro ne doit plus être vue comme un ensemble.

La deuxième question, qui est pour nous aussi essentielle, c'est celle des sanctions. Vous l'avez dit, il ne faut pas que sanctionner ceux qui sont en déficit, mais peut-être faut-il aussi réfléchir à des sanctions intelligentes. Par exemple, a-t-on imaginé de demander à un État qui serait en situation de difficulté d'augmenter certains impôts, et que le résultat de ces impôts soit versé au budget de l'Union européenne? Il y a d'autres pistes que la suppression du droit de vote ou la suppression des fonds structurels.

(Le président interrompt l'oratrice)

3-032

Sylvie Goulard (ALDE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, vous avez sans doute tous entendu cette phrase, absolument effarante, du président de BP, qui a dit: "Je voudrais ma vie d'avant".

Or j'ai l'impression qu'au Conseil européen, en ce moment, il y a des gouvernements qui voudraient faire comme s'il n'y avait pas eu de crise et qui voudraient leur vie d'avant. Ils viennent nous dire: "On va garder la supervision d'avant. Il ne s'est pas passé tellement de choses. On peut donc diluer le projet de M. de la Rosière, que la Commission avait repris, on peut refuser ce que demande le Parlement européen parce que, dans le fond, ce qui s'est passé n'était qu'une toute petite crise et on n'a pas besoin d'aller très loin".

Toutefois, il ne s'agit pas là de la position du Parlement européen et je voudrais ici que chacun assume ses responsabilités. En décembre 2009, le Conseil Ecofin a verrouillé, à l'unanimité, une position qui bloquait toute possibilité de discuter en codécision. Le jour du Conseil Ecofin, les coordinateurs des quatre groupes de la commission ECON ont dit au Conseil que ça n'allait pas. Ensuite, pendant des mois, on nous a dit: "Peut-être que vous allez vous taire". Puis, le 10 mai, la commission ECON a voté un texte exigeant.

Voilà où nous en sommes, Messieurs les Présidents, et nous n'avons pas l'intention d'accepter un accord au rabais. Nous voulons nous aussi qu'il y ait des institutions au 1er janvier prochain, mais des institutions qui fonctionnent, des institutions communautaires où on décide en commun de règles communes s'appliquant aux services financiers et aux établissements financiers, un système qui ne repose pas sur le bon vouloir des États et surtout pas un système qui donne des droits de veto à des États membres qui, manifestement, ne veulent absolument pas de supervision financière.

Donc, nous voulons bien faire des compromis, mais pas nous compromettre avec des personnes qui, en fait, ne veulent pas aboutir.

3-033

Edvard Kožušník (ECR). – Pane předsedo Rady, pane předsedo Komise, já jsem členem Výboru pro vnitřní trh a ochranu spotřebitele. My jsme tam několikrát měli pana profesora Montiho, kterého vy jste požádal o zpracování takzvané Montiho zprávy. Já sám jsem nazval tu zprávu jako velice „sexy“, ale měl jsem velikou pochybnost, co se týče odvahy. Odvahy politiků na evropské úrovni a odvahy politiků na národní úrovni tyto „sexy“ návrhy nabídnout a realizovat. Já bych se chtěl jenom možná nepřímo zeptat: vyskytly se (česky řečeno) drby, že v prostorách Evropské komise a Evropské rady se uvažuje o zavedení takzvaného „supereura“ a „horšího eura“. Já bych velice varoval proti této záležitosti, protože v Evropě máme zkušenost s markou východní a s markou západní, která rozdělovala Evropu ve formě železné opony. Děkuji.

3-034

Miguel Portas (GUE/NGL). – Em primeiro lugar, no que respeita às taxas aplicáveis aos bancos e às transacções financeiras, devo dizer-lhe que preferiria menos palavras e bastante mais capacidade de negociação, uma vez que já vimos qual vai ser o resultado no G20: vamos ser pioneiros, sem consequências.

Agora, em segundo lugar, as políticas económicas. Como é possível este Conselho dizer que quer reduzir a pobreza na Europa e, ao mesmo tempo, no mundo, quando, por todo o lado, em todos os orçamentos nacionais, o que existem são políticas de redução drástica do investimento público e políticas de redução drástica da despesa social? É este, verdadeiramente, o problema. Como é que podemos sustentar a necessidade de um crescimento sustentável se, entretanto, todas as políticas nacionais estão viradas para um só objectivo, o de reduzir os salários e aumentar os impostos mais injustos, em particular o IVA?

É por isso que nós temos um problema com o Conselho. O Conselho é como o Vaticano é com o escritor português, José Saramago: é ortodoxo, não se esquece de nada e nada aprende. Por isso, tenho que lhe colocar uma última questão, que tem que ver com a obsessão com os orçamentos nacionais e os vistos prévios aos orçamentos nacionais. Agora, há até uma outra expressão, que utilizou o Sr. Van Rompuy, ou seja, a ideia de sanções preventivas em matéria de política orçamental nacional. O que significa isto? O que é que de facto nos quer dizer? Isto não passa de uma sinfonia de vuvuzelas, uma música pavorosa.

3-035

Jaroslav Paška (EFD). – V úvode, v bode 11 záverov Európskej rady sa hovorí o zohľadnení osobitnej situácie krajín eurozóny pri posilňovaní preventívnych nástrojov na dosiahnutie cieľov Paktu stability a rastu. Jedným z takýchto nástrojov je aj nový európsky stabilizačný mechanizmus.

Po zverejnení sa, prirodzene, otvorila legitímna diskusia o konštrukcii a miere spravodlivosti príslušných podielov jednotlivých krajín, zaviazaných k jeho naplneniu. Finanční experti sa opakovane zhodli na tom, že návrh predložený na rokovaní ministrov, ktorý stanovuje výšku príspevku krajiny podľa jej podielu na základnom imaní Európskej centrálnej banky, je v tomto prípade absolútne nevhodný, keďže zvýhodňuje krajiny s vyššími aktívami v bankovom sektore na úkor ostatných.

Zdá sa, že korektnejšie by bolo určiť výšku garancií jednotlivých krajín v stabilizačnom mechanizme podľa rozhodovacieho kľúča v Európskej centrálnej banke.

Otvorenou otázkou však ešte zostáva filozofia divnej solidarity stabilizačného mechanizmu, ktorý počíta aj s tým, že sa chudobné krajiny budú zadlžovať kvôli solventnosti a udržaniu vysokej životnej úrovne zle hospodáriacich bohatých krajín. Nie som si istý, či je to tak správne.

3-036

Nick Griffin (NI). – Mr President, the EU's strategy for jobs sounds good, but the reality behind the scenes is very different.

To take just one shocking example, the forthcoming trade agreement between the EU and India will have a devastating impact on Indian agriculture and pharmaceuticals. Indians are rightly worried by this threat to their prosperity and independence.

But with the Indians giving up so much, we need to ask what is in it for Indian big business and what is it going to cost workers in Britain and Europe.

The answer is Mode 4 immigration, which bypasses any national caps on immigration. Transnational corporations will gain the automatic right to bring in Indian labour to replace, for example, skilled British workers in steel and car plants and all the other industries now owned by Indian-based TNCs.

The India-EU trade agreement will devastate the wages and employment prospects of hundreds of thousands of British and European workers. This is not a strategy for jobs but a naked sell-out to corporate greed.

3-037

José Manuel García-Margallo y Marfil (PPE). – Señor Presidente, quiero hablar de la supervisión financiera, la única concreción real de esa idea etérea que llamamos gobernanza económica, y tengo que decir que estamos en una auténtica ceremonia de la confusión.

Esta misma mañana, el Presidente rotatorio de la Unión ha declarado que estamos cerca de un acuerdo. Nos ha instado a movernos y eso, las dos afirmaciones, es hacer economías con la verdad. Ni estamos cerca de un acuerdo, ni corresponde a la Presidencia del Consejo decirnos a los demás que nos movamos; lo que ha de hacer es moverse ella en la dirección que voy a decir.

Es que el acuerdo del Consejo, como se ha dicho aquí, es un acuerdo de mínimos, es un acuerdo que quieren unas autoridades europeas cuya única competencia sea proponer normas técnicas de armonización para una interpretación uniforme de la Ley europea.

Para ese viaje no hacen falta alforjas. Eso lo podía haber hecho la Comisión con el artículo 290, apoyándose en el Comité de Supervisores Bancarios, que está en vigor.

Lo que el Parlamento ha dicho es: primero, que los bancos paneuropeos deben estar supervisados por una autoridad auténticamente europea, fuerte y sometida al control de este Parlamento; segundo, que los bancos cuya quiebra nos puede arrastrar a todos estén sujetos a una vigilancia especial; tercero, que, cuando uno de esos bancos entre en dificultades, la autoridad bancaria tenga una caja de herramientas para evitar el contagio, reestructurar el banco o liquidarlo ordenadamente sin que los cascotes caigan sobre la cabeza de los contribuyentes; y cuarto, que haya dos fondos prefinanciados por el propio sector, de acuerdo con el principio de «quien contamina, paga», para que no volvamos a ser todos los que pagamos lo que Crispin caritativamente llamó exuberancia irracional de unos pocos.

La primera vez, señor Barroso, que yo he visto a un alto representante del Gobierno español ha sido este lunes. Antes del principio de la Presidencia española se les entregaron ...

(El Presidente retira la palabra al orador)

3-038

Michael Cashman (S&D). – Mr President, I have ninety seconds and it is not a great deal of time, but I want you and the House to reflect on this. I speak as the rapporteur on the mid-term review of Millennium Development Goals.

The United Nations estimates that in ninety seconds, by the time I sit down, 45 people will have died in the developing world. One death every two seconds, deaths from preventable diseases, malnutrition, from complications giving birth, from HIV- and Aids-related illnesses, from TB, from malaria. A death every two seconds. That is why we must meet our Millennium Development Goals commitments in the G20 as well as leading at the UN; and that is why we must keep our commitment to continue funding those vital projects in the developing countries.

I have twenty seconds left, and I would ask your indulgence in the House that we say no more until my time is up, but reflect on those 45 deaths that will have occurred in these ninety seconds.

(Ten seconds of silence)

3-039

Sharon Bowles (ALDE). – Mr President, if I may address President Van Rompuy of the European Council, I am pleased to see you here and, as Chair of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I must say I would rather like to see more of you in committee, in your Task Force role, because when you come up with ideas, any multilateral surveillance will come to us under codecision. The longer that we are out of the loop, the longer it is going to take us to understand and agree the decisions you make; and we have some ideas too.

Turning to the Council conclusions, I note that they urge rapid action on the supervision package on AIFM and on derivatives. They do not give prominence to the capital requirements directive (CRD III) which puts capital on the trading book. Now trading book capital was shirked under pressure from banks from before the crisis, and it is what made speculative proprietary trading attractive and cost-free, an activity that was fundamental to the crisis. CRD III would automatically shrink casino banking without having to sort out bands and splits; so why is it not top billing for early action and implementation?

Finally, I appreciate the decision to apply bank stress tests and make them public. This is at least a year overdue and might have saved some of the current sovereign debt problem if it had been done sooner. But it is essential now that the stress tests applied cover all the challenges and concerns of the market, otherwise that would actually make matters worse.

3-040

Νίκη Τζαβέλα (EFD). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε του Συμβουλίου, είναι τιμή μας και χαρά μας να σας βλέπουμε. Θα ήθελα να σας πω ότι η νηφάλια προσέγγισή σας στα θέματα αυτή την περίοδο ήταν πολύτιμη.

Κύριοι Πρόεδροι, στο τελευταίο Συμβούλιο η Γερμανία δέχθηκε ότι η Ένωση χρειάζεται κάποιας μορφής οικονομική διακυβέρνηση· αρνήθηκε όμως να αποδεχθεί την εύλογη εισήγηση της Γαλλίας ότι η διακυβέρνηση αυτή πρέπει να ασκείται στο επίπεδο των 16 της ευρωζώνης, τουλάχιστον για την αρχή. Έτσι οδηγούμαστε στη διαμόρφωση οικονομικής διακυβέρνησης των 27. Και σας ερωτώ: τι είδους κοινή οικονομική πολιτική μπορεί να ασκήσουν 27 χώρες με 18 διαφορετικά νομίσματα, διαφορετική φορολογία, διαφορετικό ύψος επιτοκίων δανεισμού κλπ.; Φοβάμαι μήπως οδεύουμε πάλι στην προβληματική δομή της ευρωζώνης.

3-041

Martin Ehrenhauser (NI). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte ganz kurz einige grundsätzliche Dinge zu Europa 2020 anmerken. Man kann sicherlich von Fortschritt sprechen, wenn die Arbeit für mehr Wachstum mit dem Ziel der Nachhaltigkeit verbunden wird. Doch was wir nicht vergessen dürfen, ist, dass das Grundproblem damit nicht gelöst wird. Die grundsätzliche Frage ist doch, wie wir aus diesem Wachstumszwang herauskommen. Wie können wir Wirtschafts- und Finanzkrisen in Zukunft verhindern? Wenn ich mir diese Frage stelle, dann werden wir vermutlich um eine fundamentale Reform des Geldsystems nicht herumkommen. Darum müssen wir endlich einmal Fragen debattieren, wie die, ob es nicht wieder sinnvoll wäre, dass wir die Geldschöpfung in staatliche Hand bringen, ob es nicht sinnvoll wäre, dass man die Kreditvergabe der Banken wieder an den tatsächlichen Bargeldbestand bindet. Das sind aber alles Fragen, die nur eine unabhängige und starke Politik beantworten kann.

3-042

Danuta Maria Hübner (PPE). – Mr President, fiscal and financial reforms – pivotal as they are – are not a substitute for structural change and competitive growth policies. That is why, firstly, I would like to address briefly the role of cohesion policy in the delivery mechanism of the EU 2020.

In its conclusions, the Council sent us a clear message to integrate cohesion policy in the implementation of the EU 2020. After all, according to the recent March communication from the European Commission, this policy area was the only truly successful strand in the delivery of the Lisbon Strategy. Why? Because, it sets out binding guidelines or conditions for the transfer of European resources to a Member State, region or city. It also gives Member States and regions the scope to translate common European objectives into their own reality. It is efficiently adapted to monitor and support the achievement of goals; and last but not least, it has an efficient sanctions mechanism.

On economic governance, I strongly support the idea of going beyond fiscal surveillance towards the competitiveness-related factors which generate or contribute to imbalances. I also believe we should state today – clearly, urgently and loudly – why fiscal surveillance did not work and why the Stability and Growth Pact did not deliver. Continuing to rely exclusively on decentralised fiscal discipline might give us ‘better’ European governance but it will not give us ‘good’ European governance.

3-043

Ramón Jáuregui Atondo (S&D). – Señor Presidente, señor Van Rompuy, señor Barroso, yo comparto con ustedes algo que me parece que es necesario decir, y es que, efectivamente, en la reunión del pasado jueves, el Consejo Europeo tomó decisiones muy importantes, decisiones que eran impensables hace sólo cuatro meses. Me parece que tenemos que ser valientes para decirlo. Yo creo que, como en una constante histórica, las crisis mueven Europa.

Y, ciertamente, también esta crisis, como usted ha dicho, muy importante y muy grave, ha dado lugar a que haya una serie de decisiones, unos caminos que se están explorando y que son importantísimos en la construcción europea.

Por cierto que una de las decisiones que se ha tomado en este Consejo europeo –y no menor, aunque no haya sido comentada– es precisamente la decisión de reformar el Tratado y de establecer la convocatoria de una Conferencia Intergubernamental para reformar el Protocolo nº 36 del Tratado de Lisboa, y justamente esto significa, señoras y señores, que se ha acordado la incorporación de 18 nuevos diputados a esta Cámara y que 12 Estados miembros van a tener derecho a una representación más justa, frente a la que tenemos actualmente.

Pues bien, en ese contexto, yo quiero destacar la importancia de que el Consejo haya tomado una decisión para ampliar el número de representantes de este Parlamento y que hoy mismo, si no estoy mal informado, la Conferencia Intergubernamental ha tomado ya esta decisión de los 27. Y yo le felicito, señor Van Rompuy, por esta decisión y le insto a que efectivamente favorezca la ratificación, por parte de los 27 Estados miembros, de esta decisión que da a este Parlamento una representación más ajustada, y a 18 nuevos parlamentarios el derecho a representar también a sus ciudadanos europeos.

3-044

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). – Doresc în primul rând să salut decizia Consiliului European de săptămâna trecută de a da undă verde începerii negocierilor cu Islanda. Astăzi, de altfel, în Comisia pentru afaceri externe a Parlamentului, raportul meu asupra cererii de aderare a Islandei la Uniunea Europeană a fost votat cu o imensă majoritate. Prin acest raport, colegii mei și-au declarat sprijinul pentru aderarea acestei țări la Uniune, subliniind, totuși, nevoia de a ajunge la o soluție comună în domeniul precum pescuitul sau agricultura.

Suntem convinși că Islanda poate completa într-un ritm rapid progresele deja realizate și poate adopta acquis-ul comunitar, devenind un nou membru al familiei europene. Islanda poate aduce o contribuție importantă Uniunii Europene prin tradiția sa democratică, prin experiența în protecția mediului, dar și ancorând politicile europene în zona arctică.

Pe de altă parte, Islanda va avea și ea foarte multe de câștigat, și aici nu este vorba doar despre chestiunea stabilității economice, ci și de o mai mare influență pe plan internațional sau de o influență sporită în luarea deciziilor legate de piața internă.

Știm cu toții, pe de altă parte, că opinia islandezilor în privința aderării țării lor la Uniunea Europeană este profund divizată. De aceea, consider că o dezbatere publică inițiată de către guvernul islandez și sprijinită, la nevoie, de către Comisia Europeană poate contribui la cristalizarea argumentelor pro și, respectiv, a argumentelor contra aderării și, în final, poate conduce la o decizie informată a cetățenilor islandezi asupra aderării. Așa cum se știe, la sfârșitul procesului de negociere, Islanda va organiza un referendum pentru a vedea dacă societatea islandeză va susține rezultatul acestor discuții dintre Uniunea Europeană și țara despre care am vorbit.

3-045

Σταύρος Λαμπρινίδης (S&D). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τα χρόνια του ευρώ οι οικονομίες του Νότου και του Βορρά απέκλιναν μεταξύ τους αντί να συγκλίνουν. Ο κύριος λόγος είναι ότι ήταν πολύ διαφορετικά δομημένες. Ο Νότος βασιζόταν στις υπηρεσίες, στον αγροτικό τομέα, στον τουρισμό· ο Βορράς στη βαριά βιομηχανία, στις εξαγωγές. Ο Νότος, επομένως, έπρεπε να αλλάξει ριζικά τις δομές οικονομίας του μέσα σε πολύ λίγα χρόνια. Αντ' αυτού, αναπτύχθηκε μέσω κατανάλωσης, μέσω φτηνών δανείων που επέτρεπε το ευρώ, μέσω υπερχρέωσης, ενώ οι βιομηχανικές χώρες αναπτύχθηκαν επειδή μπορούσαν πλέον να εξάγουν φτηνότερα και ευκολότερα.

Να λοιπόν γιατί και πού απαιτείτο η οικονομική διακυβέρνηση. Η έλλειψή της επέτεινε τόσο τα αναπτυξιακά πλεονεκτήματα κάποιων κρατών μελών όσο και τα αναπτυξιακά μειονεκτήματα άλλων.

Για να βγει σήμερα ο Νότος αλλά και άλλοι από τον φαύλο κύκλο της ύφεσης πρέπει να μπορούν, εκτός από τις δημοσιονομικές προσαρμογές, να δανείζονται φτηνότερα για να επενδύουν στην ανάπτυξη και να εξάγουν, μεταξύ άλλων μέσω ευρωομολόγων.

Και όμως ακριβώς τώρα η συγκριτικά πλούσια Γερμανία επιδίδεται σε ένα πρόγραμμα αυστηρότατων περικοπών τόσο περιορίζοντας την εσωτερική της κατανάλωση όσο και καθιστώντας τον εαυτό της πρωτίστως πιο ελκυστικό στις χρηματοπιστωτικές αγορές απέναντι στους εταίρους της. Τέτοια μέτρα δεν συνιστούν κοινή ευρωπαϊκή οικονομική πολιτική. Μετατρέπουν δυνητικά τα κράτη μέλη σε στυγνούς ανταγωνιστές για περιορισμένα κονδύλια αντί για αλληλέγγυους εταίρους και τα βάζουν στην ίδια προκρούστεια κλίνη των περικοπών επιτείνοντας έτσι πλεονεκτήματα κάποιων και μειονεκτήματα άλλων και βάζοντας κάποια κράτη μέλη σε μια πολύ αρνητική αφετηρία για την επίτευξη των κοινών - υποτίθεται - στόχων του 2020.

3-046

Íñigo Méndez de Vigo (PPE). – Señor Presidente, ante el Comité Económico y Social Europeo, señor Van Rompuy, utilizó usted una hermosa imagen. Dijo que en la crisis económica y financiera habíamos querido construir los botes salvavidas durante la travesía. Efectivamente, así fue, porque el Ecofin que precedió al último Consejo Europeo es el que tomó determinadas medidas que eran impensables en algunos países, alguno que yo conozco muy bien.

Y, por tanto, ahora de lo que se trata es de que eso no vuelva a suceder en el futuro y que, por tanto, construyamos los botes salvavidas antes.

Yo he escuchado con mucha atención lo que ha dicho usted. Ha mencionado usted «*a strict supervision of the national budgets*». Estoy de acuerdo.

Pero, a continuación, ha añadido usted que en ningún caso era cuestión de que la Comisión supervisara los presupuestos nacionales antes de su aprobación por las Cámaras. Bueno, yo se lo he oído decir al Comisario Olli Rehn. Y, además, creo que es una buena idea, que hay que explorarla. «*De l'audace, encore de l'audace, toujours de l'audace*», que diría un revolucionario francés.

Porque a mí no me importa nada, señor Presidente Van Rompuy, estar bajo el protectorado de la Unión Europea. Yo prefiero estar bajo el protectorado de la Unión Europea que bajo el protectorado de gobernantes que gobiernan a base de bandazos y de improvisación. Y, por tanto, las vías que tengamos, vamos a perseguirlas.

En segundo lugar, aquí se ha dicho por algunos que como no están en el euro no les importa nada lo que le suceda al euro. Bueno, pues a mí sí me preocupa lo que le suceda a monedas nacionales que no están en el euro, porque eso es ser europeo. Y, si alguna vez esas monedas están en dificultades, a mí me preocupará, porque afectarán a la economía de todos nosotros.

Y una última postilla, señor Presidente. Yo sé que, en tiempos de crisis, hablar de la lucha contra la pobreza es más difícil, porque hay menos medios. Pero creo que lo que nos ha hecho más grandes a los europeos es luchar contra la exclusión social y la pobreza. Y yo pido, por favor, que el año 2010, que es el Año Europeo para la lucha contra la pobreza y la exclusión social, no sea simplemente una conclusión más del Consejo Europeo. Hagamos, señor Presidente de la Comisión, políticas activas en ese campo.

3-047

Catherine Trautmann (S&D). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, vous nous avez dit tout à l'heure que la position des Européens doit être ferme et unifiée pour arriver au G20, et qu'il en va de la crédibilité de l'Union sur la scène internationale. Or il en va avant tout de sa crédibilité vis-à-vis du citoyen, qui attend que l'Union soit capable de se doter d'instruments crédibles de sortie de crise.

Premièrement, j'attendais des conclusions du Conseil européen du 17 juin qu'elles traitent à égalité la discipline budgétaire de l'Union, la surveillance macroéconomique ou la régulation des services financiers. Force est de constater que ce ne fut pas le cas.

Deuxièmement, après avoir clairement manqué de solidarité interne face à la crise, l'Union européenne a le devoir d'être chef de file pour l'en sortir. Disons-le franchement, l'Union économique et monétaire souffre d'un vice de construction, qui engendre un déséquilibre entre politique monétaire et politique économique, alors que l'euro représente aujourd'hui 27 % des réserves mondiales des banques centrales. Cela crée l'obligation, pour les États membres et pour l'Eurogroupe, d'assurer la coordination des politiques économiques nationales. L'euro ne doit pas être le symbole de la vie chère pour nos concitoyens, et notre devoir aujourd'hui, à l'issue de ces Conseils d'étape, n'est plus seulement de rassurer les marchés. Il est de rassurer les citoyens sur notre capacité à sortir de la crise ensemble.

Troisièmement, le durcissement de la discipline budgétaire, en ces temps de crise, ne doit pas aggraver la récession. Nous voulons des preuves, des preuves que la stratégie 2020 sera effectivement accompagnée par des moyens financiers suffisants pour développer, mais aussi orienter l'économie vers les dépenses d'avenir, vers l'emploi et vers les investissements solidaires et fertiles. Nous devons entendre, Messieurs les Présidents, la mise en garde qui s'exprime aujourd'hui dans la colère, et bientôt la peur. Assimilée au libéralisme injuste, l'Union ne doit pas devenir le symbole d'une austérité brutale.

3-048

Anne Delvaux (PPE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, on dit souvent que nécessité fait loi. Face à la crise, une évidence, que dis-je, une nécessité devenue inéluctable, celle d'innover, d'être créatif. À ce titre, je me réjouis du pas réalisé par le Conseil européen, un pas que j'espère être, à terme, un pas de géant nous menant vers une vraie gouvernance économique car, ne nous trompons pas, la simple coordination des politiques économiques restera insuffisante.

Puissions-nous parvenir à une véritable fédération budgétaire, non pas forcée par les circonstances, mais parce que nous l'aurions nous-mêmes décidée.

Revenons aux décisions du Conseil, qui me réjouissent tout de même. Le renforcement du volet préventif du pacte de stabilité et de croissance, c'est une excellente chose, mais il n'y a pas de vraie discipline budgétaire sans sanction pour ceux qui y dérogent. Ces sanctions ont été renforcées, mais pas encore précisées, c'est un regret.

Sinon, je vous dirai ma satisfaction, entre autres, par rapport aux orientations décidées, comme le fameux tableau de bord d'évaluation de la compétitivité, car c'est bien de cela qu'il s'agit: renouer avec la compétitivité et la croissance durable pour tous.

Saluons encore le projet d'instauration d'une taxe bancaire, l'acceptation d'une taxation des transactions financières, l'accélération de la réforme des réglementations financières.

Monsieur le Président du Conseil européen, toutes ces décisions et orientations paraissent il y a quelques mois, voire quelques semaines, irréalistes, illusoire, voire vraiment hypothétiques. Vous avez raison, c'est vrai, c'est un changement de culture profond, à l'échelle de la politique des petits pas européens. Ceci dit, il faut maintenant obligatoirement qu'en octobre, les États mettent en œuvre très concrètement ces orientations. Il dépendra maintenant du Conseil que le pas réalisé soit un pas de géant historique ou simplement un vœu pieux, ce que nous aurons tous à regretter amèrement et, en particulier, ce qu'une majorité, les citoyens, aura à subir au quotidien.

3-049

Gianluca Susta (S&D). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signor Presidente del Consiglio, siccome sono tra gli ultimi a parlare, voglio darle qualche conforto: ha fatto molto bene secondo me a ricordare in questa sede che lei non è espressione dei governi, ma dell'Europa e dell'Unione europea in quanto tale, un'affermazione che è ovvia, ma per molti non lo è, evidentemente.

La preghiamo quindi di insistere nel suo ruolo affinché la Presidenza stabile dell'Unione provochi quegli stimoli, quei conforti, costringa i governi a passare dalle parole ai fatti.

Abbiamo apprezzato quello che è stato fatto in questi mesi, l'idea della *Task force* e anche il fatto que comunque i capi di Stato e di governo siano stati costretti a redigere un documento importante, perché le cose che sono scritte in quel

documento, signor Presidente, se vengono tradotte in fatti – ma non siamo così convinti che tutti gli Stati membri le vogliano tradurre in fatti – sono sicuramente importanti.

Ad esempio, non sappiamo se le affermazioni contenute nel documento finale sulla tassazione delle transazioni finanziarie o sulla tassa delle banche saranno davvero tradotte in fatti. Aspettiamo le conclusioni della *Task force* per poter vedere se questi strumenti efficaci, insieme alle affermazioni sulla *governance* economica, insieme alle affermazioni sulla crescita, siano davvero un postulato essenziale dell'azione politica.

Abbiamo voluto il processo costituente, che poi è terminato col trattato di Lisbona, per segnare una novità: ci auguriamo che la Presidenza stabile dell'Unione voglia insistere – come ha anche ribadito nella replica – perché questi fatti diventino realtà.

3-050

Gunnar Hökmark (PPE). – Mr President, I think we can all welcome the conclusions and goals set by the European Council. I have three points that I would like to comment on.

The first one is about the euro. I think if we enforce what has been set up with 'foreseeable and automatic sanctions' for those who are not following the rules, then we will have a much stronger framework and maybe we will see the rebirth of the euro in a much stronger condition than we have ever had before. That will be a contribution to the future of European economy.

That also implies that we need to do a lot regarding growth. I welcome the clear goals set out here, but I would like to remind us all that hard work and difficult choices have to be made. They are not made by just setting the goals. We have learned that from the Lisbon process.

We need to be able to make courageous decisions and open up the market for more trade, more investments and more innovations. That is what needs to be done. Otherwise we have only bought ourselves some time, before all the problems come back again.

Finally, we are now entering a phase of global economy which will be characterised by the reduction of deficits. It will be so in the US, and it will be so in Europe. We all know the risks associated with the contraction of economic development. We need to ensure that the economy can be stimulated in parallel. In that sense, I think reference to the Doha Round in the conclusions should be strengthened; and I think it should be strengthened in a way to make it consistent. I cannot understand a financial transaction tax which will hinder trade and liquidity and which will do more damage to poor countries and countries with big deficits. We need to support and stimulate trade, and that way we can get the injection needed to make the world a better place.

3-051

Pawel Zalewski (PPE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ostatni kryzys w Europie pokazuje jak dużym problemem jest to, że mimo traktatu lizbońskiego Europa nie jest wystarczająco zintegrowana, jeżeli chodzi o zarządzanie gospodarką. Jednak stanowi całość – problem jednego, dwóch czy trzech krajów jest problemem dla całej Europy. Dlatego dobrze się stało, że ta kwestia stała się przedmiotem dyskusji w Radzie. Konkluzje, które tam padły, w moim przekonaniu idą w dobrą stronę. Potrzebujemy koordynacji budżetowej, sankcji dla krajów, które łamią standardy i reguły.

Dobrze się stało również, że nie powstał ekskluzywny klub euro. Jest niezwykle istotne, aby pamiętać o tym, że euro jest walutą, w której będą uczestniczyli nie tylko ci, którzy dzisiaj są w tej strefie, ale także ci, którzy wyrażają taką wolę, by się w niej znaleźć. Ważne jest, aby mogli oni również uczestniczyć w tych decyzjach, które dotyczą właśnie strefy euro, tak aby w przyszłości móc być w pełni jej współgospodarzami.

3-052

Jutta Steinruck (S&D). – Verehrte Präsidenten! Es ist gut und wichtig, dass wir uns alle gemeinsam für Wachstum und Beschäftigung einsetzen und auch versuchen, die Ursachen der Krise zu beseitigen. Aber unser Ziel muss auch sein, aus früheren Fehlern zu lernen und diese zu vermeiden.

Und da ist mir ein Thema besonders wichtig, das wir nicht aus den Augen verlieren dürfen, nämlich die Bekämpfung der Armut. Ich finde es schade, dass die europäischen Regierungschefs nicht bereit waren, die Vorschläge der Kommission zur Armutsbekämpfung zügig und engagiert umzusetzen. Letztendlich ist das Signal, das von dem Rat letzte Woche ausgeht, dass sich Europa jetzt nicht um die Ärmsten und die Armen kümmert. Die ursprünglichen Ziele wurden verwässert, und übrig geblieben sind drei Kennziffern und die Reduktion der Armut um zwanzig Millionen Menschen. Das ist zu wenig, da fehlt auch der wirkliche Wille. Wir hätten uns wirklich gewünscht, dass der Vorschlag der Kommission, die Verarmung um 25 % zu verringern, angenommen und vorangetrieben wird. Denn schließlich ist Armut letztendlich eine Gefahr für Europa.

3-053

Isabelle Durant (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, je voulais évidemment m'adresser à M. Van Rompuy, qui vient de partir. Néanmoins, je voulais lui faire remarquer, et faire remarquer à tout le monde, que, s'il nous appelle à ne pas être dans la caricature, je voulais lui suggérer aussi de ne pas y céder lui-même, parce que nous sommes sans doute, certains d'entre nous ici, ses meilleurs alliés sur tout ce qui est attendu en matière de stratégie de coordination et de contrôle budgétaire.

Je voulais d'ailleurs – et je m'adresse à vous, Monsieur Barroso – relayer ici une proposition qui a été évoquée en commission des budgets: celle de lancer, au-delà même de la *task force*, une convention, une nouvelle convention sur les aspects budgétaires, de manière à pouvoir travailler, au moment où nos États membres seront tous soumis à des règles de rigueur budgétaire, sur la façon non seulement de contrôler, mais aussi de répartir les rôles entre les dépenses européennes et les dépenses nationales.

Je pense qu'il y a là un énorme chantier dont il faut se saisir, au-delà même de toute la nécessité d'institutions et d'instances de contrôle, de coordination et de sanction.

3-054

Oreste Rossi (EFD). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ho ascoltato con attenzione gli interventi del Presidente del Consiglio e del Presidente della Commissione ed entrambi hanno auspicato la massima collaborazione con il Parlamento in vista delle sfide future: *governance*, regolamenti finanziari e bancari e strategia 2020.

È altresì positivo che si chieda che la *Task force* concluda entro settembre i suoi lavori e formuli proposte reali. Si è accennato anche a interventi extraeuropei, come cooperazione e sviluppo, sanzioni internazionali, nucleare e ambiente. Quasi tutto quello che è stato detto è condivisibile, certo che adesso occorre concretizzare.

Viviamo in un'Europa in forte crisi: si sono persi milioni di posti di lavoro e una vera ripresa è ancora lontana; il Centro europeo per lo sviluppo della formazione professionale stima, entro il 2020, la creazione di 8,5 milioni di nuovi posti di lavoro comprensivi delle sostituzioni, ma la maggior parte di questi sarà per le categorie altamente o mediamente qualificate, a scapito di quelle scarsamente qualificate.

Qui sta la nostra sfida: preparare le nuove generazioni a una nuova Europa.

3-055

Mario Mauro (PPE). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Presidente del Consiglio Van Rompuy ha usato un'espressione nel suo intervento, l'espressione "gradualmente", che forse meglio di ogni altra traduce la fatica di questo momento.

Gradualmente vuol dire che il grado di buona volontà dei paesi membri non è identico, gradualmente vuol dire che le buone cose che sono scritte nel documento conclusivo del Consiglio devono essere completate e attuate.

Come facciamo a passare da "gradualmente" a "velocemente"? Come facciamo a passare da "gradualmente" a "presto e bene"?

Credo che dobbiamo rivolgerci al Presidente della Commissione, perché la leadership politica di questo momento, la leadership politica di questa Europa che cerca di concretizzare iniziative deve essere, per la nostra architettura istituzionale, del Presidente della Commissione, della Commissione che deve fare proposte, deve concludere questo processo, deve renderci capaci di innovazione.

3-056

José Manuel Barroso, President of the Commission. – Mr President, some of the people who asked me these questions are no longer here. Anyway, I will respond.

First of all, regarding the role of the European Parliament in the Europe 2020 Strategy. That has been a concern of many of you, including Corien Wortmann-Kool who has been a very important leader in this Parliament regarding the rights of Parliament in establishing this strategy. I think the European Parliament has a key role to play. It is our common responsibility to be successful in exiting the crisis and returning to growth. Our Member States must do much better on the delivery of structural reforms and fiscal consolidation than they have done over the last decade.

The European Parliament will have to play a key role as legislator in adopting legislation put forward to implement the flagship initiatives. The Commission has recently adopted the first flagship initiative for a digital agenda; six more flagship initiatives will follow before the end of 2010. It is a very intensive programme. These flagships will entail a set of legislative proposals and the Commission is counting on the European Parliament's support to deal with flagships and proposed legislation in a rapid and coherent fashion. I am looking for a commitment from the European Parliament to fast-track the adoption of those initiatives.

Secondly, I believe the European Parliament should play a much more active role than it did under the Lisbon Strategy in defining and monitoring the Europe 2020 Strategy. This calls for taking timely, proactive, common positions. The European Parliament could also play a role in mobilising national parliaments. I think there is now room for shifting this dialogue away from general discussions on Europe 2020 – the kind of general discussion held in the first phase and which I have been participating in for some time – and move towards much more specific issues, such as the five core themes of the strategy: employment policies, R&D innovation, energy efficiency, education and fighting poverty, and monitoring national performance.

National parliaments must become key actors in monitoring their government's performance and commitments to the proper implementation of their national Europe 2020 strategies, targets and European Union recommendations. This is a very important point.

I know that some of you are not happy. I would also have preferred a higher level of ambition in terms of the monitoring of the strategy. In fact there are considerable improvements, and I would like to ask you not to underestimate the potential of these improvements. The fact that there will now be national reform programmes and specific national targets makes it possible to monitor, in a concrete manner, not only what is being done generally by Europe but what each country is doing in all those matters. This can be done, and should be done – if I can express an opinion – by the European Parliament, with the other institutions of course.

The first point on this priority is poverty – also because of this year being the year on poverty. I like what some of you have said, namely Mr Méndez de Vigo and others, that we should take advantage of this year being the European year for combating poverty and social exclusion, to launch some active policies.

It was not easy to get the target agreed at European level; some expressed doubts in terms of subsidiarity. At the end it was possible to get some kind of commitment and so I think we should already make that a visible action now this year, because the social reality of Europe is in a state of emergency.

Coming back to Europe 2020, Parliament, as a budgetary authority, will have to play its role in the definition of the next multiannual financial framework. Budget priorities must reflect Europe 2020 priorities. We will present our budget review in September. I think that will be the moment to engage in a broad discussion about the future of our financial perspectives, namely some of the ideas that have also been suggested in the preliminary discussions with the Parliament.

I want to pay tribute to the working paper of Alain Lamassoure that has been presented to the Committee on Budgets this week, on how to finance Europe 2020 in times of crisis. I believe in the ideas that have been put forward. How we can decide on what could be spent at European level and what can be spent at national level is indeed something for Parliament, working also with the other institutions. On behalf of the Commission I want to tell you that we are committed to working with you in that area.

Another point made by Mr Cashman, who is no longer here, was on MDGs. I fully share everything he said on this; the need to keep the momentum on this matter. Especially, now where there is every constraint on the budgets of our Member States, it would be difficult to be sure about their commitment. From that point of view the conclusions of the Council are good. It is a point that is made in the letter that I along with President Van Rompuy addressed to the G20 colleagues; taking into consideration the commitments made by our Member States, we are reaffirming on behalf of the European Union that the European Union remains committed to support the achievement on the MDGs globally by 2015. We believe that this is possible if all partners demonstrate firm commitment. So that is a point that we are going to bring to the G20 and G8 outreach meetings this weekend in Canada.

Some of you also asked about stress testing. I think it was a very positive announcement, a positive signal ahead of the G20 Summit in Toronto, an important step to restore confidence in Europe's banks and Europe's economic prospects. The details of the commitment made at the European Council last week, including the exact scope of the exercise, are currently being discussed by all relevant stakeholders, in particular by the Committee of European Banking Supervisors, the respective national supervisors and the respective Ministers of Finance. The ultimate decision on this issue will be taken in the next few days. We are, as a Commission, playing an important part in this process; we need to advocate an approach that would ensure having as representative a sample as possible, while taking into account the timeframe set for the publication of the results in the second half of July. There is a delicate balance to be struck.

I also believe that the result should ideally take into account the most recent development in sovereign debt markets. The credibility of the exercise will be considerably enhanced if it properly addresses the recent pressures in sovereign debt markets. I understand the Committee of European Banking Supervisors has been considering this issue with the participation of all parties concerned, including the Commission. The ultimate decision in this regard will be taken in the next few days.

Finally, some of you mentioned the issue of the oil leak in the Gulf of Mexico. Just yesterday I had a meeting with the CEO of BP to be sure that they are taking all the necessary measures and that they are drawing all the lessons from that ecological catastrophe. In fact I think that not only that company but generally speaking the industry have to draw lessons from it. They gave me assurances that they are taking all the necessary steps to ensure that their operations, particularly those in and around the European Union, are undertaken with the safety of citizens and the environment as a corporate priority.

We are currently reviewing applicable EU legislation. In fact we had been working on this before this crisis; at meetings with the Baltic States some of our partners, for instance Finland, raised the issue of the possible consequences of this kind of ecological catastrophe in the Baltics and what could we do. We are already working on this. I believe that a hasty or premature regulatory response to events in the Gulf should be avoided. In fact no regulatory regime can give a 100% guarantee of safety. Much depends on the attitude and practices of the industry itself.

However, the Commission will not hesitate to propose changes in Europe if the current analysis, namely the investigation in the Gulf of Mexico, reveals weaknesses. We are intensifying our contacts and dialogues with national authorities and regulators. Furthermore Commissioner Oettinger in cooperation with Commissioners Georgieva and Potočnik established contacts with all of the industry in early May for a meeting that they are holding this week.

We have been also coordinating through the MIC assistance in response operations; Member States and the European Maritime Safety Agency have responded promptly. This was an example of initiatives that the Commission is taking.

I am coming now to the last point made by Mario Mauro, I want to reassure him and the Parliament that of course the Commission will take all its initiatives in the spirit of good cooperation with all the other institutions. As I said before and in another meeting, yes the Commission is the economic government of Europe in matters that have been transferred from national Member States to the European Union, but of course we need to work in cooperation with all the institutions. The European Council has also an extremely important role to play. That is in the Treaty and we are cooperating there. The President of the Commission attends the European Council as, of course, does the European Parliament. So I think it is in this spirit of partnership that we can indeed make our project go forward and I really want to thank those Members of the European Parliament who show this extraordinary patience – this is the kind of resilience that we need for our economy as well.

3-057

President. – The debate is closed.

Written statements (Rule 149)

3-058

Elena Băsescu (PPE), în scris. – Consider că decizia Consiliului de a aproba Strategia UE 2020, în forma propusă de Comisie, este binevenită. Noua strategie europeană pentru ocuparea forței de muncă și creștere economică va avea un rol fundamental în reorientarea politicilor privind ieșirea din criză. Ea va susține introducerea unor reforme pe termen mediu și lung care să asigure sustenabilitatea finanțelor publice, inclusiv prin reformarea sistemelor de pensii. În acest sens, este nevoie de cooperare, atât la nivel național, cât și european, pentru a se adopta, din timp, măsuri care să permită funcționarea sistemelor de pensii pe termen mediu și lung. La fel ca și celelalte state membre, România are nevoie de consolidare bugetară și reforme structurale. Criza economică și financiară a scos la iveală problemele guvernantei economice. De aceea, avem nevoie de reformarea acestui mecanism, precum și de o coordonare mai bună a politicilor economice la nivel european. Trebuie introduse reforme care să promoveze competitivitatea, creșterea economică și ocuparea forței de muncă. Aceste măsuri, precum și asigurarea unei bune supravegheri macroeconomice, vor sprijini atingerea cu succes a obiectivelor Strategiei UE 2020. De asemenea, trebuie să ne asigurăm că prevederile Pactului de stabilitate și creștere sunt respectate.

3-059

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), raštu. – Sutinku, kad per praėjusios savaitės Europos Vadovų Tarybos susitikimą priimta naujoji Europos Sąjungos darbo vietų kūrimo ir ekonomikos augimo strategija padės Europai atsigaivinti po krizės ir sustiprėti tiek ES, tiek tarptautiniu lygiu, didinant konkurencingumą, produktyvumą ir socialinę sanglaudą. Tačiau labai gaila, kad šioje naujoje strategijoje yra pamiršti žmonės su negalia, kurie šiuo metu sudaro daugiau kaip 12% ES gyventojų. Nors Taryba nuolat ragina skirti didesnę dėmesį neįgalių asmenų įtraukimui, kai sprendžiami su negalia susiję klausimai, tačiau Europos 2020 strategijoje nėra apibrėžta konkrečių užduočių, tikslų ir išpareigojimų, kurie realiai galėtų pagerinti daugiau kaip 65 milijonų neįgalių europiečių gyvenimą.

Norėčiau atkreipti dėmesį į tai, kad Europos Vadovų Taryba naujoje strategijoje pagaliau susitarė dėl ES pagrindinių tikslų ir dėl švietimo, socialinės aprėpties bei skurdo rodiklių kiekybinės išraiškos. Taigi, po ilgai vykusių diskusijų ir Europos strategijos priėmimo ateinančiam dešimtmečiui bus pereinama prie jos įgyvendinimo etapo, kuris turėtų būti dar sunkesnis nei jos patvirtinimas. Dabar valstybės narės turi imtis veiksmų strategijoje nustatytiems politikos prioritetams įgyvendinti nacionaliniu lygiu, nes kitaip naujoji strategija ir vėl bus tik gražių šūkių rinkinys. Norėčiau pabrėžti, kad Komisija ir

Taryba privalo palaikyti dialogą su valstybėmis narėmis, kad nacionaliniai sprendimai atitiktų ES pagrindinius tikslus, nes tik tada strategija duos konkrečių rezultatus.

3-060

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Além do que já conhecíamos através do documento escrito das conclusões do Conselho de 17 de Junho, o que aqui foi referido pelo Presidente do Conselho demonstra que querem aproveitar a crise para dar um salto em frente no federalismo, como instrumento ao serviço dos seus objectivos de reforço do capitalismo nesta visão imperialista da União Europeia. Para alguns, como referiu, já nem o Tratado de Lisboa chega e querem a sua revisão. Mas, para outros, essa revisão pode ficar para mais tarde.

O que, no imediato, querem é aproveitar todas as capacidades do Tratado de Lisboa para, através da chamada "governança económica", centralizarem e concentrarem ainda mais o poder económico ao serviço dos grandes interesses das potências europeias, com destaque para a Alemanha.

Para mais tarde vão ficando as medidas de regulação financeira e, sempre adiadas, as questões do fim dos paraísos fiscais.

O que fica claro é que só as lutas dos trabalhadores e dos povos, apoiadas pelas forças progressistas e revolucionárias, poderão fazer a necessária ruptura com estas políticas e iniciar uma outra política empenhada nos trabalhadores, na melhoria das condições sociais, na produção e na paz.

3-060-500

Cătălin Sorin Ivan (S&D), în scris. – Sistemul de guvernare economică a UE a fost tema centrală a discuției de astăzi cu președintele Consiliului European, Herman van Rompuy. Implementarea unor măsuri mai sigure, care să garanteze securitatea spațiului economic european sunt susținute la nivel de Parlament și Comisie, singura necunoscută în ecuația aceasta fiind voința statelor membre, care rămâne însă decisivă. Statele membre au datoria de a purta un dialog echilibrat cu Comisia și să prezinte neîntârziat obiectivele naționale, pe baza contextului național specific. În această situație, bineînțeles, fac apel și la guvernul României, care ia în prezent măsuri financiare haotice, fără o strategie concretă și scopuri realizabile, populația fiind cea care plătește și va plăti în continuare scump aceste greșeli. De asemenea, sistemul financiar european nu poate fi gândit în afara sistemului internațional, iar reuniunea G20 de la Toronto ar trebui să dea un răspuns în acest sens. Din păcate, e foarte posibil ca marile puteri să decidă să o ia pe drumuri separate.

3-061

Sandra Kalniete (PPE), rakstiski. – Pašreizējā finanšu krīze ir parādījusi, ka finanšu sektora darbība bez pietiekamas regulācijas var izraisīt nopietnas sekas. Es stingri atbalstu Eiropadomē pieņemto lēmumu ieviest tādu nodokļu un uzraudzības sistēmu finanšu iestādēm, kas mudinātu nozari ierobežot tajā esošos sistēmiskos riskus. Tādējādi tiks mazināta spekulāciju ietekme, nozare tiks padarīta pārredzamāka un stabilāka, kā arī tiks novērsti aizmetīti līdzīgām krīzēm nākotnē. Tāpat es uzskatu, ka finanšu iestādēm ir jāuzņemas līdztbildība krīzes izraisīšanā un no savas puses jāpalīdz cīnīties ar tās sekām. ES interesēs ir veicināt stabilitāti, caurredzamību, uzticamību un atbildīgumu šajā nozarē, un ES dalībvalstīm jāturpina kopīgs un saskaņots progress šajā jomā. Es apsveicu Eiropadomes lēmumu uzsākt pievienošanās sarunas ar Īslandi un ceru, ka tās būs konstruktīvas un sekmīgas. Īslande jau ilgi ir bijusi Eiropas Brīvās tirdzniecības asociācijas locekle un stabila ES partnervalsts, un tās pievienošanās ir solis pareizajā virzienā. Tāpat es apsveicu lēmumu ieviest eiro Igaunijā no nākamā gada sākuma. Igaunija, neraugoties uz smago ekonomisko stāvokli pasaulē, ir spējusi izpildīt visus saplūšanas kritērijus. Eiro ieviešana dos pozitīvu signālu gan valstīm, kas strādā, lai kopīgo valūtu varētu ieviest tuvākajā nākotnē, gan par eirozonas ilgtspēju kopumā.

3-062

Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE), kirjallinen. – Arvoisa puhemies, haluan esittää pari huomiota huippukokouksen agendasta. Yksi keskeinen tema on liittynyt Kööpenhaminan kokouksen jälkeisiin toimintalinjoihin. Komissio on toistuvasti esittänyt, että siirtyminen 20 prosenttiin vähennystavoitteesta 30 prosenttiin olisi nyt jotenkin edullisempää talouslaman seurauksena. Tämä on aika kummallista logiikkaa: numerot irrotetaan kontekstistaan, ympäröivistä olosuhteista. Ei ymmärretä, että kynnys toimiin on korkeampi sekkin. Kuka voisi ottaa komission loogisen päättelykyvyn tosissaan tällaisten puheiden jälkeen?

Mutta ennen kaikkea: vähennystavoitteen nostamisen ehto on aina ollut päästövähennysrintaman laajeneminen ja kattava globaali sopimus. Jokainen asiaa yhtään tunteva tajuaa, että muussa tapauksessa vähennystoimet menevät hukkaan ja hyödyttävät vain pörssisähkön tuottajia, eivät ympäristöä. Vain tasatahtinen vähentäminen vaikuttaa oikein eikä aiheuta tuotannon siirtymistä saastuttavampiin oloihin. Siksi EPP-ryhmämme tulee olemaan erittäin kriittinen näille korotuspuheille. Ne ovat direktiivin vastaisia. Jos taas direktiivi avataan, me vaadimme, että se avataan sitten kunnolla ja otetaan pohdintaan koko numeroskaala nollasta lähtien.

Minä itse olen pitkään ajatellut, että asetetut määrälliset luvut eivät ole välttämättä edes tehokkain tapa vähentää päästöjä. Tämänhän on komissiokin tavallaan myöntänyt todetessaan, että Kiina ja USA menevät ohitsemme. Miksiköhän? Siksi että niillä saattaa olla realistisempi dekarbonisaatiopolitiikka. Kuinka kauan Eurooppa jaksaa jatkaa tätä "follow me, I'm behind you" – politiikkaansa? Toinen asia: talouden hallinnosta totean, että Eurooppa tarvitsee kohdennetumpaa, parempaa sääätelyä, ei sinänsä enemmän sääätelyä.

3-063

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE), în scris. – Strategia UE 2020 este un document important pentru dezvoltarea Uniunii Europene. Aprobarea ținutelor europene poate fi considerată punctul de plecare în punerea în practică a Strategiei. Trebuie, însă, să nu uităm că suntem în criză economică și financiară. Continuarea crizei pune în pericol atingerea ținutelor naționale și, implicit, a celor europene. Condiția obligatorie pentru atingerea obiectivelor UE 2020 este ieșirea din criză. Este nevoie de legiferarea și aplicarea urgentă a măsurilor necesare unei guvernări economice benefice pentru UE. Este absolut urgentă realizarea unui acord între Statele Membre pentru asigurarea unei abordări echitabile a măsurilor anticriză. Nu este normal ca, în condițiile existenței unor situații similare în ceea ce privește Pactul de Stabilitate, să se aplice măsuri diferite.

3-064

Alfredo Pallone (PPE), per iscritto. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'accordo raggiunto la scorsa settimana va nella giusta direzione.

Le iniziative da parte di singoli Stati non possono essere efficaci senza un'azione coordinata a livello UE. Necessitiamo di una *governance* economica europea, di Autorità di vigilanza finanziarie forti, di regole condivise e di iniziative per rilanciare la crescita e l'economia.

Tuttavia, occorre sottolineare due aspetti. Il Parlamento è codecisore e investito di compiti e responsabilità che non possono essere trascurati. È doveroso quindi che le decisioni non vengano prese soltanto a livello intergovernativo. Nella recente crisi non tutti gli istituti sono dovuti ricorrere all'intervento statale. Vi sono stati enti che non hanno perseguito una finanza speculativa e, in caso di problemi, li hanno risolti facendo ricorso alla liquidità interna. Pertanto, è opportuno fare dei distinguo e fare sì che i meccanismi che agiscono ex ante, in caso di crisi, siano finanziati da quegli enti che, per la loro struttura, per gli *assets* che posseggono e per le riserve, possono provocare future crisi.

Infine, per non perdere competitività a livello mondiale, questo tipo di misure va concertato a livello di G20 e occorre evitare che l'Europa ponga sulle sue imprese un fardello che imprese asiatiche o americane non hanno.

3-065

Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), na piśmie. – Strategia 2020 została przyjęta. Pozostawia ona wiele do życzenia, ale jej ambitne cele napawają optymizmem. Od wysiłku i zaangażowania państw członkowskich zależy, czy nowa strategia podzieli smutny los poprzedniej, czy przyczyni się do budowy nowoczesnej unijnej gospodarki zdolnej do konkurencji w zglobalizowanym świecie i do podniesienia jakości życia Europejczyków. Biorąc pod uwagę, różnice w poziomie rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczego, strategia słusznie przewiduje różne sposoby realizacji jej celów przez poszczególne państwa. Przyjęcie trzech wskaźników ubóstwa, zwiększyło z 80 do 120 milionów osób grupę, do której jest adresowany program wyjścia z ubóstwa, przy jednoczesnym zachowaniu unijnego celu jej redukcji do 20 milionów.

Liczę, że wszystkie kraje podejną ambitnie do tego zadania. Ubóstwo to nie tylko kwestia materialna, to jeden z najważniejszych problemów społecznych. Istnienie biedy kompromituje wszystkich, którzy jej nie przeciwdziałają, a tym samym przyczyniają się do jej trwania. Niech tym razem hasło walki z biedą nie pozostanie tylko pustym frazesem. W moim kraju, według danych Eurostatu, wskaźnik biedy obejmuje 17% Polaków. Czekam z niecierpliwością na polskie plany walki z biedą oraz zapewniam, że wesprę wszelkie działania w tym zakresie. Polska lewica mówi biedzie zdecydowane NIE. To hańba, że w XXI wieku tak wielu Europejczyków jest z powodu niedostatku wykluczonych z godnego życia.

3-066

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D), în scris. – Consiliul European din 17 iunie 2010 a adoptat cinci obiective principale pentru creștere economică și ocuparea forței de muncă: o rată de ocupare de 75% pentru populația cu vârsta între 20 și 64 ani; îmbunătățirea condițiilor de cercetare și dezvoltare și utilizarea a 3% din PIB pentru acest sector; reducerea cu 20% a emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră comparativ cu nivelul din 1990, creșterea cu 20% a eficienței energetice, 20% din energia consumată să provină din surse regenerabile; reducerea abandonului școlar și creșterea numărului de absolvenți de studii superioare; reducerea sărăciei. Parte din aceste obiective au fost stabilite prin strategia de la Lisabona, în anul 2000, dar rezultatele obținute până acum sunt încă departe de așteptări. În plus, criza economică și financiară a generat o creștere dramatică a șomajului, punând în pericol sustenabilitatea sistemelor de pensii, oricum dependente de schimbările demografice, amenințând, astfel, cu riscul sărăciei în special populația vârstnică și tinerii. Consider că Agenda Digitală, agenda privind schimbările climatice, investițiile în infrastructura de transport și energie și dezvoltarea agriculturii ar trebui să fie elemente principale ale Strategiei UE2020, care să fie susținute prin politica de coeziune, politica agricolă comună și prin viitoarea perspectivă financiară.

3-066-500

Rafał Trzaskowski (PPE), na piśmie. – Kryzys panujący dzisiaj w Europie pokazał, że nie żadne państwo nie jest już w stanie poradzić sobie samodzielnie. Nawet największe gospodarki Unii Europejskiej opowiadają się dziś coraz silniej za wzmocnieniem mechanizmów wspólnotowych i taki też powinien być kierunek naszych działań. Ale nie może być mowy o Europie dwóch czy więcej prędkości, nie możemy dopuścić do powstania gorszej i lepszej Unii Europejskiej. Paradoksalnie państwa starające się dziś o wejście do strefy EURO, a przede wszystkim Polska, łagodnej przechodzą w większości dzisiejszy kryzys. Mamy, więc dziś sprzyjające warunki do wzmocnienia metody wspólnotowej, wzmocnienia

Komisji, transferu kompetencji z poziomów narodowych. Za tym opowiada się Parlament Europejski, którego rola również musi być uwzględniona dla przejrzystości całego procesu, od samego początku.

3-067

Wałęsa, Jarosław Leszek (PPE), in writing. – As we have seen, many different and important issues were addressed by the Council last week during the 17 June meeting. I would appreciate a moment of your time to concentrate on what was discussed concerning the Millennium Development Goals. Ten years ago, the European Union agreed to eradicate world poverty in all its key dimensions by 2015. With only five years to go it is essential that we take the necessary steps to ensure that this deadline is met. While some significant progress has been made, I believe that the upcoming UN High Plenary Meeting on the Millennium Development Goals offers us a unique opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to accomplishing this monumental task. I agree and support the Council's position to urge the High Plenary Meeting to focus on taking concrete actions aimed at increasing ownership by developing countries; focusing efforts; improving the impact of policies; mobilising more and predictable financing for development; and making more effective use of developmental resources. The decisions and actions we take now will determine whether we offer excuses or congratulations five years from now. Let us commit ourselves to the latter.

3-068

10 - Składanie dokumentów: patrz protokół

3-069

11 - Kalendarz następnych posiedzeń: patrz protokół

3-070

12 - Przerwa w obradach

3-071

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszono o godz. 17.20)