

**СРЯДА 23 ОКТОМВРИ 2013 Г.
MIÉRCOLES 23 DE OCTUBRE DE 2013
STŘEDA 23. ŘÍJNA 2013
ONSDAG DEN 23. OKTOBER 2013
MITTWOCH, 23. OKTOBER 2013
KOLMAPÄEV, 23. OKTOOBER 2013
ΤΕΤΑΡΤΗ 23 ΟΚΤΩΒΡΙΟΥ 2013
WEDNESDAY, 23 OCTOBER 2013
MERCREDI 23 OCTOBRE 2013
MERCLEDI' 23 OTTOBRE 2013
TREŠDIENA, 2013. GADA 23. OKTOBRIS
2013 M. SPALIO 23 D., TREČIADIENIS
2013. OKTÓBER 23., SZERDA
L-ERBGĦA, 23 TA' OTTUBRU 2013
WOENSDAG 23 OKTOBER 2013
ŚRODA, 23 PAŹDZIERNIKA 2013
QUARTA-FEIRA, 23 DE OUTUBRO DE 2013
MIERCURI 23 OCTOMBRIE 2013
STREDA 23. OKTÓBRA 2013
SREDA, 23. OKTOBER 2013
KESKIVIIKKO 23. LOKAKUUTA 2013
ONSDAGEN DEN 23 OKTOBER 2013
SRIJEDA 23 LISTOPADA 2013**

3-002-000

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ANNY ΠΟΔΗΜΑΤΑ*Αντιπρόεδρος*

- 1. Έναρξη της συνεδρίασης**
- 2. Τροποποίηση της ημερήσιας διάταξης**

3-005-000

Πρόεδρος. - Πριν ξεκινήσουμε τη συζήτηση θέλω να κάνω μία ανακοίνωση. Χθες, η Επιτροπή Προϋπολογισμών ενέκρινε την έκθεση του κυρίου La Via σχετικά με το σχέδιο διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού αριθ. 6/2013: αναθεώρηση των προβλέψεων των Παραδοσιακών Ιδίων Πόρων, βάσεις ΦΠΑ και ΑΕΕ, εγγραφή στον προϋπολογισμό των διορθώσεων υπέρ του Ηνωμένου

Βασιλείου και αναθεώρηση των μειώσεων ΑΕΕ για τις Κάτω Χώρες και την Σουηδία - λοιπά έσοδα από το πρόστιμο στην Microsoft - σύσταση των καταπιστευματικών ταμείων της Ένωσης

Σύμφωνα με το άρθρο 140 παράγραφος 2 του Κανονισμού, προτείνω την προσθήκη αυτής της έκθεσης στην ημερήσια διάταξη της Πέμπτης 24 Οκτωβρίου 2013 προς συζήτηση και ψηφοφορία, με το εξής χρονοδιάγραμμα:

- Προθεσμία κατάθεσης τροπολογιών στο ΣΔΠ 6/2013: σήμερα Τετάρτη, στις 12 το μεσημέρι
- Ψηφοφορία: Πέμπτη, στις 12 το μεσημέρι.

Θέλω να ρωτήσω αν υπάρχουν ενστάσεις.

3-007-000

Daniel Cohn-Bendit, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, je crois que la situation est quand même surréaliste, voire ridicule. Nous avons besoin de deux budgets rectificatifs: le budget rectificatif n° 6, dont vous avez parlé, de 2,7 milliards, et le budget rectificatif n° 8, de 3,9 milliards. Nous avons, dans ce Parlement, depuis des semaines, dit, redit et répété que pour nous, les deux budgets rectificatifs étaient à examiner ensemble et que c'était là la condition pour que nous votions le CFP.

On découvre à présent, par le hasard des choses, qu'il y a un problème de financement à la Commission. Très bien! Ensuite, on nous dit que le Conseil nous propose les budgets rectificatifs n° 6 et 8. Le Conseil a été capable de nous proposer le budget rectificatif n° 6 – 2,7 milliards – et n'a pas encore été capable de proposer le budget rectificatif n° 8 pour les 3,9 milliards. Mais on nous dit aussi qu'il faut prendre une décision avant le 15 novembre.

Ergo, la solution est simple: séance extraordinaire du Parlement européen le 4 ou le 5 novembre! D'ici là, le Conseil aura le temps de nous présenter le budget rectificatif n° 8. C'est avant le 15 novembre, donc la Commission pourra travailler, Alain Lamassoure pourra travailler, tout le monde pourra travailler avec le Conseil pour élaborer les deux budgets rectificatifs. Si nous acceptons la procédure proposée, nous ne verrons jamais les 3,9 milliards.

Je termine en vous disant ceci, chers collègues: pour l'année 2014, il y a un déficit prévu de 20 milliards. 20 milliards! Si nous ne parvenons même pas à avoir les 3,9, nous ne réussirons jamais! Si ce Parlement n'arrive pas enfin à faire entendre raison au Conseil, plus jamais nous ne serons pris au sérieux. Refusez de voter lors de cette session! Acceptons qu'il y ait une séance extraordinaire en novembre, le 4 ou le 5, et ce Parlement pourra ainsi pratiquer un bras de fer intéressant avec le Conseil.

3-008-000

Hannes Swoboda, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Cohn-Bendit hat Recht. Der Rat verhält sich völlig unverantwortlich. Und wenn wir so agieren würden wie der Rat, müssten wir so handeln, wie Daniel Cohn-Bendit gesagt hat. Nur, liebe Freunde und liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, wir sind den Bürgern gegenüber verantwortlich dafür, dass die Kommission auch arbeiten kann. Und so Leid es mir tut, dann muss man auch wirklich dazu kommen, dass wir diese Entscheidung treffen.

Meine Fraktion ist dafür, das auf die Tagesordnung zu setzen. Aber, Frau Präsidentin, das möchte ich gleich jetzt sagen: Unsere Fraktion ist auch dafür, dass wir, bevor wir den Beschluss fassen, am Donnerstag auch erklären können, was die Situation ist. Denn es ist

unakzeptabel, wie der Rat sich in den Verhandlungen zum MFR verhält, dass er nicht bereit ist, einen Kompromiss einzugehen. Aber wir wollen den Bürgern und Europa zeigen, dass dieses Parlament mehr Verantwortung zeigt, als der Rat das tut. Wir müssen das gute Beispiel setzen!

3-009-000

Guy Verhofstadt, *au nom du groupe ALDE* . – Madame la Présidente, je n'ai rien contre la proposition de Dany, cela me paraît une excellente idée d'avoir une session supplémentaire à Strasbourg ou à Bruxelles... sauf que j'entends dans les couloirs que les deux grands groupes veulent déjà discuter aujourd'hui et demain.

Ma proposition est constituée de trois éléments. D'abord, je demande qu'il y ait un débat jeudi avec un tour d'intervention des différents groupes, parce qu'il n'est pas question qu'on vote sur le budget, comme ça, sans qu'il y ait un débat en séance plénière: il y a eu un débat en commission, c'est donc normal qu'il y ait aussi un débat sur ces budgets rectificatifs en séance plénière.

Deuxièmement, je demande à la présidence lituanienne de nous confirmer aujourd'hui ou demain jeudi au plus tard, que le budget rectificatif n° 8 de 3,9 milliards est accepté et préparé par le Conseil et qu'il sera déposé au Parlement dans les heures et dans les jours qui viennent. Ce n'est quand même pas difficile, Monsieur le Président du Conseil, de prendre la parole maintenant et de nous dire que le Conseil déposera bel et bien le budget rectificatif n° 8 de 3,9 milliards. Si vous ne pouvez pas nous dire cela maintenant, à cette heure-ci, cela signifie qu'il y a anguille sous roche, qu'il y a toute une stratégie derrière pour nous faire avaler le projet de budget rectificatif n° 6 sans la moindre intention de nous présenter le budget rectificatif n° 8 de 3,9 milliards et de nous le faire approuver.

Ma demande est donc très claire: si on veut discuter de ça demain, je veux, avant demain, entendre le Conseil nous dire que les 3,9 milliards seront présentés au Parlement. Si le Conseil n'est pas capable de le faire, je pense que nous avons intérêt à ne voter aucun budget rectificatif, puisque cela voudrait dire que nous commencerions la période 2014-2020 avec un déficit de plusieurs milliards d'euros et ça, nous ne pouvons pas l'accepter.

Donc, Madame la Présidente, vous pouvez peut-être donner la parole au président du Conseil maintenant, afin qu'il nous dise quelle est l'intention du Conseil, parce que ce petit jeu avec les budgets rectificatifs a assez duré.

3-010-000

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion* . – Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ich möchte für meine Fraktion erklären, dass ich es für unverantwortlich halte, die Auseinandersetzung, die gegenwärtig um den Haushalt 2013-2014 läuft, in den Rahmen von Machtspielchen einzuordnen. Und ich halte es für sehr problematisch – und das gilt aus meiner Sicht auch für die großen Fraktionen –, dass wir uns als Parlament von vorne herein beeinflussen lassen, wie andere uns darstellen.

Wir tragen hier die Verantwortung, wenn die 3,9 Milliarden Euro für den Haushalt nicht zur Verfügung stehen, so dass letztendlich die Ausgaben, die Verantwortungen der Europäischen Union nicht bezahlt werden können. Und wir werden die Frage der Zahlungsunfähigkeit immer wieder neu vor uns herschieben. Wir werden immer wieder neu unter Druck gesetzt werden: Jetzt müssen sie das entscheiden, damit wir wenigstens

für die nächsten vier Wochen noch zahlungsfähig sind. Das sollten wir uns als Parlament nicht antun. Das geht einfach nicht.

Deshalb bin ich gegen eine Tagesordnungserweiterung zum Ergänzungshaushalt um die 2,7 Milliarden, wenn nicht gleichzeitig die Garantie gegeben wird, dass die 3,9 Milliarden gezahlt werden. Wenn wir die nicht bekommen, dann können wir darüber nicht entscheiden. Es ist nicht möglich!

Es gibt jetzt mehrere Möglichkeiten: Wir könnten es so machen, wie es Daniel Cohn-Bendit vorgeschlagen hat, nämlich eine Sondersitzung einberufen. Wir können es aber auch so machen, dass wir hier von den beiden Vertretern von Rat und Kommission die Zusicherung bekommen, dass wir spätestens morgen früh die Ansage vom Rat, vom Gipfel, bekommen, dass diese 3,9 Milliarden gezahlt werden. Wenn diese Garantie nicht kommt, können wir nicht über die 2,7 Milliarden entscheiden. Das muss klipp und klar hier gesagt werden. Dann sollte der Vorschlag von Daniel Cohn-Bendit greifen, dass wir in der kommenden oder übernächsten Woche eine entsprechende Sondersitzung durchführen und dann entscheiden. Ohne diese Garantie darf das Parlament nicht entscheiden. Das kann nicht sein, und das sollte nicht sein, und wir sollten uns dafür nicht hergeben.

3-011-000

Alain Lamassoure, *présidente de la commission des budgets*. – Madame la Présidente, je m'exprime non pas au nom de mon groupe, mais en tant que président de la commission des budgets.

Je voudrais rétablir un certain nombre d'éléments, parce que certains collègues prennent la parole en donnant l'impression qu'en votant ce budget n° 6, nous ferions une concession au Conseil. La réalité est exactement le contraire. Le Conseil n'aime pas ce budget n° 6. Pourquoi? Parce que ce n'est pas un budget de dépenses, c'est un budget de recettes. L'objet du budget n° 6, c'est d'obliger les États membres à sortir de leurs budgets nationaux 2,7 milliards d'euros pour permettre de payer les factures liées au budget rectificatif n° 2, adopté en juillet. C'est ça qui est en cause.

Je regrette – je le dis avec courtoisie et respect en présence du président de la Commission européenne – la maladresse de la Commission. Nous avons eu un trilogue la semaine dernière sur les sujets budgétaires. Nous avons invité – elle a été représentée à un très haut niveau – la Commission européenne à la commission des budgets jeudi dernier. Or, elle n'a pas souligné à ce moment-là la gravité de son problème de trésorerie. Ce n'est que pendant le week-end que la Commission s'est aperçue qu'elle était à la limite de la cessation de paiement.

Dans ces conditions, la commission des budgets s'est saisie du sujet hier, comme l'avait souhaité la plénière lundi matin. Nous avons auditionné le commissaire Lewandowski. Il nous a donné des réponses satisfaisantes aux vingt questions que nous lui avons posées et, dans ces conditions, la commission des budgets vous propose d'adopter ce budget rectificatif n° 6, qui – je le répète – a pour objet d'obtenir des États membres qu'ils paient 2,7 milliards d'euros.

Si nous n'obtenons pas cela, nous ne gênons pas le Conseil: nous nous gênons nous-mêmes pour la suite de la négociation budgétaire et nous compromettons la possibilité d'obtenir – nous y arriverons – les 3,9 milliards d'autorisation de crédits de paiement qui nous sont évidemment nécessaires.

3-012-000

President. – I just want to remind you that this is not a debate. We have to resolve a procedural issue. I would like to ask the President of the European Commission firstly, and then the representative of the Council, if they want to intervene briefly on the specific issue that we are discussing.

3-013-000

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission.* – Madam President, I was intending to speak about this point in the next point, but since comments were made regarding the Commission, I think that it is appropriate to clarify some issues now.

First of all, I basically agree with what the President of the Committee on Budgets, Mr Lamassoure, has just said. I do not think that you will be doing yourselves any favours if you do not vote for Draft Amending Budget No 6. It is critically important for Draft Amending Budget No 6 to be approved for the reasons that have just been mentioned by the President of the Committee on Budgets.

I would also like to remind you that Draft Amending Budget No 8 has already been approved by the COREPER. So, while I understand that there has been lack of confidence between Council and Parliament – and we have just heard some comments here – I would like to make a strong appeal to the Council and to Parliament to engage in these matters, not through arm-twisting but through loyal cooperation. The citizens of Europe simply do not understand that debate. The citizens of Europe are asking for the financing of the regions in their countries. For some of our countries, it is critically important that the programmes are up and running on 1 January 2014. For some countries, the debates on institutional matters are not relevant.

So it is a matter of urgency and of the highest importance that the money is ready for the programmes – for youth unemployment and so on – as soon as possible. Having said this, I understand that Parliament, because it felt that some of the commitments made by the Council were not undertaken in due time, decided to postpone the votes that were supposed to take place in October to November. That is why, Mr Lamassoure, the Commission came forward very late, as you said, with these elements. But let me tell you that, since the beginning of the year, the Commission – Commissioner Lewandowski and myself – has been saying, loud and clear, that without the amending budgets there will be a rupture of payments. I have been saying this since January.

That is why this year we have asked for exceptional draft amending budgets. In the triologue with President Schulz and Prime Minister Kenny, we clearly said that, without the approval of these draft amending budgets on time, the Commission would not be able to pay the bills we are supposed to pay. It is true that – precisely because the matter is so important – I myself tried to call the President of the European Parliament over the weekend to ask him to at least vote on Draft Amending Budget No 6, otherwise there would be a rupture of payments.

I am asking this not on behalf of the Council but on behalf of the Commission. I think it is the Commission's duty to draw the attention of all the parts of the budgetary authority – Council and Parliament – to the negative consequences. It is true that we could probably have managed it differently, but frankly we are on record, Mr Lamassoure, as saying very often that, without those two amending budgets – and also the other more, let us say,

restricted one, but 6 and 8 are the two important ones – there will be a rupture of payments. So we are not saying anything new.

But of course, since we were expecting you to vote in October – which you have not done, because you thought that the Council did not give you enough elements – putting it off to November will mean that we have a payment problem. You are trying to get the guarantees you want. That is up to you, and I do not want to interfere in this debate between you and the Council. But please let us avoid a rupture of payments, which would not be in the interest of the image of the European institutions. Let us work to finalise all the budgets: the draft amending budgets and the MFF. I think this is feasible if all the parties, including the Council – and I want to appeal very directly to the Council – show the goodwill that is indispensable in matters of this importance.

3-014-000

Vytautas Leškevičius, *President-in-Office of the Council* . – Madam President, President of the Commission, honourable Members, since I was asked about Draft Amending Budget No 8, I can only repeat what President Barroso was saying. The political agreement on it has already been reached and has been made known in a letter to you as well

(The President asked the speaker to wait while an interpretation problem was resolved)

As I was saying, since I was asked a direct question about the Council's intention with regard to Draft Amending Budget No 8, I can only repeat what the President of the Commission was saying. The political agreement on the Draft Amending Budget has already been reached at COREPER level, and it is the Council Presidency's intention to convene an extraordinary Council meeting on 30 October. It is my strong expectation that after this meeting we will be able to report to you about the formal adoption by the Council of Draft Amending Budget No 8.

3-015-000

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group* . – Madam President, we have used, Mr President of the Council, a written procedure for Draft Amending Budget No 6. Why is it not possible to use a written procedure for Draft Amending Budget No 8? It is as simple as that. You were capable of organising a written procedure to put before Parliament for DAB 6 within a few hours, but this is not possible for DAB 8. What is the problem?

3-016-000

Daniel Cohn-Bendit, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE* . – Madame la Présidente, si j'ai bien compris le président de la Commission, M. Barroso – Monsieur Barroso, rectifiez-moi – la Commission a besoin, pour ne pas être en cessation de paiement, des budgets rectificatifs n°6 et 8.

Alors, si le Conseil fait une proposition le 30, quand est-ce que la commission des budgets pourra faire un rapport pour ce Parlement? Avant le 15? Il n'y a pas de réunion du Parlement. Par conséquent, si nous voulons avoir le tout, la solution est d'organiser une séance extraordinaire le 5: ils font leur proposition le 30, M. Lamassoure convoque sa commission, nous avons les deux rapports, nous votons sur ces deux rapports et "tout va bien, Madame la marquise!" Voilà. C'est quand même simple, non?

3-017-000

President. – What I propose right now is to hold two votes. Firstly, we will vote in order to decide whether we include or not point No 6 on the modification of the budget in the agenda, and then we will vote on whether there will be a debate before the vote on Thursday.

Η πρόταση για την εγγραφή στην ημερήσια διάταξη της έκθεσης σχετικά με την θέση του Συμβουλίου όσον αφορά το σχέδιο διορθωτικού προϋπολογισμού αριθ.° 6/2013 της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης για το οικονομικό έτος 2013 εγκρίνεται.

Εγκρίνεται επίσης η διεξαγωγή συζήτησης πριν από την ψηφοφορία της Πέμπτης 24 Οκτωβρίου 2013.

3. Κατ' εξουσιοδότηση πράξεις (άρθρο 87α του Κανονισμού): βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά

4. Εκτελεστικά μέτρα (άρθρο 88 του Κανονισμού): βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά

5. Μεταναστευτικά ρεύματα στη Μεσόγειο, με ιδιαίτερη έμφαση στα τραγικά γεγονότα κοντά στην Λαμπεντούζα (προτάσεις ψηφίσματος που έχουν κατατεθεί): βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά

6. Αναστολή της συμφωνίας SWIFT ως συνέπεια των παρακολουθήσεων από την Υπηρεσία Εθνικής Ασφάλειας των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών (NSA) (προτάσεις ψηφίσματος που έχουν κατατεθεί): βλ. Συνοπτικά Πρακτικά

7. Προπαρασκευαστικές εργασίες ενόψει της συνεδρίασης του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου (24-25 Οκτωβρίου 2013) (συζήτηση)

3-025-000

Πρόεδρος. - Το πρώτο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση επί των δηλώσεων του Συμβουλίου και της Επιτροπής σχετικά με την προετοιμασία της συνεδρίασης του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου της 24ης και της 25ης Οκτωβρίου 2013

3-026-000

Vytautas Leškevičius, President-in-Office of the Council . – Madam President, President Barroso, honourable Members, I am pleased to be able to present to you this morning the preparations for this weekly European Council. I look forward to hearing your reactions and responses to the many important issues which are on the agenda.

Later this week the European Council will have a further opportunity to make progress towards improving competitiveness and returning to strong and sustainable growth and job creation. President van Rompuy has therefore decided to focus the debate on the following issues: firstly, tapping the potential of the digital economy, boosting innovation and repeating the benefits of a single market for services. Secondly: continuing progress to combat youth unemployment, improving access to finance for the economy and regulatory fitness, and further deepening of the EMU.

On the digital economy, the European Council will look at how Europe's industry can regain momentum through increased investment in the digital economy, promoting a consumer and business-friendly digital single market and improving IT skills. To boost the digital economy and create jobs, Europe needs both investment and the appropriate

regulatory framework. The European Council would look at this issue in the broader context, ranging from broadband speed to cloud computing. We also need to promote a consumer- and business-friendly digital friendly market.

This requires us to tackle fragmentation for more effective competition and attract private investment through a predictable and stable EU-wide legal framework. We must accelerate ongoing work on the various legislative proposals in this area. Here I count on the support of this Parliament.

We have to increase the trust of consumers and businesses in the digital economy; this requires a strong data protection framework and the modernisation of public administration. Citizens and companies must all have the necessary IT skills to benefit fully from the digital single market. The European Council will put forward some specific proposals to address the situation.

The issue of innovation was discussed by the European Council in detail in February. Two years on, a significant number of issues highlighted then are being complemented. However, further efforts are required at both national and European level; these include measures to ensure that the Union's intellectual and scientific potential is actually transformed into new products and services which can be sold on the markets.

The European Council will look at the areas which need to be addressed for the completion of the European research era by 2014. Concerning services, the European Council will send a strong message that Member States urgently have to improve the implementation of the Services Directive and remove unjustified or disproportionate barriers.

Madam President, honourable Members, as you know, last June the European Council focused on how to step up efforts to fight youth unemployment. This remains one of our top priorities, and it is the most important social challenge facing us. This week's European Council will look at and take stock of progress, in particular on the preparations for the launch of the Youth Employment Initiative and implementation by the Member States of the youth guarantee. This must become operational by 1 January 2014.

The Heads of State and Government will also discuss concrete measures to restore normal lending to the economy and facilitate financing of investment – with particular reference to SMEs – on the basis of the Commission and EIB reports. They will address the regulatory fitness with the aim of making EU law less of a burden for those to whom it is addressed.

I would like to add a few words about another important issue on this week's agenda: economic and monetary union. Although the situation of financial markets is less volatile, we must continue to make progress towards the completion of EMU. This week's European Council will focus on strengthening economic policy coordination and the social dimension of the EMU following the recent communication from the Commission on this issue.

Heads of State or Government will also come back to the issue of the banking union, our most immediate priority. The final adoption of the Single Supervisory Mechanism and the European Banking Authority amending regulations are very welcome, but more needs to be done; a single supervisory mechanism is not enough. It is also essential that a bank recovery directive and a deposit guarantee directive are adopted rapidly. I count on your cooperation to help ensure that this happens. It is in any case clear that the October debate will not be the end of our discussions on EMU. The European Council will come back with all these issues in December as well.

Finally, the European Council will take note of the state of play on the preparations for an Eastern Partnership Summit to take place in Vilnius on 28 and 29 November. It will also hold a discussion on the recent tragic accident off the coast of Lampedusa.

Madam President, President of the Commission, honourable Members, the October European Council will be a further step in our determination to return to growth and jobs and improve competitiveness in Europe. We look forward to constructive discussions and concrete results, which we will be taking forward in the months to come.

3-027-000

José Manuel Barroso, *President of the Commission* . – Madam President, this week's European Council has a very broad agenda: the digital economy, innovation, services, youth unemployment, financing of the economy, regulatory fitness, EMU and economic governance, EMU and the social dimension, the Banking Union, Eastern Partnership and migration.

My main message to the European Council tomorrow is that, over the next weeks and months, the European Union can – and must – achieve concrete results in all these areas. Many of our initiatives can be brought to a successful conclusion even before this House rises ahead of next May's elections. But I will make it clear that we can only deliver if there is the necessary political will among our Member States. Just yesterday, as you know, the Commission approved a very substantial working programme for 2014. So there is a lot to do.

The thematic focus of tomorrow's European Council will be on innovation and the digital agenda. Digital services, telecommunications, e-government and skills are the drivers of tomorrow's growth and productivity. Even in the crisis, this is a sector that has continued to show growth potential, and we predict there will be nearly one million ICT job vacancies unfilled in the coming years. This is unacceptable, given the level of youth unemployment that we face. This is why the Commission has launched the Grand Coalition for Digital Jobs, a multi-stakeholder partnership to exploit the employment potential of ICT.

We need a thriving digital sector to drive all other parts of our economy, and the internal market for telecoms has to be at the heart of this programme. We must urgently address the underlying shortcomings and create the right environment for investment. There is now a major reform package for the telecoms sector on the table. Let us all make maximum progress on this file by the end of this legislature.

This package complements a number of important recent proposals on the completion of the Digital Single Market, for example on reducing the cost of deploying high-speed broadband networks, on e-invoicing in public procurement, on cyber-security and on electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions. These, too, are in your and the Council's hands, and I hope the European Council will throw its weight behind the call to finalise them in the months to come.

We need to build this Digital Single Market in a manner that is consistent with our European values. That includes making sure that those who operate in the online world do not escape from fair taxation. The Commission is actively working on a series of measures to fight against tax evasion in general, working with the G8, G20 and OECD. But there are some specific challenges which are posed by new digital business models which existing tax policies may not yet fully address. This is why the Commission decided yesterday to set up an expert group on taxation in the digital economy, which will report by next summer.

Core European values, namely the respect of fundamental rights, including the right to privacy and security, also matter just as much on-line as off-line. Recent disclosures concerning surveillance activities have cast a shadow on European Union citizens' trust. We need to combine the digital agenda with a better framework for the protection of data and privacy rights. Trust in the data-driven economy has to be restored, not only in order to re-establish much-needed confidence but also for its potential impact on growth. I therefore strongly welcome this week's vote in the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs of this Parliament, lending its strong support to the Commission's proposals. I want to thank Parliament for the priority which it attaches to this file. We should do all we can to conclude this much-needed modernisation and strengthening of the EU data protection rules before the end of this legislature.

The other thematic priority for this European Council will be research and innovation. The evidence is there: Member States that have continued to invest in innovation have fared better in the current crisis than those that have not. We will need to increase our efforts – public and private – to keep up with international competition. International investors are now finding their way to Europe, but business research and development expenditure in the EU is far below that of our main competitors. The crisis has also taken its toll, with a decrease in public spending on R&D in 2011.

Europe is lagging behind, in particular in fast-growing markets and high tech. If no action is taken, the EU may miss out again on fast-growing markets linked to the technologies which tackle societal challenges.

The Commission has recently launched an Indicator of Innovation Output to focus attention on the right R&D policies. But additional investment in R&D makes no sense without critical structural reforms of national research and innovation systems. The Commission will continue to push for reforms to create a true European Research Area. We must enable the mobility of researchers and provide open access to publicly-funded research results and transnational access to research infrastructures.

Creating the right business environment is also key to stimulating growth. This is why the Commission is removing unnecessary burdens on business across all policy areas. The Commission has, since 2005, repealed 5 590 legal acts and reduced the administrative burden by EUR 32.3 billion, and we are determined to go further. In our Communication on Regulatory Fitness (REFIT), we have just launched a programme to further simplify legislation. We plan to withdraw some pending proposals and repeal existing laws which no longer serve their purpose. We act where action is needed at European level. We should not act where it can be done better at national or sub-national level.

At the European Council tomorrow I will be looking for a strong endorsement of the REFIT programme. But let me be clear: this is not about calling into question established policy goals, nor should it be a battle of competences between Brussels and national capitals. This is about finding the right balance for using existing competences in full respect of subsidiarity and proportionality. I also expect Member States to cut red tape at their level and avoid 'gold plating' EU legislation by adding new national burdens to European rules.

This brings us, honourable Members, to another issue I have repeatedly stressed in this House, as well as in the European Council: financing the economy. This remains one of the biggest bottlenecks in the European economy. Even with growth returning, confidence and pre-crisis lending patterns will not return quickly. We need to unblock the flow of

credit and help businesses, especially SMEs. Frankly, I am disappointed that the Member States are not more ambitious here, and I will say this tomorrow to the European Council.

In some countries, the European Union budget will be by far the most important source of public investment over the next few years. These funds will help kick-start private funding as well. This is key to future growth. The preparations for the next MFF have come a very long way, but we are not yet there. We need a final push from all concerned in order to conclude. This is of the utmost importance and urgency for many of our Member States and many of our regions. Without the budget of the European Union, they will simply not be able to invest, because they have no fiscal space to do so. I can assure you that the Commission will continue to do its utmost to facilitate a fair and balanced outcome between the European Parliament and the Council – an outcome which is as close as possible to the Commission's level of ambition, something I know Parliament shares.

Honourable Members, you know that, together with the EIB, we have also looked into other, alternative instruments for financing the economy, including forms of risk-sharing by pooling and leveraging parts of EU funds and EIB loans. I will call upon Member States to bring forward concrete pledges and to go beyond the status quo. We are not asking governments to renounce part of their funds, we are asking Member States to increase the effect of the funds – including for the benefit of SMEs, which suffer the most from the fragmentation of Europe's credit markets.

Equally important in our comprehensive crisis response is that we move forward on the road to a deep and genuine Economic and Monetary Union. In this sense, the European Council is an intermediate step towards decisions in December, but every step is necessary. Completing the Banking Union, in particular, is the single most significant and important advance we can make to end the unfair distortions of lending conditions in financial markets. So it must remain our absolute priority for the euro area.

I congratulate the co-legislators on the final approval of the Single Supervisory Mechanism. Now we have to find a final agreement on the directive on bank recovery and resolution and a political agreement in Council on the Single Resolution Mechanism by the end of the year. Our goal must be to conclude negotiations with this House in the spring. I want to thank the European Parliament for its efforts and the hard work that has been done to prepare its position for these discussions.

We also need to pay attention to the balance sheet assessment and forthcoming stress test exercise in the banking sector. The Commission will support the European Central Bank and European Banking Authority in any way possible in that important work. We also expect Member States to do their own work in terms of ensuring the availability of any necessary backstops in line with state aid rules if private solutions are not adequate, and in terms of the full cooperation of national supervisors, to bring this exercise to fruition.

We have made significant progress as regards economic governance in the EU, in particular as regards the country-specific recommendations, which are the end-point of the European Semester. But we must continue our efforts to strengthen economic policy coordination, in particular, within the euro area. We must make further progress on identifying the policy areas which require coordination, including ex-ante coordination. On the other hand, the implementation of the country-specific recommendations is not yet optimal. This is also due to insufficient ownership by each Member State of the recommendations which are addressed to them. The widening of these to the social and employment dimensions will surely contribute to enhancing ownership.

As you know, the Commission has presented a communication on the social dimension of Economic and Monetary Union. One of the core proposals is stronger surveillance of employment and social challenges and policy coordination. The role of the European Parliament is crucial in this regard. The Commission will cooperate with Parliament to select the indicators for the Alert Mechanism Report and will discuss with it the new scoreboard of key social and employment indicators. The Commission intends to make use of those indicators in the forthcoming Alert Mechanism Report. Moreover, in the Annual Growth Survey – to be adopted by the middle of next month – the Commission will present a first overview of the implementation of the country-specific recommendations. We will spare no effort in making the European Semester the real tool for economic coordination in the European Union.

We must also step up our efforts to fight against youth unemployment. As you know, in June the Commission proposed the frontloading of the social funds so that the initial EUR six billion is invested in the first two years. Adopting the necessary regulations is a matter of urgency and of concern. We are approaching the programming period. The Member States, with the support of the Commission, are in the process of finalising the design of the Youth Guarantee Implementation plans and Youth Employment Initiative programmes.

While moving forward on our internal priorities, we should not lose sight of our external responsibilities, particularly in our near neighbourhood. This European Council will prepare the Eastern Partnership Summit, which will take place in Vilnius later in November.

The European Commission launched this initiative, the Eastern Partnership Summit, back in 2009. Four years later, we are now in a position to deliver on our common objective of political association and economic integration with our Eastern partners. Our common goal is to conclude association agreements, including Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Areas. The free will of these countries must be respected by everyone. Of course, we also expect our partners to adhere to and deliver on their commitment to the reforms and to the values that underpin these partnerships. I therefore launch, from here, an appeal to Ukraine to fulfil the remaining benchmarks and seize the opportunity of the extension of the Cox-Kwaśniewski mission. I believe the coming weeks are critically important for Ukraine, and I make a strong appeal for all of us and for Ukraine to make progress in that process.

Last of all – and importantly – after the awful and all-too-frequent tragedies in the Mediterranean, migration policy too will feature heavily at this European Council. As you know, I was in Lampedusa two weeks ago, on an invitation from the Italian authorities, and of course I was profoundly moved by what I saw. The images will remain impressed on me for ever. I was there to express the European Commission's understanding and solidarity with the local and national authorities and to the people of Lampedusa, as well as to offer concrete aid to the Italian authorities, which we have done.

We must all do more to prevent tragedies like this. I hope the European Council will pave the way for a new chapter in the common management, common responsibility and cooperative management at European Union level of migration policies. There are no magic bullets or immediate solutions, and we need to be realistic. But the character and scale of the problem calls for stronger measures to organise search-and-rescue operations to save lives in danger, to better protect our borders, to effectively tackle the criminal networks behind the migration flows and to protect those in need. In this sense, and knowing well that most responsibilities and competences lie at national level, more has to be done at European level in terms of cooperation with countries of origin and transit and

of Member States' efforts on resettlement. It is quite clear that Europe cannot turn its back when faced with this kind of humanitarian tragedy.

These elements form part of the solution, but first and foremost we need the political will. The Commission is doing its part and, for example, has now been asked by governments to lead a task force together with Member States and EU Agencies such as Frontex, the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) and Europol. We must not allow the momentum on such vital issues to be fuelled by tragedies alone.

In conclusion, in all these files, we need to get the solutions where they can be found, working together to make them really produce results. I think there are no excuses, and the opportunity to go forward before the elections is there. There are efforts directly aimed at the welfare of our citizens, but there are also efforts which are critically important for the credibility of our institutions, to show that in fact we bring solutions to the problems of our citizens. I am convinced we can continue to work on this together in the spirit of achieving results. I thank you for your attention.

3-028-000

Joseph Daul, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président du Conseil, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, chers collègues, lors de sa réunion, demain, le Conseil abordera les points sur lesquels notre Parlement s'est déjà penché: l'union bancaire et l'achèvement de l'union économique et monétaire.

Aujourd'hui, le moindre événement qui touche une de nos capitales se répercute sur les autres. De fait, nous sommes de plus en plus intégrés. Nous devons donc créer le cadre législatif qui permette à nos économies de mieux fonctionner ensemble. C'est important.

Un autre point qui devrait enfin être à l'ordre du jour pour être définitivement réglé mais qui n'y figure malheureusement pas, c'est le CFP. Moi, je suis comme tous les autres, et je l'ai dit très clairement dans ce Parlement il y a deux jours, je ne comprends plus le fonctionnement du Conseil. Ce n'est pas le président présent ici que j'accuse mais, je le redis, je ne comprends plus le fonctionnement du Conseil.

Le Parlement a été clair. Le déficit de 3,9 milliards pour 2013 devait être soldé et je crois qu'on a même signé. Nous avons demandé une clause de révision et la mise en place du groupe de haut niveau pour un système de ressources propres. C'était des demandes de bon sens et nous étions convaincus qu'elles avaient été acceptées.

Ces 3,9 milliards, ce n'est pas de l'argent en plus qui est décidé. Chers collègues, nous n'arriverons pas à nous en sortir si nous ne mettons pas, demain ou après-demain, les factures de trois milliards qu'à la Commission sur la table du Conseil, et puis ce seront eux qui décideront qui ne sera pas remboursé. Ce n'est pas de l'argent du Parlement, c'est de l'argent qui a été dépensé pour des projets qui ont été acceptés et qui ne sont pas financés. Alors, nous pourrions faire ce que nous voulons ici, mais nous devons, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, mettre toutes les factures impayées, que nous ne pouvons pas payer parce que le traité est ainsi prévu, sur la table du Conseil. C'est eux, entre eux, qui diront: la France n'aura pas ça, la Grèce n'aura pas ça, et qui diront à tous les autres pays: "voilà ce qu'on ne va pas vous payer". Par exemple, le rabais à l'Angleterre, on ne pourra pas le payer cette année, on le paiera l'année prochaine, on va le reporter.

Toutes ces choses-là, nous devons maintenant les cogérer comme un chef d'entreprise. On m'avait toujours dit que je ne comprenais rien à la gestion, mais les institutions, c'est comme

les entreprises. Vous pouvez reporter un déficit d'une année, de deux années, mais la troisième année, vous êtes pris. Par qui? Par les banquiers. Et nous allons connaître la même situation.

Nous devons donc dire simplement à nos chefs d'État et de gouvernement: "Messieurs, OK, vous nous demandez les 3,9 milliards, vous ne voulez pas les payer, alors décidez entre vous!"

Pourquoi on s'énerve ici? Nous n'avons pas le droit de faire un déficit, alors mettons les factures sur la table du Conseil pour qu'il décide qui ne sera pas remboursé. Nous ne pouvons pas tolérer ce qui s'est passé cette semaine, ce n'est pas possible. Nous allons avoir un déficit de plus de 20 milliards en 2014. Tout le monde le dit. Alors si c'est le cas, mettons-nous autour de la table pour voir quelles actions nous ne finançons pas, quelles actions nous ne mettons pas en place. On ne lance pas nos régions, nos différents pays dans différentes actions pour leur dire, à la fin de l'année: "Messieurs, je regrette, on vous a fait dépenser de l'argent et il y a 24 milliards qu'on ne peut pas payer". C'est comme cela que les États sont arrivés à la faillite.

Nous avons fait le *two-pack* et le *six-pack* pour éviter cela et on est en train de nous imposer ce système au niveau de l'Europe. Je crois qu'il faut simplement revenir à du bon sens, je dirais même du bon sens paysan: on ne peut pas dépenser plus que ce qu'on a! Voilà ce que j'ai envie de dire au Conseil, à la Commission et au Parlement: mettons-nous autour de la table! Monsieur Farage, c'est sûr, on ne pourra plus payer les députés qui veulent de la subsidiarité (ce n'est pas un problème, c'est pour la petite remarque)!

Pour demain, c'est exactement pareil. Ils veulent investir dans l'innovation, favoriser un marché unique des télécommunications ... Nous dépensons de l'argent lors des Conseils, des milliards et des milliards que nous n'avons pas. Nous devons donc revenir à des choses beaucoup plus simples et plus terre-à-terre. Par contre, c'est vrai que dans cette modernisation, dans ces investissements européens, il y a à peu près 900 000 emplois qu'on peut mettre sur la table avec les nouvelles technologies et tout ce qui tourne autour.

Nous devons simplement être réalistes. Au lieu de nous chercher, nous devons essayer de nous trouver et de nous mettre autour de la table pour décider qui fait quoi. En effet, mes chers présidents, chère présidence du Conseil, vous croyez qu'il aurait été difficile, comme l'a dit Dany, de mettre dans la même lettre les 2,7 milliards et ces 3,9 milliards qui étaient soi-disant décidés et au sujet desquels le Coreper et tout le monde était d'accord? Deux phrases supplémentaires auraient suffi et le problème était réglé. Là, franchement, vous nous prenez pour des cons, excusez-moi du terme! J'en ai ras-le-bol de la manière et de la méthode dont cela s'est passé les quinze derniers jours avec le CFP.

Je vais vous dire encore une chose, je vais encore aller plus loin. On m'a dit la semaine dernière, au niveau des techniciens de la Commission et des autres, que, de toute façon – et je suis d'accord avec ça – voter sur le CFP quinze jours plus tard dans un paquet global, cela n'aurait rien changé. Rien, parce que les factures qui sont sur la table, si vous les payez quinze jours plus tard, vous n'avez pas de problème de trésorerie. Vous le savez aussi bien que moi. Donc, ce ne sont pas ces quinze jours qui auraient changé les choses. Ce que je ne comprends pas, c'est que, après, on essaie 2,7-3,9.

Mais maintenant j'ai compris: si certains pays repoussent l'échéance de quinze jours ou de trois semaines, ils n'auront pas besoin de sortir l'argent cette année, ils le sortiront l'année prochaine. C'est cela que veut le Royaume-Uni quand il propose un report de quinze jours:

cela lui évitera de sortir l'argent. Dites-le nous, si c'est cela. Même cela nous pouvons le comprendre. Nous sommes des gens responsables. Je ne dis pas que nous l'acceptons, mais nous pouvons le comprendre. Ne cherchons pas à détourner le système tel qu'il est fait! Je vais intervenir très fortement demain dans ce sens-là, au niveau du sommet PPE, parce que je n'ai plus envie de continuer de cette manière. Si nous ne pouvons pas, entre nous, travailler honnêtement, eh bien il faudra qu'on trouve d'autres solutions et qu'on bloque.

(Applaudissements)

3-029-000

Hannes Swoboda, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, we will come back to that. They were strong words, but where are the actions? But I will say some words about that later.

The Commission President spoke about a broad agenda, but I have looked at the conclusions and they are very empty for the Council. I do not know if the Council will take the chance to go forward to what we would call a progressive economy in Europe. Yes, we need more innovation, more digital economy. Why, then, has the Council cut the budget, for example, for broadband? It was not a large sum proposed by the Commission, but it was an important sum. The Council said that we do not need it, but some weeks later they come up with some enormous words about the digital economy.

But let this be very clear, also in conclusion, and in combination with data protection. The digital economy – and I am very happy about the vote on Monday, although some elements could have been given broader support – is one side of it for us, and data protection is the other side. It is a complement which is absolutely necessary.

But let me also be very clear on this: the digital economy is not only something for the upper echelons of society, it is for everybody. I was recently in Košice in the far East of Slovakia, and I saw how in the schools – remember, with the support of the European Social Fund – many of the children, including the Roma children about whose integration or non-integration we are always complaining, were integrated into society and into the digital economy thanks to European money, European support and the European Social Fund.

That is what we expect from a progressive economic policy in the European Union: to have an enhancement of the economy, of business, of start-ups, but at the same time, integration of those people who need to be integrated into society. Therefore, the European Social Fund is important, and we are still fighting for 25 % of the European Social Fund from the Regional Fund. This is an important aim for us.

Ich möchte zurückkommen und in deutscher Sprache über Deutschland reden. Kollege Daul ist jetzt abgelenkt. Vielleicht war es ein Freudscher Fehler, aber er ist immer wieder gekommen. Sie haben immer nur von Männern gesprochen, mit denen Sie reden. Da gibt es eine Frau, mit der Sie reden sollten: Frau Merkel, die nämlich sehr bestimmt, was hier auf der europäischen Ebene in vielen Fällen geschieht! Zum Beispiel – was nicht nur die Frage der Budgetpolitik betrifft – die ganze Grundkonzeption, die Frau Merkel hat. Europa ist zum Strafen derjenigen da, die zum Beispiel ihre finanziellen Ziele verfehlen. Oder zum Beispiel der Kampf und die Diskussion, die wir führen, gerade auch mit Frau Merkel, was die Frage der sogenannten makroökonomischen Konditionalität betrifft, dass Regionen bestraft werden sollen, wenn Regierungen sich nicht an die Regeln halten, die Frau Merkel

entworfen hat. Das ist, was wir als ungerecht empfinden! Wir wollen den Regionen helfen, nicht sie bestrafen! Das ist die Politik, die wir betreiben sollen.

(Beifall)

Frau Merkel gebraucht ja immer wieder das Modell der schwäbischen Hausfrau. Das ist ja nett, und eine schwäbische Hausfrau kann sehr innovativ sein. Aber wenn wir eine Innovationspolitik betreiben wollen, wie das jetzt auch im Rat geschehen soll, dann ist das nicht genug. Wir brauchen Investitionen! Auch Deutschland braucht Investitionen. Sehen wir uns doch die Infrastruktur in Deutschland an! Selbst im reichen Deutschland ist die in vielen Fällen nicht mehr in Ordnung. Daher brauchen wir Investitionen, daher müssen wir eine offensive Politik betreiben. Das ist notwendig, und das erwarten wir von Deutschland. Und ich hoffe, dass wir das auch bekommen, weil ja jetzt Koalitionsverhandlungen stattfinden. Nicht alle sind begeistert von einer zukünftigen großen Koalition in Deutschland. Ich glaube aber, dass es wichtig wäre und eine Chance ist, in Europa durch Deutschland eine andere Politik zu bekommen, auch eine soziale Politik. Denn die soziale Dimension ist für uns ganz entscheidend in diesem Europa. Es geht nicht nur um die Ökonomie, und es geht nicht nur um die Effizienz der Wirtschaft, sondern es geht auch um die Beschäftigungskraft der Wirtschaft. Wir brauchen mehr Jobs. Wir können diese Arbeitslosigkeit nicht tolerieren!

Let me come back to the third chapter which is, I think, the most cynical and the most devastating one. A small paragraph in the conclusions – I do not know whether you have seen it – on migration and asylum policy. The first sentence reads: ‘The European Council expresses its deep sadness about the recent tragic accidents in the Mediterranean’. What is the conclusion? In one year’s time, in June 2014, we will come back to this issue. This is a conclusion of the Council. This is the orientation and the speediness of the Council’s work. Hundreds of people die in the Mediterranean – nearly every day there is an accident – but in June 2014 we will come with some ideas!

(Applause)

This is not acceptable. What is also not acceptable, for example, is how it is being discussed in Britain by the government and even further by UKIP: ‘migration is a bad thing, internal migration from Romania and Bulgaria is also a bad thing’. You cannot say: ‘come to our country, contribute to our economy, to our growth, to our wealth’ but then if a small percentage of these people want benefits perhaps: ‘go home, we are not for you’. This is not solidarity in the European Union.

Migration in the European Union – labour migration – is a right, a freedom. It should not be forced, but it is a freedom. This policy and this tendency in Europe to say that migration is always bad – migrants from outside can also contribute. You know perfectly well how many people from outside the European Union, in Great Britain and many other countries, have contributed to the wealth of our countries.

So let us have a sensible migration policy. Let us open the strategy for legal migration in order to combat illegal migration. Let us give these migrants a chance, let us give them an education – for temporary migrants too, from Syria, for example. Let us not just say ‘OK, we want to do something’, because the burden always lies with countries like Jordan, Turkey, Lebanon and others. Let us give them training and education too, so that they can go back and do something in their own country.

Once again, I think migration should not always be seen as a burden; it is also an opportunity. In any case, to have hundreds and hundreds of people dying until June 2014, and to come back only in June 2014 on migration, is shameful. This is shameful for Europe and shameful for the European Council.

3-032-000

Guy Verhofstadt, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I want to continue on a point made by Mr Daul, because I thought he made an important intervention. It would be better if the staff of the EPP never prepared your speeches again. I think it is far better like that, Joseph. You get straight to the point. What he said is very important, and maybe, Mr Callanan, you need to hear it in English too, because that is the reality. The reality is that a number of Member States, and especially Britain, do not want to pay their commitments in 2013. By not giving in on this Draft Amending Budget No 8 of EUR 3.9 billion now, we push it back to the 30th in the Council and until the 15th or 20th in Parliament, and they can push it to 2014. That is what is happening in reality.

At the same time, these political forces are urging us to approve the MFF – the Multiannual Financial Framework. They cannot deliver their commitments and ensure that there is no deficit at the beginning of 2014. I think, Mr Daul, that you are totally right, and that it is important that we see on Thursday what is happening, because we have to stop this cynical little game being played by a number of Member States which are officially in favour of the MFF but are in fact doing everything not to fulfil their commitments and to start with a deficit.

My second point is about the intervention made by Hannes Swoboda. I want to tell you that my first European Council was in 1999. It was in Tampere, in the north of Finland, Olli, where the reindeer live. That was the summit on migration policy. The Tampere Summit in 1999, under the Presidency of Finland, decided finally to develop a common migration policy in the European Union. It is 15 years since we took that decision to have a common migration policy. Here we are now, a few hours before the start of the European Council, with what Mr Swoboda has rightly described as shame for the European Union. We have one paragraph to say ‘okay, we will start a migration policy and we will have some ideas in June 2014’. This is even less than what we discussed 15 years ago in Tampere in Finland at the European Council of 1999.

What I am asking is that we develop a policy, and that the Commission also comes forward with a policy, based on three pillars. This is what we urgently need. The first is that we give more money and more instruments to our European institutions, to Frontex and to EUROSUR, so that we can avoid the tragedies that we have seen in Lampedusa. The only way to do this is by giving money to Frontex, and not just EUR 90 million. Today that is the whole Frontex budget: EUR 90 million. Frontex has to do its job across the whole of the Mediterranean Sea and prevent the tragedies that we have seen in Lampedusa. The first thing to do is to provide more funding for Frontex and more funding for EUROSUR as rapidly as possible.

The second thing is that we have to be honest with our citizens. We have to start with a policy of legal economic migration in the European Union. What we are doing makes no sense. A number of countries urgently need migrants. Germany, for example, will need four million migrants in the next 10 to 15 years if they want to maintain their economic record and their economic results of today. I think a policy of legal migration is necessary, the same way that the US, Canada and Australia have a policy of legal migration. It is the

only way to avoid and eliminate illegal migration and human trafficking such as we have today.

My third point is that we also need a policy towards North Africa, which is where these migrants are coming from. We have not given one euro more to these countries since the Arab Spring. We have simply repackaged the money that was already in the budget.

My last point, Mr Barroso, is on the banking union. In my opinion, there is only one priority for this summit, instead of this long list of topics. When there are too many points on the agenda, you decide nothing at all. It is better to have one point on the agenda. It could be the banking union. Why not a political agreement, so that the Council agrees with the Commission proposal? That is my proposal. My proposal continues to be that Council and Parliament should start the negotiations immediately. Why is it necessary for us to adopt the position paper and lose months? Why is it necessary for the Council to lose months in negotiations and in debates?

The Commission proposal is a good one. That is what we need, and we need it urgently. Every day the banking union is not in place means a loss of initiative and investment in the real economy. That is the problem: it is not all the money that we will find on the right or the left, the problem is that the transfer of money from the banks to the real economy is blocked today, and only banking union – a European solution – can solve the problem.

(Applause)

3-033-000

Daniel Cohn-Bendit, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE* . – Madame la Présidente, chers collègues, tout d'abord, Joseph, *good luck* quand tu vas revenir avec tes 24 milliards... Je vais vous dire une chose. La culture politique européenne, c'est la culture du "trop tard". On arrive toujours trop tard. Guy vient de nous le dire, on a mis quinze ans à ne pas faire une politique d'immigration.

Je crois qu'il faut dire les choses clairement. L'efficacité de Frontex dépend de l'efficacité d'une politique d'immigration légale et d'un droit d'asile qui soit compréhensible et qui puisse fonctionner. Si cela ne fonctionne pas, Frontex ne garantit pas que la Méditerranée ne devienne pas une tombe. Arrêtons avec ce mirage.

Les choses sont simples. Frontex fonctionnait lorsque l'Europe négociait l'arrêt des immigrés avec les dictatures de l'autre côté de la Méditerranée. C'est alors que cela fonctionnait et, manque de pot, les dictatures ont disparu et nous découvrons tout à coup le problème. Nous étions des cyniques et nous voulons continuer à être des cyniques. Voilà notre problème.

Alors, oui, il faut une loi d'immigration européenne qui régitte l'entrée légale pour des raisons professionnelles. Deuxièmement, oui, il nous faut un droit d'asile qui ne soit pas un sanctuaire en laissant aux pays frontaliers, c'est-à-dire l'Italie, le sud ou l'est de l'Europe, la responsabilité du droit d'asile, tandis que l'Allemagne et les autres seraient sanctuarisés, à l'abri, derrière leurs aéroports. Ce n'est pas de la solidarité européenne.

Troisièmement, et il faut vraiment être clair là-dessus: si le Conseil européen ne répond pas à ce problème de l'immigration, qui est difficile et contradictoire dans nos sociétés, il se fait le moteur de l'accentuation des populismes dans nos États. Si nous ne sommes pas capables de faire quelque chose, alors la rhétorique des "y a qu'à" – y a qu'à fermer les frontières, y a qu'à sortir de l'Europe, y a qu'à sortir de l'euro, y a qu'à faire un bras d'honneur

à la mondialisation – l'emportera, parce que nous sommes des incapables. Il est donc beaucoup plus important que ce Conseil européen freine les choses. Vous parlez des citoyens, mais les citoyens, c'est cela qu'ils attendent.

Encore un point, pour revenir au budget. Expliquons aux citoyens que nous avons besoin du budget européen pour la solidarité européenne. Le débat que nous avons, actuellement, sur le budget, c'est la grande victoire – je l'ai déjà dit – de Margaret Thatcher. Nous avons 27 ministres des finances qui ne savent dire qu'une chose: "we want our money back!". Avec ce type de discours, on détruit l'Europe. Alors qu'on admette qu'on veut détruire l'Europe, mais qu'on arrête de nous dire qu'on construit l'Europe, alors qu'on la détruit! Mais cela, personne ne sait faire.

C'est pour cela que je crois que c'est une erreur et je vous le dis: si vous ne décrochez pas au moins le budget rectificatif – nous serons de toute façon déficitaires en 2013, même avec les 3,9 milliards –, ce sera la catastrophe en 2014. Vous serez en cessation de paiement non pas en novembre, mais en mai, Monsieur Barroso! En mai, vous serez en cessation de paiement, juste après les élections européennes.

Donc si vous voulez être responsables pour l'Europe, il faut s'engager dans un bras de fer avec le Conseil. Si vous dites "il faut discuter, il faut être gentils" – on peut être gentil avec des gens qui ont envie de négocier, mais face à un Conseil qui ne veut pas négocier, il faut rentrer dans un rapport de force –, si vous ne voulez pas rentrer dans un rapport de force, ne pleurez pas et rentrez à la maison. Car si vous pleurez alors que vous n'avez rien tenté, je vous le dis, vous allez être balayés aux élections européennes parce que vous n'aurez pas démontré que vous êtes un Parlement qui défend les citoyens!

3-034-000

Martin Callanan, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Madam President, I and my group welcome the emphasis that tomorrow's Council will place on economic matters. The agenda says – and I quote – that the Council will have a 'thematic discussion'. They are going to 'take stock' and 'assess ongoing work'. That does not sound very inspiring to me. I fear that this agenda merely asks for business as usual, while outside, real businesses are still struggling.

We all know what needs to be done. The only question in my mind is whether we have the political will to actually deliver it. Perhaps, instead of thematic discussions, we need clear decisions. Instead of taking stock, let us actually have some action, and instead of assessing ongoing work, perhaps some radical reform to remove the barriers to competitiveness would be useful.

Europe should be exporting goods and services, not jobs and wealth, but every time we place an additional burden on businesses and industry, we make Europe less attractive to potential investment. In my own Member State, research by the think-tank Open Europe highlighted that, of the 100 most costly regulations for the UK economy, 24 of those laws actually cost more than the benefits that they bring. We need to look again at many of those laws.

The Commission's proposals for REFIT (Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme) were a good opening salvo in the war on red tape, and I welcome them. With any red tape, of course, it is much easier to put in on than it is to get it off again. EU red tape is no different. But last week we were presented with a new way forward. This report on EU red tape was drafted by the leaders of some of Europe's most successful businesses. I am sure they will be reviled by the left and by the Greens in this Chamber because they are not, of course,

EU-funded NGOs. But, unlike those NGOs, these are the people who actually provide the jobs and the taxes that pay all of our salaries and for all of our services. We should be listening to them with care. In this report there are some very sensible suggestions. I think Mr Barroso already has a copy of it, and I hope that he will go and beat Commissioner Andor over the head with it, because it is his department that produces many of the regulations that we want to get rid of.

One of the absurdities in this debate is that many of the people in this room, who bask in the title of pro-European, have an agenda for centralisation that will actually damage Europe: an agenda that will limit its economy, limit the opportunities of its people and condemn us all to a poorer future. Because there is nothing pro-European about obsessively pursuing an outdated vision that is undermining Europe's future potential. That is the old-fashioned agenda that is reinforced by many of the vested interests that we have within the Brussels beltway. Just think of all the NGOs that we face every day, which are paid by the Commission to campaign for yet more regulations and yet more red tape. We seek their opinions as stakeholders, but all too often we are simply receiving the opinions of individuals with a centralising agenda of their own.

It was almost exactly 150 years ago at Gettysburg that Lincoln outlined the challenge of a government of the people, by the people and for the people. Well, today in the EU, we have an EU of the NGOs, by the NGOs and for the NGOs. This challenge is why much of the good work done by the Commission's Internal Market and Trade and Industry departments is undermined by the paid allies of the Commission's own Social Affairs or Environment departments. It is all too often a case of one step forward and two steps back. Overcoming those vested interests should be our challenge, but it will be very difficult. However, I can tell you now where to start. We could slash the EUR 7.5 billion that the Commission gives to those very NGOs. A report here by the New Direction think tank outlines exactly that. I would recommend it to you as yet more set reading. It is a very good study. It sets out the reforms needed so that we can fully represent the people of Europe and not predominantly the interest groups of the European district.

I hope we will see some action from the European Council this week: action to break down barriers to starting and expanding a company, action to break down the barriers to Europe's competitiveness, and action to ensure that our debates are not drowned out by the special interest groups with their own agendas. These reports show the way forward to reforming Europe's economy. They should be set reading for anyone who genuinely wants to see a business-led recovery in Europe.

3-035-000

Gabriele Zimmer, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Herr Callanan, was Sie als uralte Agenda bezeichnen, ist doch in erster Linie der Traum der Menschen, in Würde und gleichberechtigt leben zu können. Was bezeichnen Sie daran als uralte Agenda? Aus welcher Klamottenkiste sind Sie denn heute hier herausgesprungen und versuchen, uns einzureden, dass das, was für viele Menschen seit Jahrzehnten – im Prinzip seit 1789 – ein Wert ist, keiner mehr sein soll? Da versuchen Sie uns hier zu erklären, dass das nichts im Europäischen Parlament zu suchen hat? Sollen wir uns einstellen auf das, was wir hier gestern zum Bericht-Estrela erlebt haben? Dass letztendlich versucht wird, Grundrechte, und wenn es die auf die gesundheitliche Reproduktion sind, wieder zurückzudrehen? Wollen Sie dahin zurück? Ist das Ihr Traum von einem Europa? Das kann doch wohl nicht ernsthaft gemeint sein!

Was wir gestern erlebt haben, ist doch ein Vorgeschmack auf die Auseinandersetzungen während des europäischen Wahlkampfes. Und ich sage, gerade Ihnen in der Kommission und im Rat, Sie tragen wesentlich mit Verantwortung dafür, ob wir in der nächsten Legislaturperiode noch mehr Rechtspopulisten, national denkende Leute hier sitzen haben, oder ob es hier Menschen gibt, die wirklich für eine Europäische Union streiten, in der sich alle wiederfinden und die auch Lösungen parat hält, die wirklich zukunftsfähig sind.

Wenn ich mir die Agenda des Gipfels angucke, dann klingt das wunderbar. Da wird über die digitale Agenda geredet, das klingt alles zukunftsfähig. Wenn wir uns aber in die Augen schauen, dann wissen wir genau, dass die Institutionen gegenwärtig nicht in der Lage sind, die Aufgaben der Gegenwart zu lösen, und dass sie noch nicht einmal die Aufgaben, die aus der Vergangenheit resultieren, wirklich in Angriff zu nehmen.

Wir reden hier darüber, dass es in einer Art von Annex eine Position oder eine Verständigung für die Flüchtlingspolitik geben soll. Wir reden nicht darüber, was denn eigentlich die Gründe sind, warum Menschen hierher kommen, warum wir als Europäische Union verpflichtet sind, legale Wege zu schaffen, damit Menschen, die vor Hunger, Klimakatastrophen, Kriegen oder Armut fliehen, wenigstens menschlich behandelt werden, und dass wir uns diesen Werten verpflichtet fühlen müssen.

Wer die Europäische Union rundum abschottet, muss sich nicht wundern, wenn Menschen nach illegalen Wegen suchen. Das heißt, wenn wir etwas geregelt haben wollen, wenn wir unserer Verpflichtung als Europäische Union nachkommen wollen, dann müssen wir Tore finden, die genau die Möglichkeiten schaffen, dass Menschen erst einmal nicht sofort kriminalisiert werden, wenn sie den Weg in die Europäische Union suchen. Das ist unsere Verpflichtung.

Wenn ich mir dann anschau, wie wir es nun mit dem MFR und mit den Teilen des Haushalts halten, kann ich einfach nicht anders, als jetzt an diesem Punkt noch einmal anzusetzen: Wir werden – und das muss noch einmal klar gesagt werden –, selbst wenn die 3,9 Milliarden gezahlt werden, ein Defizit von 5 Milliarden in das nächste Haushaltsjahr hineinschieben. Ich hätte gerne eine ganz klare Auskunft: Wie hoch ist der Anteil des Haushalts 2014, der für Verpflichtungen aus dem MFR 2007-2013 noch zu zahlen ist? Damit wir überhaupt einmal wissen, wovon wir hier reden. Wie hoch ist dieser Anteil?

Wo ist denn überhaupt noch eine Gestaltungsfähigkeit für die nächsten Jahre? Es ist doch jetzt schon vorprogrammiert, dass wir im nächsten Jahr wieder einen Nachtragshaushalt nach dem anderen haben werden. Wir wissen, dass die Zahlungsunfähigkeit dann auch im nächsten Jahr wieder vor uns schweben wird. Wann bringen Sie den Laden in Ordnung? Wann bringen Sie Ihren Haushalt in Ordnung? Warum lassen wir uns von Finanzministern der Mitgliedstaaten diktieren, dass es sie nicht schert, was wir hier im Europaparlament gemeinsam mit dem Rat vorher beschlossen haben.

Der Haushalt und der MFR, alles, was vorher beschlossen wurde, ist gemeinsam beschlossen worden. Das ist nicht irgendeine Erfindung des Parlaments. Dazu müssen die Länder stehen, und das tun sie einfach nicht, und das muss doch einmal auf den Tisch. Das gehört zu den Verpflichtungen. Das ist meinerseits eine uralte Agenda, nämlich zu sagen: Die Solidarität ist die Grundfeste der Europäischen Union.

Und wenn einzelne Mitgliedstaaten hier aufgeben, dann brauchen wir uns nicht zu wundern, wenn wir bei den Wahlen die Quittung kriegen. Dann brauchen wir uns nicht zu wundern, wenn künftig hier vielleicht halbe-halbe oder noch ganz andere Verhältnisse herrschen

und keine normale, kulturvolle, tolerante Debatte mehr stattfinden kann, wenn es um Grundwerte geht, nämlich um Menschenrechte, um die Rechte von Menschen, in Würde zu leben. Das ist der Anspruch, oder wir lassen es sein. Dann können wir es aufgeben. Aber bitte, geben Sie uns klare Antworten! Verschaukeln Sie uns nicht länger, und tun Sie nicht so, als würden wir es nicht merken!

(Beifall)

3-036-000

Nigel Farage, *on behalf of the EFD Group*. – Madam President, there is only one real debate going on here this week in Strasbourg: it is the fear stalking the corridors, the concern you have got about the rise of euro-scepticism. Years ago you were less worried. The few of us here who were euro-sceptics were treated as being mentally ill and sort of patted on the head. Now we are evil populists; we are dangerous; we are going to bring down western civilisation. It is clear that you do not get it, you do not understand why this is happening. Well, let me help you.

In 2005 it was the pivotal moment of this project: the French and the Dutch had said ‘No’ to the EU Constitution. Mr Barroso stood up and said: ‘They did not really vote ‘No’. They did not understand what they were doing’. But they did. You see, ever since 2005, the real European debate has been about identity. What we are saying – large numbers of us – from every single EU Member State is: ‘We do not want that flag. We do not want the anthem that you all stood so ramrod straight for yesterday. We do not want EU passports. We do not want political union’. If you think about it, there is nothing extreme about that position. There is nothing right-wing about that position; there is nothing left-wing, indeed, about that position. It is a normal, sensible assertion of identity.

What we are saying on our side of the argument – you see, you can scream and shout all you like, which really rather proves to me why you are going to do so badly in the European elections next year, because you are not listening – we want to live and work and breathe in a Europe of nation-state democracy. We want to trade together, we want to cooperate together. We are happy to agree sensible common minimum standards and, yes, we want to control our own borders, which is the rational, logical and sensible thing for any nation state to do.

We are not against immigration or immigrants. We believe there needs to be a degree of control, and that is the message that is picking up support right across this continent. I genuinely think that there is an opportunity for an electoral earthquake to happen in the European elections next year, with a large number of people from all sides of this House who will come with a nation state agenda, who will come saying: ‘Let us have a Europe, as de Gaulle might have said, of the *patries*; let us not have a Europe of political union’. You can abuse us all you like, but what we stand for is fair, principled and democratic.

3-037-000

Laurence J.A.J. Stassen (NI). - Overall worden banken die in de problemen zijn gekomen geherkapitaliseerd, gesaneerd of zelfs failliet verklaard. Het is aan elke democratisch verkozen regering om te besluiten of de eigen belastingbetalers aan het redden van een nationale bank moeten bijdragen, behalve in de Europese Unie.

De EU heeft geen boodschap aan de democratieën van de lidstaten en de door de eurofielen gedroomde bankenunie is daar opnieuw een voorbeeld van. Met een bankenunie dreigt

het ESM, waar Nederland voor maar liefst 40 miljard euro aan bijdraagt, gebruikt te worden om noodlijdende banken in Europa direct van geld te voorzien zónder inspraak van de nationale regeringen.

Voorzitter, de eurofielen weten het altijd zo eufemistisch te formuleren: een bankenunie met een Europees banktoezicht. Maar het komt natuurlijk neer op het afschuiven van schulden. Alle schulden, met name uit het zuiden, worden op één grote hoop gegooid en vervolgens kan het noorden ervoor opdraaien. Met andere woorden, degenen die er een puinhoop van maken komen ermee weg. Door eigen wanbeleid van banken elders in Europa mogen Nederlanders nu hun zuur verdiende geld afstaan. Kortom, een bankenunie betekent een financiële ramp voor Nederland en zijn burgers.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen: whether you like it or not, the turning point will be the next elections, in May next year.

3-039-000

Manfred Weber (PPE). - Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte mich in meinem Beitrag vor allem auf Lampedusa, auf die Fragen der Zuwanderung konzentrieren.

Wir sind uns hier im Parlament einig, dass wir Menschen in Not, vor allem in Seenot, helfen müssen. Das steht außer Frage und ist auch Rechtslage in der Europäischen Union. Das Kommando auf den Schiffen haben aber die Mitgliedstaaten vor Ort und damit auch die Verantwortung. Wir sind uns hier im Europäischen Parlament als Zweites darüber einig, dass wir wirklich Verfolgten helfen müssen. Da wäre die Bitte an den Europäischen Rat, ein Signal Richtung Syrien auszusenden, dort jetzt aktiv zu werden und feste Kontingente zuzusagen, um den Bürgerkriegsflüchtlingen vor Ort zu helfen.

Aber es gibt einen dritten Punkt, und da gibt es einen Unterschied hier im Haus. Wenn ich den Kollegen Swoboda, den Kollegen Verhofstadt und andere höre, die mehr legale Migration fordern, um das Problem zu lösen, dann stelle ich mir zunächst die Frage: Es wird so getan, als gäbe es diese legale Migration nicht. Wir haben Hunderttausende von EU-Ausländern, die jedes Jahr nach Europa kommen. Es wird aber national entschieden, und es ist auch gut, dass die nationalen Kollegen darüber entscheiden, welche Zuwanderungsquoten wir haben, weil die besser Bescheid wissen über die Arbeitsmärkte als wir auf europäischer Ebene.

Ein zweiter Gedanke geht mir dabei durch den Kopf: Wie viele nehmen wir denn auf, Herr Swoboda? Nehmen wir eine Million aus Afrika auf? Nehmen wir zwei Millionen aus Afrika auf? Nennen Sie mal Zahlen! Glauben Sie denn, dass man mit legaler Zuwanderung dann die hunderte von Millionen, die noch warten in Afrika und die aus der Hoffnungslosigkeit entfliehen wollen, davon abhalten kann, den Weg über die Schlepperbanden zu gehen? Glaubt das ernsthaft jemand?

Das Dritte, Herr Swoboda: Ich möchte, dass Sie die Argumentation, wir müssten jetzt die Türen öffnen, gerne einmal den griechischen Jugendlichen, den italienischen Jugendlichen, den spanischen Jugendlichen erklären! Wir haben dort 50 % Jugendarbeitslosigkeit. Unsere Jugend in Europa hat keine Arbeit! Und dann gibt es ernsthafte Überlegungen, die Türen für afrikanische Jugendliche zu öffnen. Das kann nicht der richtige Weg sein! Deswegen: Ja zur Hilfe in Syrien, ja zur Hilfe bei wirklich Verfolgten, aber bitte hören Sie auf, die legale Migration als eine der Antworten zu geben. Wer das propagiert, der schafft die Grundlage für Rechtspopulisten in der Europäischen Union. Das wollen wir alle nicht!

3-040-000

Ivailo Kalfin (S&D). - Madam President, the agenda of the next European Council looks very good: growth and jobs, youth unemployment, economic and monetary union, banking union, etc. The problem lies in the delivery because, when we say all these fine words, we have to look at what is happening in practice and what the Council is doing in practice.

Let us take the digital economy. Actually we should say 'digital economies', because there is no single digital economy in Europe. We have 28 regulators, 28 rules and 28 markets for this. What the Council is suggesting we do about this, as Mr Swoboda has just said, is to cut expenditure on enlarging the infrastructure and the broadband which would bring digital technologies to the people. It suggests cutting resources for innovation and research by EUR 200 million next year. We agreed with the MFF that they have to be increased, but now the Council is suggesting that they will be increased post-2017.

We have a number of files on the table: data protection, spectrum policy, connected Europe and cloud computing. Where is the Council's delivery? There is nothing on that. We have less than 10 % cross-border e-commerce in Europe. Only 3.5 % of research spending goes to the 13 new Member States. Do you know why? Because there is a difference in researchers' pay of up to seven or eight times. So this is what is not delivered by the Council.

A brief word on immigration: Mr Weber, whatever arguments you use about immigration, you cannot leave the burden of immigration to the border states. This is not sustainable or possible. You cannot ignore what is happening on the borders of Europe.

3-041-000

Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE). - Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisa neuvoston puheenjohtaja, EU:n tulevaisuus on kiinni kansalaisista ja kansalaisten luottamuksesta. Kansalaisten luottamus saadaan parantamalla arjen asioita.

Euroopan huippukokous on usein puhunut yhteisvastuusta ja solidaarisuudesta. Minä toivoisin, että EU:n johtajilla olisi solidaarisuutta siinä, että tehtäisiin toimenpiteitä, jotta jokainen yritys ja jokainen ihminen maksaa verot niin kuin kussakin maassa on säädetty. Tänä päivänä sallitaan se, että piilotellaan veroja toiseen jäsenvaltioon. En ymmärrä sellaista, että toinen jäsenvaltio tavallaan varastaa toisen jäsenvaltion verotuloja.

Toivoisin, että EU:n johtajat ottaisivat tämän asian todella tosissaan. Siitä saataisiin rahoja uusien työpaikkojen luomiseen, nuoriso-ongelmien hoitamiseen ja monien muiden asioiden hoitamiseen, ja sillä taattaisiin myös, että eurooppalainen hyvinvointi säilyy eikä kuihdu.

3-042-000

Sven Giegold (Verts/ALE). - Herr Präsident! Die Europäische Bankenunion ist eines der zentralen Themen dieses Gipfels. Diese Bankenunion ist ein großes Versprechen, Banken in Zukunft konsequent zu kontrollieren und dafür zu sorgen, dass die Rechnungen in Zukunft nicht mehr von den Steuerzahlern bezahlt werden, wenn Banken sich verspekulieren oder unsolide Geschäfte machen, sondern eben in Zukunft von den Gläubigern dieser Banken.

Genau dieses Versprechen der Bankenunion ist derzeit in höchster Gefahr. Bei den Verhandlungen zur Abwicklungsrichtlinie hat der Rat eine Ausnahme hineingeschrieben, die jetzt so aussieht, dass, wenn sie die Subventionen an die Banken vor dem eigentlichen Abwicklungsfall bezahlen, sie das unbegrenzt tun können! Das heißt, es soll eben nicht

das Ende der Bankenrettung eingeläutet werden, sondern es wird ein Scheunentor von Ausnahmen geschaffen. Das ist unakzeptabel! Die Europäische Kommission verteidigt nicht ihren Vorschlag, sondern legitimiert sogar noch diese Ausnahmepolitik des Europäischen Rates.

Das Gleiche geschieht derzeit beim Abwicklungssystem. Dort deutet sich jetzt ein Kompromiss an, dass der gute Vorschlag der Europäischen Kommission dadurch gefährdet wird, dass man eben nicht für die Eurozone eine Abwicklungseinheit schafft, sondern beides. Das ist eine typisch europäisch-bürokratische Lösung. Eine europäische Abwicklungseinrichtung und mindestens 18 nationale, die weiterbestehen sollen, mit 18 Fonds, was dazu führen wird, dass die Entscheidungen nicht effizient getroffen werden, und am Schluss wieder die Steuerzahler die Rechnung zahlen müssen. Das sind keine vernünftigen Lösungen.

Deshalb muss man dem Rat zurufen: Retten Sie die Bankenunion, statt sie jetzt durch neue Ausnahmetatbestände auszuhöhlen!

3-043-000

Susy De Martini (ECR). - Signora Presidente, signor Ministro, la politica europea per i cosiddetti rifugiati è stata fino ad oggi sbagliata e fallimentare.

I numeri in nostro possesso dei richiedenti asilo, o comunque in fuga, sono enormi e vanno ben oltre ogni capacità e possibilità concreta di accoglienza. Si parla di 50 milioni di persone in arrivo dall'Africa nei prossimi cinque anni, un numero quasi pari a quello di tutta la popolazione italiana.

E che cosa ha fatto l'Europa? Ha finanziato proprio i dittatori di quei paesi che spingono i loro cittadini a fuggire con una cifra pari a quasi 10 miliardi di euro. Vada a controllare, onorevole Swoboda. Una cifra enorme, finita in parte nei rivoli della corruzione, se non addirittura nelle mani dei terroristi.

Non si può più continuare così. È necessario che il prossimo Consiglio agisca immediatamente, non a giugno, inviando navi sottocosta in quei paesi dai quali provengono i migranti e decidendo lì chi ha diritto all'asilo e può essere accolto nei vari Stati membri e chi invece è criminale – o peggio terrorista – e non deve certo essere accolto.

Il prossimo Consiglio deve anche avviare subito accordi internazionali più vasti per accogliere l'enorme numero dei richiedenti asilo che ho appena citato e che non possono essere assorbiti – lo ripeto con forza – dalla sola Europa.

L'Africa è un problema del mondo intero e credo anche, e soprattutto, di quei paesi quali la Cina che ne stanno sfruttando tutte le risorse.

3-044-000

Rolandas Paksas (EFD). - Skaitmeninės ekonomikos darbotvarkė, bendra interneto rinka, inovacijos ir paslaugos elektroninėje erdvėje iš tikrųjų yra labai svarbus ateities dalykas. Diskusijos šia tema sveikintinos. Tačiau aš atkreipčiau dėmesį į antrąjį susitikimo darbotvarkės punktą „Ekonomikos augimas, konkurencingumas, darbo vietų kūrimas“. Šiandien tai yra svarbiausi klausimai Bendrijos valstybėms. Nedarbas yra šmėkla, kuri grasina šiandienos Europai. Pažanga jaunimo užimtumo iniciatyvos srityje yra pernelyg nežymi ir kol kas nesudaro jokių prielaidų jos visapusiškai veiklai. Ekonomikos augimas bei darbo vietų kūrimas kol kas tebėra gražūs žodžiai be realaus turinio. Bankai ir kitos

finansų institucijos kol kas nelinkę skolinti mažoms ir vidutinėms įmonėms. Verslo reglamentavimas tebėra pakankamai klampus, apsunkinantis ir reikalaujantis nemažai išlaidų. Jaunimo nedarbo lygis Europos Sąjungoje šiuo metu siekia daugiau kaip 23 proc. ir yra dvigubai didesnis nei suaugusiųjų nedarbo lygis. Yra valstybių, kur šis rodiklis perkopia 50 proc., ir dėl to Europos Sąjungos rinka kasmet netenka milijardų eurų. Kyla grėsmė Europos ekonomikai ir konkurencingumui. Šie skaičiai – tik iliustracija tam, ką pasakiau. Įvairiais aspektais privalome spręsti pagrindinę šiandienos problemą. Sujudinti rinką gali drąsūs, netikėti sprendimai bei pasiūlymai. Tokių aš ir linkiu.

3-045-000

Francisco Sosa Wagner (NI). - Señora Presidenta, ambición desde luego no le falta al orden del día del próximo Consejo Europeo. Tanta ambición que me parece poco realista, pues cualquiera de los asuntos de ese orden del día merecería un análisis monográfico. Además, se hablará de Lampedusa, una desgracia colectiva que exige actuar ya y actuar en tres frentes: en primer lugar, en los países origen del drama; en segundo lugar, sobre las redes de delincuentes que trafican con personas humanas; en tercer lugar, en el diseño de una política de inmigración y de asilo común, lo cual ha de ser responsabilidad de las instituciones comunitarias, es decir, de la Comisión, del Parlamento y del Consejo.

Poco confío, señora Presidenta y queridos colegas, en el Consejo Europeo, un órgano que ni estaba en el proyecto de los fundadores, ni debería estar en el futuro de las instituciones europeas, pues el Consejo Europeo es el lugar donde los asuntos no reciben el calor del método comunitario, sino que duermen el sueño de la pereza intergubernamental.

3-046-000

Giuseppe Gargani (PPE). - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, devo constatare che oggi si è svolto un vero dibattito in questo Parlamento, cosa un po' rara. Vi è stato un alto livello di valutazione e quando il livello è alto c'è un sostanziale accordo: tutti abbiamo chiesto un'Europa politica.

Il problema che a me frulla sempre nella testa è quindi del perché, fra i tanti punti all'ordine del giorno, non si inserisca anche quello della valutazione del Consiglio sulla problematicità politica che l'Europa deve avere. Mi riferisco ai tanti punti all'ordine del giorno che certamente non giungeranno mai a conclusione, come sempre avviene nei Consigli, citando il caso di Lampedusa – dell'immigrazione – non perché sono italiano, ma perché ritengo che si tratti di un problema europeo, politico prima ancora che finanziario ed economico.

Ci dobbiamo rendere conto che l'Europa monetaria deve avere presupposti quali la politicità, l'unità politica e la solidarietà perché sono termini previsti negli statuti e nelle grandi carte, ma che non vengono attuati. I nostri dibattiti sono sempre burocratici e si riferiscono a scadenze, mai che tengano conto dell'anima europea.

Se, come tutti sosteniamo, il problema dell'immigrazione è di grande attualità ed è un problema che comporta una valutazione politica in Italia, in riferimento all'Europa, ha rafforzato l'Europa anche nella tragedia che è capitata a Lampedusa, perché se l'Italia, se i paesi da soli non ce la fanno, e l'Europa ha una sua ragione d'essere per questa solidarietà, la politica deve aiutare a risolvere questo problema, che è il problema suo principale.

3-047-000

Enrique Guerrero Salom (S&D). - Señora Presidenta, como siempre, el orden del día del próximo Consejo está muy cargado, pero, como siempre, es repetitivo. Como siempre, parece que estamos a punto de tomar una decisión conclusiva, pero, como siempre, en la próxima sesión volveremos a hablar de su puesta en práctica. Un ejemplo: el fondo de la Garantía Juvenil, en relación con un drama al que tenemos que enfrentarnos, del que venimos hablando meses y meses, pero para el que todavía no hemos puesto nada en práctica.

Estamos en un proceso de sustitución de burbujas. Hemos vivido la burbuja financiera y la burbuja inmobiliaria, que nos ha llevado a una crisis desastrosa, y ahora estamos construyendo una burbuja de autocomplacencia y una burbuja de desigualdad.

Autocomplacencia. Hay una avalancha de declaraciones que nos dicen que estamos ya saliendo de la crisis, que las cosas van bien. Pero la realidad es que el crecimiento es cero o próximo a cero y que no hay ningún indicador que sea mejor ahora que antes de la crisis. Se nos habla de que hay dinero a espuestas, que llega de todas partes. Llega de todas partes pero a ningún lugar salvo a la bolsa o al dinero especulativo. Falta ese dinero en la economía productiva en las pequeñas y las medianas empresas. Sube la bolsa, pero también sube el paro. Sube el desempleo en todas partes de Europa. Caen los salarios y, a la vez, caen las prestaciones sociales.

Hablaba también de una burbuja de desigualdad. ¿Por qué? Porque, al mismo tiempo que aumenta el número de ricos, el número de millonarios en la Unión Europea, se duplica la pobreza y, además, la desigualdad no solamente se extiende por toda Europa, sino que es desigual dentro de Europa. Los últimos datos de Eurostat muestran que, mientras en algunos países, como el mío, España, la desigualdad entre el 20 % de población más rica y el 20 % más pobre ha aumentado casi el 30 % desde el comienzo de la crisis, en el promedio de la Unión lo ha hecho el 4 %. Por tanto, una Europa más desigual y más desigual entre nosotros.

3-048-000

Andrew Henry William Brons (NI). - Madam President, this agenda is a distraction from the real causes of unemployment and the lack of growth. They include restrictive budgetary policies, cheap foreign imports from emergent economies, domestic earned income being invested abroad, and the outsourcing of jobs. But the cause of unemployment which is the real taboo is immigration, especially immigration from the Third World. Their migrants are assisted by anti-discrimination laws, while what we really need are native population preference laws, so that each country's nationals could go to the top of the employment list. Immigration should be on the agenda as one of the causes of unemployment.

In the UK, we have an establishment safety-valve party that would pretend to be opposed to mass immigration, but on 4 May 2010, its leader, Mr Farage, said that the UK should issue a quarter of a million work permits each year.

3-049-000

Elisabeth Morin-Chartier (PPE). - Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Président du Conseil, Monsieur le Président de la Commission, Mesdames, Messieurs, chers collègues, nous pourrions nous réjouir de l'ordre du jour. Nous voulons certes nous occuper de l'emploi des jeunes, mais dans quelle situation sommes-nous aujourd'hui? Nous sommes

au point mort. Vous avez beaucoup parlé de l'initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes, qui serait la solution à ce problème. De quels moyens disposons-nous? De six milliards d'euros! C'est bien insuffisant face à la réalité du problème, qui est qu'aujourd'hui 22,9 % des jeunes entre 15 et 25 ans sont au chômage, qu'il s'agisse de jeunes sans qualification ou de jeunes diplômés. Et si nous prenons la tranche des 15 - 30 ans, nous multiplions par 2 le nombre de jeunes au chômage.

Il y a là une génération qui est dans le désespoir et ce n'est pas l'initiative pour l'emploi des jeunes, qui est la vraie réponse, comme on voudrait nous le faire croire, c'est la garantie "Jeunesse". Et la garantie "Jeunesse", sur quoi repose-t-elle? Elle repose sur le Fonds social européen, mais nous avons du mal à obtenir les crédits nécessaires à ce Fonds.

J'ajouterai aussi que dans cette réflexion sur l'emploi des jeunes, vous ne devez pas oublier que les jeunes femmes ont un retard d'embauche incroyable par rapport aux hommes.

Je reviens au Fonds social européen. C'est l'essentiel de notre outil de cohésion sociale. Or, vous ne voulez pas garantir une part suffisante du Fonds social européen pour répondre à ce besoin de capital humain. Je vous en veux! Vous devez faire un effort!

3-050-000

Pervenche Berès (S&D). - Madame la Présidente, je constate que nous préparons un Conseil européen alors que le président Van Rompuy n'est pas là. Je constate que la question de l'Union économique et monétaire a été rajoutée à cet ordre du jour parce qu'elle n'a pas pu être traitée au mois de juin, car nous attendions le résultat des élections en Allemagne, et je constate que, vraisemblablement, le Conseil européen d'octobre devra reporter la discussion de fond sur une véritable Union économique et monétaire au Conseil européen de décembre, parce qu'il attend un gouvernement en Allemagne.

En attendant, la question de l'emploi des jeunes est sur la table. Alors, Mesdames et Messieurs les chefs d'État et de gouvernement, prenez cette question à bras-le-corps et autorisez le financement à hauteur de 25 % du FSE pour que la garantie "Jeunesse" puisse être une réalité et que nous puissions soutenir les jeunes en situation d'échec jusqu'à 30 ans.

Sur la véritable Union économique et monétaire, vous allez pour la première fois aborder le débat sous l'angle de la dimension sociale. C'est très paradoxal, parce que vous dites - tout le monde le dit - qu'il faut mettre en valeur le dialogue social. Or, dans les mêmes conclusions du Conseil européen, vous abordez un point qui s'appelle REFIT, en clair, le nettoyage de la législation européenne et, dans ce cadre-là, vous demandez qu'un accord qui a été conclu entre partenaires sociaux soit retiré de l'ordre du jour. Il y a là une contradiction que je ne comprends pas.

Enfin, le jour où vous voudrez aborder la question d'une véritable Union économique et monétaire, vous devrez aborder celle du modèle économique de la zone euro. Car ce n'est pas à travers des logiques de sanctions ou de discours sur les conditions macroéconomiques que vous permettrez aux citoyens de la périphérie de la zone euro de vivre et de travailler là-bas, ce qui est le modèle auquel la plupart des Européens aspirent.

3-051-000

Luis de Grandes Pascual (PPE). - Señora Presidenta, hemos avanzado mucho desde que hace poco más de un año se temiese por la desaparición del euro y por la quiebra de varios Estados miembros. Las turbulencias financieras del año pasado han quedado atrás y las

reformas emprendidas son los cimientos sólidos que garantizan una salida sostenible de la crisis.

Sin embargo, Señorías, ahora nos encontramos en una situación frágil. Todavía es necesario garantizar la estabilidad financiera. La acción del Banco Central Europeo como supervisor único será decisiva para despejar definitivamente las dudas sobre nuestro sistema bancario. Para que este proceso se realice con garantías deben preverse las redes de protección necesarias tanto a nivel nacional como europeo, para cubrir cualquier necesidad de capital que aflore. Estos ejercicios deben entenderse como una oportunidad en vez de como una amenaza.

España, Señorías, es un buen ejemplo de ello. El sistema financiero español ya se ha sometido a un ejercicio de transparencia, de análisis, sin precedentes. La reforma del sector financiero español se ha puesto como ejemplo modélico de transparencia y de eficiencia. Gracias a su éxito, el programa de asistencia financiera al sector bancario español se cerrará sin necesidad de prórroga o medidas de acompañamiento. Hoy nuestro sector bancario está en mejor situación que muchos bancos europeos, no solo a nuestro juicio, sino también a juicio de cualificados y rigurosos observadores.

¿Qué falta pues? Lo ha dicho el señor Barroso: lo que falta son medidas para la reactivación del crédito. Es preciso pasar, Señorías, de la macroeconomía a la microeconomía. Es necesario que los emprendedores encuentren confianza, encuentren recursos, para apostar, para arriesgar, para crear riqueza, que es la única manera, naturalmente, de crear empleo y es la única forma de crear bienestar para los Estados.

3-052-000

Edit Herczog (S&D) - Emlékszünk még a 2000-ben elfogadott lisszaboni stratégiára, ami az EU-t a világ legfejlettebb régiójának álmodta? Emlékszünk a 2005-ös felülvizsgálatra, amikor felsoroltuk az elmaradt végrehajtási hibákat? Most a 2008-as válságot követő év abban eredményes, hogy a legrosszabbat elkerültük. De ma már ugyancsak arról beszélünk, hogy hogyan maradjunk a legversenyképesebbek. Sürgős teendő, hogy az EU finanszírozását rendbe tegyük! Mi lenne, ha a választók nem fizetnék ki a számláikat? Mi lenne, ha a vállalatok nem fizetnék ki szerződésben vállalt kötelezettségeiket? Milyen példát mutatnak az államfők, amikor kibújnak kötelezettségeik alól, majd másra mutogatnak?

Sürgős teendő, Hölgyeim és Uraim, hogy felgyorsítsuk a törvényhozást, különösen a digitális területen, mert e nélkül versenyképességünk nem kezelhető. Az IKT-ágazat fejlesztése nem ágazati kérdés, hanem sürgető gazdasági, társadalmi kérdés, a kirekesztés legfontosabb eszköze. Miközben a világ egy kattintásra van, elég 60 km-re elhagyni bármelyik európai fővárost, s már nem beszélhetünk megfelelő Internet-lefedettségéről. Tudomásul kell venni, hogy a vidék kirekesztése a digitális hálózatokból, ma a legnagyobb kockázat. Ez az elvándorlás oka vidékről városba. Aki nincs a hálón, az nincs! Annak nincs munkahelye, az nem része a társadalomnak, az nagyon nehezen éri el a közszolgáltatásokat. A digitális agenda végrehajtása korunk legnagyobb lehetősége, a kormányfőknek élni kell vele!

3-053-000

VORSITZ: OTHMAR KARAS*Vizepräsident*

3-054-000

Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE) - Nagyon sok és nagyon széles az a témakör, ami az ülésnek a napirendjére került. Csak remélni tudom, hogy az általánosságon túl a lényegi kérdésekhez is a tanácsi ülés el fog érni. Három témát szeretnék érinteni, az első a digitális gazdaság kérdése. Fontos, hogy keressünk kitörési pontokat, olyan pontokat, amelyek lehetőséget adnak az integrált uniós gazdaság számára. Ugyanakkor azt is kell látni, hogy ez a terület, bár a válságban átlag fölött teljesített, mégis azt tapasztalhatjuk, hogy leginkább érzi a belső piaci akadályokat és érzi a belső piaci töredezettséget. Az nem lehet, hogy miközben rövid távon forrásokat csökkentünk, azt várjuk, hogy ez a terület tartós növekedést mutasson fel. Ha nem szüntetjük meg az akadályokat, akkor lesz továbbra is 28 fregmentált digitális piacunk.

A másik téma a gazdaságpolitikai koordináció, az európai szemeszternek a kérdése. Nagyon fontos, hogy a gazdasági koordináció erősödjön, azonban a felelősséget ebben a folyamatban mindenkinek viselni kell. Úgy tapasztalom, az eddigi döntéseiben a Bizottság bizonyos kérdésekben túlmént a saját hatáskörén, tagállami kompetenciák területére tévedt, sőt számaiban bizonyos tekintetben erőseket is tévedett. Szeretném azt látni, hogy a következő időszakban, a következő szemeszterben a Bizottság viselni fogja a döntéseinek a következményét. Azt is fontosnak tartom, hogy ex ante és ex post is ez a felelősség megjelenjen. A harmadik téma a bürokrácia csökkentése, amit csak támogatni tudok.

3-055-000

Libor Rouček (S&D). - Mr President, I would like to say a few words about the Eastern Partnership and the preparations for the Vilnius summit. I think it is in our vital interests that we have peace, stability and cooperation on our eastern borders. For this reason, the Eastern Partnership is the right instrument. We need political associations and economic integration with those countries that wish to have this partnership with us.

I wish the Council would talk about concrete help for our neighbours. Association Agreements and the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreements are the right way forward, but countries such as Moldova need immediate and concrete help. So let us look for ways to increase trade and to speed up the process of building the gas pipeline. We should also think about how to improve and increase mobility, and especially how to help young people – in other words, visa liberalisation. Let us move on a path towards a visa-free regime.

Unfortunately, our eastern neighbours are under great pressure from Russia. We should send a clear message to Russia that we express our full solidarity with our neighbours, but, at the same time, we do not want a new Cold War. We do not want a new division in Europe. I think that should be our clear message. We must not sink back into a Cold War mentality or zero-sum games. Let us work together to create a common economic space: a zone of peace, cooperation and prosperity from Brest all the way to Vladivostok.

Good luck with the preparations for the Vilnius summit.

3-056-000

Μαριέττα Γιαννάκου (PPE). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η ημερήσια διάταξη του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου πραγματικά παρουσιάζει εξαιρετικό ενδιαφέρον με θέματα όπως η καινοτομία, η ανάπτυξη, η ανταγωνιστικότητα, η απασχόληση, η ψηφιακή οικονομία, η εμφύσηση της οικονομικής και νομισματικής ένωσης, η ανατολική εταιρική σχέση. Τα ζητήματα ανάπτυξης, ανταγωνιστικότητας και απασχόλησης όμως έχουν συζητηθεί αναρίθμητες φορές και για τον λόγο αυτό αναμένει κανείς ουσιαστικότερα συμπεράσματα.

Σε ποιο στάδιο βρίσκεται το επενδυτικό σχέδιο για την Ευρώπη και η Ευρωπαϊκή Τράπεζα Επενδύσεων; Πώς ακριβώς θα επιταχυνθεί ώστε να συμβάλει περισσότερο στην ανάπτυξη και την ανταγωνιστικότητα; Τι συμβαίνει με την πρωτοβουλία για την απασχόληση των νέων που είναι τόσο σημαντικό θέμα; Όσο εξακολουθεί η Ευρώπη να βρίσκεται σε κατάσταση όπου το άνοιγμα μεταξύ Βορρά και Νότου, σε συμβολικό επίπεδο, γίνεται ολοένα και μεγαλύτερο, τόσο μικρότερη ανταγωνιστικότητα συνολικά θα έχει σε σχέση με τους άλλους ανταγωνιστές σε διεθνές επίπεδο. Για τον λόγο αυτό, είναι απόλυτη ανάγκη να επικεντρωθεί το Συμβούλιο στο ζήτημα αυτό και οπωσδήποτε να ολοκληρώσει τις εργασίες για την τραπεζική ένωση και τον ενιαίο μηχανισμό εξυγίανσης τραπεζών, για τον οποίο εκφράζονται ακόμη αντιδράσεις σε ορισμένες χώρες. Ελπίζω ότι αυτό το ζήτημα θα κλείσει επί ελληνικής Προεδρίας διότι στην υπόθεση των τραπεζών σημαντική παράμετρος δεν είναι μόνο η εμπλοκή τους στην οικονομική κρίση αλλά και η εξυγίανσή τους, η οποία είναι μία προϋπόθεση σύνθετη αλλά απαραίτητη για ένα καλύτερο μέλλον στην Ευρώπη.

3-057-000

Roberto Gualtieri (S&D). - Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il timore che questo Consiglio europeo non sarà memorabile è molto concreto e non sarebbe peraltro una novità.

Sull'Unione economica e monetaria siamo allo stallo: l'idea di incentivi per rafforzare il coordinamento delle politiche economiche si allontana all'orizzonte, mentre si vogliono imporre surrettiziamente nuove sanzioni con le condizionalità macroeconomiche, svuotando in modo illegittimo il concetto stesso di codecisione. Alcuni governi in scadenza vogliono addirittura annacquare ulteriormente i timidi passi avanti sulla dimensione sociale dell'UEM, che per noi è un elemento essenziale che va sviluppato e che deve portare a un vero utilizzo degli indicatori sociali nell'ambito del semestre europeo. Sullo sfondo c'è l'incapacità di prendere atto che occorre cambiare rotta e che l'Europa deve potenziare il suo mercato interno.

Sull'immigrazione è positivo il riferimento alla tragedia di Lampedusa, ma non basta stabilire una *task force*. Lo sforzo di solidarietà verso i migranti e verso gli Stati più esposti si deve realizzare subito. Sospensione dei trasferimenti dei rifugiati ex Dublino, applicando la clausola di particolare difficoltà prevista dal regolamento, concessione di visti umanitari per mettere in sicurezza le persone nei paesi di transito, approvazione rapida di nuove regole per le operazioni di soccorso.

Per noi è tempo di agire, giudicheremo il Consiglio europeo dai fatti e non dalle parole.

3-058-000

Der Präsident. – Meine Damen und Herren! Ich würde Sie sehr bitten, sich mehr an die Redezeit zu halten, weil wir weit über der Zeit sind. Alles, was wir jetzt überzogen haben, muss ich bei *catch-the-eye* einsparen, sodass ich Ihnen jetzt schon sage, dass ich maximal

fünf Personen bei *catch-the-eye* das Wort erteilen kann. Sollte die Zeit weiter überzogen werden, muss ich *catch-the-eye* überhaupt streichen.

3-059-000

Gay Mitchell (PPE). - Mr President, I think this is probably a dangerous environment in which to mention Ecclesiastes Chapter 3, verse 1, but it does say 'to everything there is a season'. I would like to follow that up by taking to task the comments of the well-intentioned Bishops of Ireland recently about what they call austerity when they should actually be talking about consolidation – the only thing that is actually working, getting people back to work and working well and restoring confidence. What they should have spoken about is solidarity, and I think that is what we need to talk about here.

This is a time for change, a time to talk about growth and recovery. There are two things I would like to see coming out of the European Council: one is to put the social market economy at the heart of our talk about recovery. Adenauer said that people should not serve business, business should serve people. The second thing we need to do is to revisit the issue of common European bonds. I think George Soros has a point when he says, for example, that this would lift Italy out of its current mire and put it on the road to recovery.

Let us talk more about the social market economy, a Christian Democrat principle which is shared by the Social Democrats and others, and let us put people at the heart of our recovery. Let us again look at this issue of common European bonds. If we are to change the language, if we are to move to a new season, we need to talk about growth and recovery.

3-060-000

Frank Engel (PPE). - Monsieur le Président, une fois n'est pas coutume, en tant que dernier orateur de ce débat, du moins parmi ceux inscrits, je ne fabulerai pas sur la nécessité abstraite de "plus d'Europe", mais je déplorerai, en revanche, l'absence de toute initiative significative prévue par le Conseil européen en matière migratoire.

Le président de la Commission revient de Lampedusa secoué. Le Premier ministre maltais dit, à raison, que la Méditerranée est en train de devenir le cimetière de l'Europe, et le Conseil européen se dit "nous allons revenir aux questions migratoires en juin 2014". J'ai l'impression que, pour parler métaphoriquement, s'il n'a rien de mieux à faire que de revenir à cela en juin 2014, il faudra mettre une croix sur le cimetière de l'Europe que continuera d'être la Méditerranée.

Non seulement nous sommes dans l'incapacité totale de faire face aux questions migratoires que nous rencontrons avec acuité, à Lampedusa et ailleurs, mais nous n'avons pas non plus grand-chose à dire en termes de politique de voisinage et de solde migratoire des pays qui nous avoisinent. Nous sommes aujourd'hui absents des conceptions politiques de gestion des migrations en Europe et autour de l'Europe. Ce n'est pas bon pour l'Europe, ce n'est pas bon pour ceux qui nous entourent, et ce n'est pas bon pour notre économie non plus.

3-061-000

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

3-062-000

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). - Mr President, my experience in this Chamber is that there are more considered speeches later on in the debate. We had a very lively exchange this

morning with the Presidents of the Groups, and that was very important in clearing the air, particularly on the budget issue.

Let me just pick up on my colleague Gay Mitchell's very well-considered presentation here. There are signs of economic recovery, so there is hope here. Let us build on it. Our biggest problem is youth unemployment and a lack of cash and credit for SMEs so that they can employ young people. There is a complete logjam. We know the problem, but the Council has to find and come forward with those solutions. The social market economy is vital. There is absolutely no doubt that both matter. You cannot have one without the other.

Finally, I would just like to say something regarding the impasse over the budget: this is a very unseemly mess. Citizens do not like it. We should clear it up. Let us never allow this to happen again in our future budget debates.

3-063-000

Francesco De Angelis (S&D). - Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, il Consiglio che si apre domani è di cruciale importanza per il futuro dell'Unione. Credo non sia un caso che il primo punto all'ordine del giorno sia il completamento del mercato unico digitale.

Per ogni due posti di lavoro persi con la crisi, cinque nuovi posti di lavoro sono creati dalla diffusione dell'economia digitale, ma si hanno anche risparmi e benefici per le pubbliche amministrazioni e soprattutto per i cittadini.

Mi auguro quindi – ed è un invito che rivolgo al Presidente – che il dibattito si concentri su quattro punti prioritari: il completamento del mercato unico digitale e dei servizi di linea, l'abolizione del roaming, la promozione delle infrastrutture digitali e del ruolo chiave delle amministrazioni nella diffusione dei servizi digitali innovativi, gli incentivi ad investire nelle competenze digitali e lo sviluppo dei progetti a lungo termine.

3-064-000

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL). - Senhor Presidente, dirijo-me ao Presidente da Comissão Europeia que, mais uma vez, foi embora antes do fim do debate.

Queria falar-lhe de democracia, de soberania, do Estado de direito. São conceitos com os quais terá alguma dificuldade de relacionamento, a julgar pelas suas declarações recentes sobre o Tribunal Constitucional português.

Queria também falar-lhe da mediocridade dos que se armam sempre em fortes perante os fracos mas que são sempre fracos perante os fortes. Saberá bem do que lhe falo.

Enquanto Presidente da Comissão Europeia, o senhor Barroso resolveu chantagear o Tribunal Constitucional português, dizendo que, se este não aceitar as medidas impostas pela troica, então temos o caldo entornado.

Senhor Barroso, a Constituição Portuguesa, que o senhor assim desrespeitou e ofendeu diz, no seu artigo 1.º, que Portugal é uma República soberana baseada na dignidade da pessoa humana, na vontade popular e empenhada na construção de uma sociedade livre, justa e solidária.

Essa determinação não vive apenas na letra da Constituição, vive na vontade do povo português que, da mesma forma que correu consigo quando primeiro-ministro, correrá com a troica, com os seus homens de mão, com a sua política de desastre e de destruição.

3-065-000

Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE). - Monsieur le Président, mes premiers mots seront pour féliciter le président du Conseil européen de faire plancher nos chefs d'État et de gouvernement sur des sujets thématiques. Demain et après-demain, la croissance et l'emploi, au mois de décembre la défense, au mois de mars l'énergie. Bravo! Je regrette néanmoins, Monsieur le Président – je ne sais pas si c'est vous qui avez omis de l'inviter – que M. Van Rompuy ne soit pas là pour débattre de tous ces sujets avec le Parlement européen.

Un mot sur le grand plan d'infrastructure qui a été décidé en juin. Merci d'avoir repris cette idée au Conseil européen. Il faut maintenant être plus précis. Ce n'est pas soixante ou cent milliards qu'il nous faut, c'est de 1 000 à 1 500 milliards sur une dizaine d'années pour le numérique, les transports, l'énergie, avec l'idée également que nous puissions introduire des contributions obligatoires à la charge des consommateurs de ces services. Oui, il faut un grand plan d'investissement. C'est la condition de la confiance de nos concitoyens dans leur continent.

3-066-000

Juan Fernando López Aguilar (S&D). - Señor Presidente, he solicitado participar en este turno de palabra para expresar mi protesta, como Presidente de la Comisión de Libertades Civiles, Justicia y Asuntos de Interior, por la redacción del apartado 39 de la propuesta de conclusiones, no solamente porque es tibio, patéticamente inexpresivo, y porque elude referirse a lo que hay que hacer, que es reforzar la cooperación con los países de origen, reforzar, sobre todo, el salvamento de vidas en el mar y aplicar, de una vez, la cláusula de solidaridad que está en el Tratado de la Unión Europea en lo relativo a la gestión integrada de fronteras, sino porque, además, pospone la decisión de la nueva orientación estratégica y la planificación de la definición de la política de asilo y refugio a junio de 2014, es decir, exactamente en el lapso de tiempo comprendido entre la expiración del mandato de este Parlamento Europeo y la constitución del que vendrá después de las elecciones de mayo de 2014, para evitar justamente que, al definir esa política, pueda escucharse a la representación de la ciudadanía europea y eludir así el mandato de los artículos 10 y 11 del Tratado de la Unión Europea. Simplemente, inaceptable.

3-067-000

Olli Rehn, *Vice-President of the Commission* . – Mr President, I would first like to thank you all for a very substantial and serious debate today. The Commission shares your concerns about making concrete progress in the European Council this week on such key issues as immigration policy, banking union, the digital economy, financing of the real economy and fighting youth unemployment, as well as on the Eastern Partnership, which is very important for peace, stability and progress in Europe.

Let me make a few comments on this, starting with the issue of migration and immigration. First, the Commission fully agrees with the need to enhance legal economic immigration and labour mobility instead of illegal immigration. My colleague, Cecilia Malmström, continues to work hard – and decisively – to strengthen Europe's ability to act in this important field. In fact, responding to Guy Verhofstadt on migration policy, a lot of things have been done since the Tampere Summit in the late 1990s and in recent years. The creation of Frontex and the European Asylum Support Office, the creation of funds for refugees and the completion of a common asylum policy are just some of the main steps taken recently.

But – and of course there is a very big but – as President Barroso said, the tragedies of Lampedusa show us that it is indeed necessary to step up our efforts. Messages from the Commission on this are clear, and we trust that the European Council will listen to them and support us in reinforcing European actions to help prevent and stop tragedies such as this one. We need stronger measures to organise search-and-rescue operations to save lives in danger. This calls for more intensive cooperation between the responsible bodies, and here the Commission is taking the lead in a taskforce with Member States and EU agencies such as Frontex and the European Asylum Support Office, as well as Europol.

Another priority of the European Council is the digital economy. This has a clear and immediate link to migration. Let us face it: we have a skills shortage in Europe, especially with regard to digital skills. Therefore, legal economic immigration is one of the solutions – not the only one, but one of the solutions – to this skills shortage. We have to be more forthcoming in this critical field.

The Commission has also put forward a proposal for a telecoms single market, on which my colleague Neelie Kroes is working very hard and effectively. We know that this will not be built overnight, but it is an essential step forward, both for bringing benefits for European consumers and for improving our economic competitiveness, thus helping to create employment in the European economy.

Better regulation is also one of the key areas of the European Council and, as underlined by President Barroso, we are committed to simplifying legislation to ensure that we have the right regulatory framework to promote economic growth, competitiveness and employment. We have a single market that requires common rules, but the rules need to be smarter and effectively implemented in the same way in all 28 Member States.

To Mr Callanan – who is no longer here – I would say that I believe that we are committed both to better regulation and to the single market. So, by the way, was his heroine, Margaret Thatcher, who supported both the single market and the Single European Act of 1987, which opened the gates for qualified majority voting, because she realised that, in order to have a strong single market, you also need strong rules and institutions. They go very much hand in hand.

I also agree with many speakers that in the coming months our strong priority will be the completion of the banking union, which should still happen during the Lithuanian Presidency in terms of the single resolution mechanism. At the European Council, the Commission will underline the importance of maintaining momentum in rebuilding the economic and monetary union and, as a next step, completing the banking union. Why is this important? It is important in order to restore and reinforce confidence in the European banking system and to open the credit flows that the SMEs in Europe so badly need. Both businesses and households very badly need this, especially in southern Europe. This is crucial and is essential in order to create jobs in Europe.

The Commission will also call on the Member States to support the important European-level initiatives to address the consequences of the crisis. Improving access to finance, particularly for SMEs, remains a priority, as does the fight against youth unemployment. I have also taken note of your comments on the social dimension of EMU. The Commission has put the social dimension at the heart of the Europe 2020 Strategy by including employment and social inclusion targets in it. Tackling unemployment and the social consequences of the crisis is a key priority of the Annual Growth Survey.

We have proposed concrete ways to develop the social dimension of EMU through reinforced surveillance of employment and social developments in the European Semester, enhanced solidarity via the EU budget and support for labour mobility, and a strengthened social dialogue, which we see as an equal part of the European social market economy.

Economic recovery is now under way in Europe. It is still fragile but will be on a stronger footing next year when it will also be positively reflected in employment – on condition that we stay on the course of reform, because there is no room for complacency and the economic turnaround now under way should in no way be taken as a signal to scale back the level of ambition. This is what we – both Parliament and the Commission, as I believe – expect from the European Council. We expect concrete steps and concrete progress to support economic recovery and job creation. That is essential, and that is what the citizens of Europe call for from the European Council.

3-068-000

Vytautas Leškevičius, *President-in-Office of the Council* . – Mr President, Vice-President of the Commission, honourable Members, thank you for this valuable discussion in advance of tomorrow's European Council meeting. A wide range of issues have been covered during the course of the debate. I will ensure that the President of the European Council is aware of the specific points which have been raised here in this morning's debate. As I made clear in my opening remarks, this week's European Council is set to address a number of different issues, but they are interlinked and coherent.

The issue of deepening economic and monetary union is about ensuring that we continue to emerge from the economic and financial crisis and create a stronger framework within the eurozone and, in particular, for preventing future crises. It is about developing mechanisms to allow us to cope with future stresses on our economic and financial systems. The key issue of youth unemployment is primarily about addressing one of the most serious consequences of the crisis. Tomorrow, heads of state will be taking stock of progress with the initiative on which we agreed at the European Council in June. I took note of what has been said by Ms Berès, Ms Morin-Chartier and Ms McGuinness in this regard.

The final issue and the main focus of this week's discussion is an issue which is vital to our future competitiveness in the world: digital economy, innovation and services. This is about ensuring that Europe is able to emerge stronger from the crisis, with increased potential for economic growth and the creation of new jobs. There will be a particular focus on the digital economy. We have to promote a digital single market which benefits both consumers and businesses. We must improve IT skills and create an environment which encourages investment in the technology of the future. We have to make full use of the potential of the internal market for services.

Mr Rouček raised a very good and pertinent question regarding the Eastern Partnership Summit. I am grateful for his suggestions and proposals. I will certainly transmit these messages to the EU institutions and partners concerned.

Mr Swoboda and Mr Verhofstadt touched upon a very tragic issue, namely the tragic events in Lampedusa and migration policy. The tragedy of the coast of Lampedusa has uncovered major issues in the EU migratory framework and border protection policies. As a result, the last Justice and Home Affairs Council called for a Commission-led joint task force to identify the main gaps and conduct a needs assessment to improve the current system and

to avoid tragedies like Lampedusa in the future. Let me simply say that the Lithuanian Presidency is working hard to contribute to a comprehensive solution.

Speaking more concretely, let me simply reiterate that, following a call from the European Council for clear rules of engagement for joint patrolling and for rules of disembarkation for rescued persons, the Council adopted a decision on 26 April 2010 supplementing the Schengen Borders Code as regards the surveillance of the external maritime borders in the context of operational cooperation coordinated by Frontex. This decision includes guidance on the implementation of international law obligations relating to search and rescue, in accordance with the Search and Rescue Convention.

Then, in October 2012, the European Court of Justice annulled the above decision but decided to maintain its enforcement until a new legal instrument is adopted. On 16 April 2013, the Commission adopted a proposal for a regulation to replace the annulled Council decision. Under the Lithuanian Presidency, the first reading has now been completed, and the competent Council working party and the Strategic Committee on Immigration Frontiers and Asylum have discussed certain issues this week. The Presidency welcomes the draft report by Mr López Aguilar and wishes to reiterate its commitment to making as much progress as possible before the end of the year, so as to allow a first-reading agreement for the European Parliament before the elections next year.

Finally, let me get back to the issue of MFF. There are a couple of remarks that I want to get across. Firstly, the Lithuanian Presidency has been doing, on the Council side, whatever is in our power in order to clinch a deal. I am glad that we managed to facilitate an agreement on Draft Amending Budget No 6 on the Council side. I would expect the European Parliament to do the same here. Secondly, it is simply a fact that we in the Council managed, in a record-breaking time of two weeks, to get a qualified majority on Draft Amending Budget No 8 and Draft Amending Budget No 9. You could have voted on the whole MFF during this plenary. If we in the Council could do it another way, when it comes to procedures, of course we would have done it already.

3-069-000

Der Präsident. – Ich möchte auf Ihre letzte Bemerkung im Sinne der Beschlüsse nicht wirklich eingehen. Das ist heute am Beginn ausführlich debattiert worden und wird morgen in der Debatte, bevor wir eine Klärung herbeiführen, noch einmal geschehen. Die Beschlusslage und die Vorgangsweise sind bekannt. Darauf hätte man schon lange reagieren können.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149 GO)

3-070-000

Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D), *bil-miktub* . – Huwa kruċjali li l-problema tal-immigrazzjoni illegali fil-Mediterran tinghata prijorità assoluta fis-summit tal-Kunsill Ewropew. Ġimagħtejn ilu tkellimna dwar it-traġedja ta' Lampedusa. Minn dak inhar 'l hawn kellna traġedja oħra li sehhet fl-ibhra Maltin li fiha mietu għexieren ta' Sirjani. Dawn it-traġedji jpoġġu piżijiet akbar fuq spallejn l-UE. Illum kulhadd jistenna li tal-anqas nuru solidarjetà ma' dawn in-nies li qegħdin ikunu kostretti li jhallu kollox warajhom biex jitbiegħdu miċ-ċirkostanzi attwali f'pajjiżhom. Dawn in-nies qegħdin ikunu sfurzati jafdaw hajjithom f'idejn kriminali li ma jiddejuq xejn jissugraw hajjet haddiehor biex ihaxxnu

bwiethom. Qegħdin nitkellmu dwar kriminalità organizzata li tinhtieg battalja organizzata li tirnexxi biss bl-appoġġ konkret tal-pajjiżi membri kollha. Irridu naraw x'nagħmlu biex dawn in-nies ma jkollhomx għalfejn jafdaw hajjithom f'idejn kriminali biex jitbiegħdu mill-perikli li jdawruhom. Tqum mistoqsija ċara: Il-kriminalità organizzata hija kapaci aktar mill-UE? Nixtieq nagħmel referenza għal dak li qalet Aung San Suu Kyi meta f'din il-plenarju rċiviet il-Premju Sakharov. Saħqet fuq l-importanza tal-libertà tal-ħsieb. Saħqet fuq l-importanza tad-dritt li kulhadd jistaqsi "għaliex?". Imma lejn tmiem id-diskors tagħha qalet li mistoqsija li ma tixtieqx tisma' hija: Għaliex twelidt? Ejja nerfgħu r-responsabbiltà tagħna u ma nħallux lil dawn in-nies jagħmlu din il-mistoqsija. Il-Kunsill għandu jieħu azzjoni konkreta ISSA.

3-070-500

John Bufton (EFD), *in writing*. – This summit sees us discuss, once again, the EU's Youth Employment Initiative, its place within wider efforts to foster growth, jobs and EU competitiveness, and the aim of making it fully operational by January 2014. The UK currently has a youth unemployment rate of 21 %. This means that approximately 1 million 18-25 year olds in the country are out of work. And, as of 1 January 2014, when 29 million Romanians and Bulgarians will be allowed to enter the country freely, the youth job market – and, more than likely, the job market as a whole – is sure to reach saturation point. We can sit here and discuss and dissect the Youth Employment Initiative all day and all night but my party and I quite simply cannot see how this initiative will make any real positive impact in our country. It is clear to me that the only way to ease the youth employment crisis we are currently facing in the UK is to leave the EU, regain proper control of our borders and make sure that any available jobs are done by our own young people.

3-071-000

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), *in writing*. – The next Council meeting is set to focus on economic affairs, particularly on research, innovation, job creation and youth unemployment, etc. These are all fields that require investment and long-term commitment. Therefore, it is rather ironic that the Council's strategy has been going in the opposite direction. This can be seen with the EU's 2014 budget, where the Council made overall cuts of EUR 240.7 million in commitment appropriations, and EUR 1.06 billion in payment appropriations. These cuts represent a decrease in the funding available in 2014 for programmes that will drive growth and productivity.

Another example is the EU's long-term budget, MFF 2014-2020, where the Council has yet to formally accept the second tranche of EUR 3.9 billion – funds that are needed to pay the outstanding bills for 2013. Therefore, ahead of the meeting of the Council, I would like to remind the Member States that actions speak louder than words. By failing to take the necessary actions, the Council is neglecting its commitments to our institutions, and – more importantly – failing to live up to the expectations of 26.5 million unemployed citizens in Europe, of whom 5.4 million are under the age of 25. It is time for the Council to back its words with solutions and actions.

3-071-500

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D), *în scris*. – Consiliul European din 24-25 octombrie 2013 va avea trei teme principale: 1. economia digitală, inovațiile și serviciile; 2. creștere, competitivitate și locuri de muncă; 3. Uniunea Economică și Monetară.

Solicităm Consiliului să asigure în cadrul financiar multianual 2014-2020 fondurile necesare stimulării economiei digitale, a inovării, a creșterii competitivității și a combaterii șomajului, în special în rândul tinerilor. Solicităm șefilor de state și de guverne să asigure refacerea bugetului alocat mecanismului „Conectarea Europei”, componenta ICT, la valoarea propusă inițial de Comisie. Investițiile în infrastructură și serviciile ICT finanțate prin mecanismul „Conectarea Europei” sunt esențiale atât pentru competitivitatea UE cât și pentru redresarea economică a Uniunii. Aceste investiții reprezintă atât o necesitate pentru modernizarea și competitivitatea multor industrii europene, cât și o măsură de asigurare de locuri de muncă. De crearea acestor locuri de muncă ar putea beneficia în special tinerii, întrucât noile generații dispun de competențele necesare utilizării ICT în diferite domenii.

De asemenea, având în vedere că încrederea cetățenilor europeni și a companiilor în instrumentele ICT este esențială pentru dezvoltarea economiei digitale, atragem atenția că sunt necesare, la nivel european, măsuri ferme pentru protecția datelor și pentru asigurarea securității rețelelor și a datelor.

3-072-000

Kathleen Van Brempt (S&D), *schriftelijk*. – De Sociale dimensie van de EMU dreigt een zwakgebod te worden. En dat terwijl de aanpak van de crisis in verschillende lidstaten een sociaal slagveld heeft achtergelaten en er op sociaal vlak grote verschillen bestaan (bijvoorbeeld het al dan niet bestaan van minimumlonen), met de bevolking als slachtoffer.

De Europese Commissie wil dat aanpakken met de ontwikkeling van een sociaal scorebord. Dit is erg mager. De cruciale vraag is immers niet wie goed of slecht scoort, maar welke acties wij gaan ondernemen om het sociale beleid in de Unie vorm te geven. Bovendien ontbreken een aantal relevante indicatoren op het scorebord: armoede, kinderarmoede, werkloosheid bij vijftigplussers of bij vrouwen.

Eigenlijk zie ik maar één lichtpuntje en dat is dat de Europese Commissie eindelijk heeft ingezien dat Europa méér is dan een economische Unie en dat de sociale dimensie eindelijk op de agenda is komen te staan. Maar om de sociale dimensie van de EMU werkelijk te versterken, is er nood aan gezamenlijke sociale doelen en de introductie van sociale minimumstandaarden, in balans met de economische doelen van de EU. Pas dan zal het Europese beleid opnieuw een draagvlak vinden bij de bevolking.

3-072-500

Anna Záborská (PPE), *písomne*. – Úlohou verejnej správy je vytvárať legislatívne podmienky, ktoré umožnia každému občanovi uplatniť v maximálnej miere svoju slobodu. Digitálna agenda je nepochybne snahou o rozšírenie priesoru slobody pre podnikanie, ale zároveň má za cieľ rozšíriť slobodu voľby spotrebiteľov v oblasti ponuky digitálnych služieb a technológií. Ale som v rozpakoch z tej časti vystúpenia predsedu Komisie pána Barrosa, v ktorej hovorí o snahách riešiť nezamestnanosť, a to predovšetkým mladých ľudí. Človek potrebuje prácu – nielen kvôli zabezpečeniu svojich materiálnych potrieb, ale aj pre zachovanie svojej dôstojnosti. Lenže žiadna verejná politika nedokáže predpovedať potreby trhu. Bola by som veľmi rada, keby sme sa na európskej úrovni sústredili na odbúravanie bariér na trhu práce tak, aby geografická vzdialenosť, zodpovednosť za ďalších členov rodiny či zmena kariéry neboli neprekonateľnými prekážkami. Naším cieľom by nemalo byť dotovanie stáží a krátkodobých pracovných miest pre mladých nezamestnaných absolventov škôl, ale vytvorenie prostredia, v ktorom by títo mladí ľudia nemali strach postaviť sa na vlastné nohy či nájsť si prácu tam, kde práve je.

8. Europäisches Semester für die wirtschaftspolitische Koordinierung (Aussprache)

3-074-000

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Elisa Ferreira im Namen des Ausschusses für Wirtschaft und Währung über das Europäische Semester für die wirtschaftspolitische Koordinierung: Umsetzung der Prioritäten für 2013 (2013/2134(INI)) (A7-0322/2013).

3-075-000

Elisa Ferreira, relatora. – Senhor Presidente, caros colegas, quero começar por agradecer a todos os colegas e, em particular, aos relatores-sombra e relatores de outras comissões, o espírito de cooperação com que trabalhámos.

O Parlamento Europeu vai hoje pronunciar-se sobre as recomendações de política económica dirigidas aos seus membros, aos países, elaboradas pela Comissão e aprovadas pelo Conselho.

Este ano, elas revestem-se de importância particular, porque entrou em vigor o novo quadro europeu de governação económica, a chamada *economic governance* e, ao abrigo do Semestre Europeu, estas recomendações têm de ser forçosamente tidas em conta pelos países na elaboração dos seus orçamentos nacionais. A Comissão Europeia adquire poderes adicionais também sobre o controlo desse processo orçamental.

É verdade que a crise evidenciou o quanto as economias europeias estão interligadas, em particular dentro da zona euro. E também evidenciou o quanto uma mesma política comum pode ser benéfica para uns e dramaticamente negativa para outros países. Desde o alargamento à moeda única, os exemplos são muitos.

Estas realidades justificam de facto uma coordenação reforçada e hoje a Comissão, está aqui o Comissário Olli Rehn que pode testemunhar isto, com o apoio deste Parlamento, adquiriu poderes excepcionais, em particular através do *six pack* e do *two pack* para exercer essa coordenação de forma musculada.

Mais poder obriga, no entanto, a mais responsabilidade a pelo menos dois níveis. Num primeiro nível, essa maior coordenação obriga a um correspondente reforço do controlo democrático por parte deste Parlamento para as decisões tomadas a nível europeu e por parte dos parlamentos nacionais para as de nível nacional, ambas naturalmente com envolvimento dos parceiros sociais.

Justifica-se talvez ponderar um processo de codecisão no início de semestre, aquando da Análise Anual de Crescimento, a chamada AGS, e, no atual momento, no momento em que se termina o ciclo europeu e se inicia um nacional, com as recomendações específicas por país.

Em segundo lugar, urge melhorar a qualidade das recomendações. As propostas deste Parlamento são claras e esperamos que a Comissão as ouça.

Destaco, entre várias, as seguintes: a consolidação orçamental tem de ser ajustada à especificidade de cada país. Ela tem de permitir melhorar a competitividade desse país, mas também gerar um crescimento socialmente equilibrado e tem de gerar emprego.

Entretanto, as fortes interdependências recomendam que também os países com excedentes contribuam para o relançamento económico e saúdo que a Comissão, pela primeira vez,

tenha abordado este tema. Esses países deverão estimular a procura interna europeia através de investimento e da sua própria procura.

Mas a economia da União só ressurgirá se concretizar as promessas tantas vezes feitas e nunca concretizadas, de lançar programas sérios de investimento, sejam eles *project bonds*, a iniciativa de crescimento em emprego e outras, que ainda agora surgiram no anterior debate, se for capaz de rever a sua política industrial e a sua política comercial externa e torná-las compatíveis com o mundo de globalização em que vivemos, bem como não deixar cair a aposta na inovação, educação, ciência e ambiente, sobretudo nos países que estão neste momento sob fortes restrições.

Crescer e refazer a coesão interna, social, regional e política tem de estar no centro da agenda a par de um combate, bastante mais sério do que tivemos até agora, à fraude e à evasão fiscais.

Mas, entretanto, a crise fez com que uma iniciativa de carácter social europeia de combate ao desemprego e apoio ao emprego se tornasse numa prioridade absoluta.

O Parlamento continua a aguardar os resultados do grupo de alto nível que analisa a viabilidade da gestão coordenada da dívida soberana, termino já senhor presidente, mas penso que tenho 6 minutos e que posso distribuí-los entre aqui e um comentário final.

O Parlamento continua a aguardar os resultados do grupo de alto nível que analisa a viabilidade da gestão coordenada da dívida soberana, aguarda ainda a proposta da Comissão Europeia sobre o novo instrumento de financiamento das reformas estruturais, o chamado CCI, e aguarda a clarificação do modo como o investimento estratégico nacional pode ser compatibilizado com a rigidez da disciplina orçamental, sobretudo nos países mais frágeis.

Estamos ainda em crise, os desequilíbrios internos à União aumentaram insuportavelmente. Eles são visíveis nas taxas de crescimento, no desemprego, no custo do crédito e nos níveis de pobreza.

A recuperação é lenta e, nos países mais débeis, pouco sustentada, apesar dos sacrifícios enormes a que se submeteram.

Neste contexto, pedir aos cidadãos que deleguem ainda mais poder no nível europeu só é possível se se restabelecerem os elos de confiança mútua entre os cidadãos, entre si e entre eles e as instituições, nomeadamente as europeias. Eles foram quebrados e há opressões que estão neste momento a prejudicar a sua recuperação.

Indico apenas algumas: neste momento o regime *ad hoc* das troicas deve ser urgentemente absorvido em processos europeus e democráticos, em particular, permito-me sublinhar, que comentários como os que têm sido feitos pela Comissão, sobre temas absolutamente sensíveis porque são os únicos que restam, quase, da democracia a nível nacional, como as decisões dos tribunais constitucionais também não ajudam.

E, por último, gostaria de referir que a confiança mútua também passa por um processo que não traga de novo o regime das sanções, nomeadamente através do corte de fundos estruturais, como um processo externo que duplica as sanções para os países que usam fundos e que contraria completamente, termino já senhor presidente, a franqueza e a frontalidade com que negociamos um regime de sanções específico e comunitário dentro do contexto do *six pack*.

Muito obrigada mas a confiança, penso que é a palavra-chave neste momento.

3-076-000

Vytautas Leškevičius, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, I am grateful for the opportunity to take part in this debate on the European Semester. It is very timely, given that we are about to embark on the next European Semester cycle in a few weeks' time when the Commission publishes the Annual Growth Survey. This Semester is of growing importance. Even though the next Semester is, technically speaking, the 2014 Semester, work will begin this autumn, and this debate is also particularly valuable, given the work we have done on the Council side on the lessons learnt from the 2013 Semester.

Yesterday's General Affairs Council concluded our evaluation phase. It endorsed the Presidency synthesis report on lessons learnt from 2013 and the recommendations for 2014 and future European Semester cycles. I would like to take this opportunity to present the key elements of this report.

The main message is that the Council considers the 2013 Semester to have been successful. It was in many respects an improvement compared to its predecessors, and this was mainly because it was based on a more substantial and continuous dialogue between the Commission and the Member States, and also between them and the parliaments at European and national level – and other stakeholders, of course. Effective dialogue is key to a shared understanding of the challenges, enhanced ownership of the recommendations and, through that, better implementation.

The 2013 Semester was more European, more multilateral in character. Member States took a more active interest in the situation and in the recommendations of the other Member States. This peer review and peer pressure should lead to better implementation. We have made good progress towards a better sectoral balance. In recent years we have seen a steady increase in the number of employment and social recommendations in the Semester framework. There has also been more focus on the single market, starting with the annual report on the single market that the Commission presented together with the Annual Growth Survey for the first time last year.

We are therefore seeing greater involvement of a wider range of stakeholders in the Member States. At the same time, it is important that country-specific recommendations remain focused on the main objectives of growth and jobs. In this respect, a good and focused balance between macro-economic, micro-economic, employment and social aspects is essential for a semester to contribute to the achievement of these objectives. On some, there was good progress, but our lesson has been learnt: the process made it clear that we cannot rest on our laurels, and further positive refinements can be made. There is still more that can and should be done. We must use the European Semester to the full to enable Europe to put the crisis behind us.

There is a long way to go. There is scope for improving the national ownership and implementation rate of country-specific recommendations. Many of the reforms are of a long-term nature and require proper preparation together with national stakeholders. Europe cannot afford to be complacent when the first weak signs of economic recovery are emerging.

At European level, the Semester should be further geared towards implementation of the recommendations. This could be achieved through better dialogue, improving the quality of the recommendations and improving the monitoring by the Council of implementation at national level.

During the 2014 Semester, implementation will also be helped by the new tools following the 'two-pack' and, hopefully, by the new MFF. The 'two-pack' will be key to improving surveillance and coordination of euro area Member States' economic and budgetary planning processes. The draft budgets were submitted to the Commission on 15 October. They will now be scrutinised by the Commission in the light of the country-specific recommendations, the Stability and Growth Pact and the excessive deficit procedure targets for the country concerned. If they do not comply with the Stability and Growth Pact, the Member State concerned can be asked to submit a revised plan.

Before closing, I would like to commend you for your impressive report on the 2013 Semester. I was glad to know that we largely agreed on the key issues. We are making progress towards a semester that better captures the employment, social and micro-economic aspects of reforms without undermining efforts to strengthen public finances. I also agree with your approach to competitiveness, which calls for simultaneous action on industrial policy, financing of the economy, innovation, energy, education and other fronts. These are all issues which we on the Council side have discussed and continue to work on.

I would like to refer specifically to our effort under the Competitiveness Council on the framework conditions for a competitive European industry. The European Semester is a tool to facilitate the necessary reforms at national level. At EU level we have to keep refining this tool so that it fulfils its purpose. At the same time, as co-legislators, we have to continue to work to conclude the priority files for jobs and growth before the end of this parliamentary cycle.

3-077-000

Olli Rehn, *Vice-President of the Commission*. – Mr President, let me start by thanking the rapporteur, Elisa Ferreira, and all the other Members involved for their work on this report, which is a timely and important contribution to the debate about economic governance in the European Union.

I am glad to see that we agree that this year's European Semester has been a clear improvement compared to the previous ones and that you appreciate the stronger degree of country-specificity and concrete detail in the recommendations. This is encouraging, and it confirms that we are on the right track in reinforcing our economic governance for the sake of sustainable growth and job creation.

Today, Europe is at a turning point in economic terms. We have a subdued, modest recovery under way this year and will be moving onto a stronger footing next year when we also expect better improvements in employment, which is of course a critical yardstick for the performance of our economy.

Together with the enhanced credibility of Member States' fiscal policies and the decisive action to stabilise finance and bond markets by the European Central Bank, strengthened economic governance has been one of the key factors which have contributed to this economic recovery. We are not, of course, out of the woods yet, and there are several things that will be decisive for sustained recovery to which we have to commit ourselves.

Firstly, it is essential that the EU Member States stay the course of economic reform. We recommended to several Member States that they should continue with their consistent but somewhat slower pace of fiscal consolidation on condition that they commit themselves

to substantial economic reforms. Indeed, we cannot afford to scale back the level of ambition for reforming Europe and our economies, and we cannot go back to business as usual.

The Commission therefore fully agrees with your report on the paramount importance of the monitoring and implementation of the country-specific recommendations. We will present our assessment on progress in both fiscal policy and structural reforms in mid-November, in a few weeks' time. I am pleased that I will meet the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs soon afterwards to report on that, and I count on your support as regards our assessment.

Secondly, while we in the past few years have taken a quantum leap in reinforcing economic governance, there is still much room for further progress. We need to further strengthen the economic pillar of the economic and monetary union, which requires ensuring that there is also a strong social dimension in our policies. Likewise, a key priority is maintaining the momentum for the completion of the banking union, as we discussed in the previous debate on the European Council this week. To this end, I count on the support of Parliament in finding a solid and timely agreement on the single resolution mechanism so that we can conclude the work on this before the Lithuanian Presidency comes to a close at the end of this year.

Thirdly, we need to complete the repair of the banking system and financial industry in Europe in order to restore confidence and ensure that households and businesses – and especially SMEs – have access to finance for the sake of sustainable growth and job creation. The banking union is one key objective, but the current gaps in private sector lending also need to be bridged, including by other players such as the European Investment Bank.

To conclude, I see much common ground between your report and the views of the Commission. This is good news for the Community method, which merits being strongly defended against intergovernmental temporary solutions. The Community method is the way of democratic governance that makes the European Union work and deliver, and I know that I can count on your continued support to this effect. Thank you for your attention, and I look forward to having a constructive and productive debate with you here today.

3-078-000

Catherine Trautmann, *rapporteuse pour avis de la commission des budgets*. – Messieurs les Présidents, au moment où l'on constate que le système actuel, qui fait reposer l'essentiel du budget européen sur les contributions des États membres, est à bout de souffle et où le débat fait rage à propos de l'instauration d'une condition macroéconomique qui reviendrait à infliger une double peine aux États les plus en difficulté, je regrette que ma proposition, par deux fois énoncée dans mes rapports, demandant l'exclusion des dépenses d'investissement du calcul du déficit public, ait été systématiquement écartée par le PPE et les libéraux.

J'ai entendu M. Barroso dire ce matin que certains États membres ont pour seule capacité d'investissement le budget européen. Alors, assurons-leur d'en disposer et ne pénalisons pas les États membres qui contribuent à un budget d'investissement, puisque c'est cela le budget européen.

Le semestre devrait davantage intégrer l'impact du budget européen sur les perspectives économiques et budgétaires des États membres en termes de croissance, d'emploi et d'innovation.

Voilà, Messieurs les Présidents, ce que je voulais dire dans mes recommandations au nom de la commission des budgets.

3-079-000

Verónica Lope Fontagné, *Ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Empleo y Asuntos Sociales*. – Señor Presidente, la crisis económica puso en tela de juicio la sostenibilidad de toda la Unión Europea, haciendo temer por la desaparición del euro y la quiebra de varios Estados. Gracias a los esfuerzos de consolidación fiscal, estas dudas se han disipado y se han garantizado la sostenibilidad de las cuentas públicas y el mantenimiento del sistema de bienestar. Ahora es necesario que la mejora de los mercados y las reformas emprendidas tengan su traslación a la economía real. En mi país —en España— estas medidas están empezando a dar sus frutos.

Pedimos que el Semestre Europeo se centre en los objetivos de la Estrategia Europa 2020 y tenemos que mejorar la situación del mercado laboral. Para lograrlo es necesario proseguir con las reformas de los mercados laborales destinadas a aumentar la flexibilidad interna y externa, mejorar la capacidad de adaptación ante los cambios, disminuir la segmentación y facilitar la transición profesional. Es necesario que el crédito vuelva a fluir, en particular hacia las PYME y los emprendedores.

3-080-000

Andreas Schwab, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für Binnenmarkt und Verbraucherschutz*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die länderspezifischen Empfehlungen im europäischen Semester dienen dazu, dass die Mitgliedstaaten untereinander abgestimmt auf nationaler Ebene die notwendigen Maßnahmen ergreifen, damit der Aufschwung in Europa gelingen kann.

In manchen Ländern – auch wenn man von der linken Seite des Hauses immer etwas anderes hört – zeigen sich bereits positive Effekte dieses Vorgehens. Ein wichtiges Element ist in diesem Zusammenhang, dass nicht nur makroökonomische Elemente, sondern vor allem auch die einheitliche und gleichlautende Umsetzung und Anwendung der Regeln für den europäischen Binnenmarkt zum Maßstab für die Bewertung der Politiken der einzelnen Länder werden. Nur so kann der Binnenmarkt seinen vollen Wert ausspielen und allen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern in gleicher Weise zugute kommen.

Wir werden deshalb den sogenannten *single market integration report* als Bestandteil der länderspezifischen Empfehlungen stärken müssen. Der Binnenmarktausschuss hat die Initiative von Kommissar Barnier in dieser Hinsicht einstimmig unterstützt.

3-081-000

Tamás Deutsch, *A Regionális Fejlesztési Bizottság véleményének előadója* – Elnök Úr! Biztos Úr! Kedves Kollégák! A Regionális Fejlesztési Bizottság véleményének előadójaként üdvözlöm a 2013-as országspecifikus ajánlásokat, melyek a növekedésre, a munkahelyteremtésre, az uniós gazdaság versenyképességének növelésére összpontosítanak. A kohéziós politika befektetési politika, meghatározó a szerepe a növekedésben, a munkahelyteremtésben, a versenyképesség növelésében. Mindennek fényében fontosnak tartom aláhúzni, hogy a kohéziós politika finanszírozását a jövőben is megfelelő szinten kell tartani. A kohéziós politika szerepe a válsággal való megbirkózásban is vitathatatlan.

Azonban a válság miatt sok tervezett fejlesztés nem valósulhatott meg, hiszen a szükséges önerő, a nemzeti társfinanszírozás biztosítása gondokat okozott. A Regionális Fejlesztési Bizottság európai szemeszterrel kapcsolatos véleménye ezért rugalmasságra hív fel, például oly módon, hogy a pénzügyi segítségnyújtásban részesült országok társfinanszírozási arányának uniós komponensét átmenetileg megemelik, így a nemzeti társfinanszírozási kötelezettség átmenetileg csökkenthető lenne.

3-082-000

Marije Cornelissen, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality.* – Mr President, I am a great supporter of the European Semester in theory. We desperately need more coordination if we are to emerge from the crisis, and if we are to combat unemployment and poverty. But I find it a bit depressing that, in practice, the Semester does not seem to be genuinely delivering, since it is still inherently flawed. It is clear that we are nowhere near achieving the 2020 goals by 2020. Far deeper, concerted reform is needed if we are to move towards a sustainable economy with job-rich growth. I would therefore like to ask the Commission two questions.

Firstly, will the Commission make environmental taxation and the elimination of environmentally-harmful subsidies a key priority in the annual growth survey? While countries are told to cut down on social expenses, Europe is at the same time still massively subsidising environmentally-harmful industries. This is, of course, insane. We should reduce taxation on labour and shift it to environmental taxation.

Secondly, in this report, Parliament will strongly call for a social dimension of the EMU, by including social indicators for macro-economic imbalances, among other things. However, it worries me a bit that the Commission calls these indicators 'auxiliary'. So I ask: will the Commission ensure that social indicators are put on an equal footing with economic and financial ones in its policy guidance?

3-083-000

Jean-Paul Gauzès, *au nom du groupe PPE.* – Monsieur le Président, le rapport écrit qui nous est présenté est le résultat d'une réflexion commune fructueuse, et j'en remercie le rapporteur. Le groupe PPE soutient l'approche de la Commission européenne sur les recommandations spécifiques par pays, orientées vers la promotion de la croissance et de l'emploi. Ces recommandations sont, comme l'avait demandé le Parlement, plus détaillées. Elles donnent davantage d'indications sur la mise en œuvre des obligations sur lesquelles les États s'engagent.

Il est à noter que les progrès de plusieurs États membres leur ont permis de sortir des procédures de déficit excessif et d'y mettre fin. Des progrès restent à faire, mais on observe aujourd'hui une évolution positive dans l'économie des États membres, et même de ce sous-programme d'assistance financière. C'est bien la preuve que l'orientation générale des politiques économiques et budgétaires choisies par les États membres, à savoir l'assainissement des finances publiques, les réformes structurelles et la concentration sur la compétitivité internationale, commence à porter ses fruits.

Les recommandations sont certes proposées par la Commission européenne, mais elles sont adoptées par les États membres en juillet. Il s'agit donc dorénavant de recommandations du Conseil aux États membres. Il est donc important que les États membres respectent leurs engagements, ce qui permettra de sortir définitivement de la crise, de relancer la croissance et de créer de l'emploi.

Nous devons faire face à la majorité des problèmes auxquels nous avons été confrontés, mais nous devons constater que ces derniers sont dus le plus souvent à des erreurs au niveau national, qui ont été commises dans le passé et parfois pendant des décennies. Vouloir faire porter le chapeau de la crise à d'obscures forces, que ce soient des spéculateurs, l'étranger ou une troïka soi-disant mal intentionnée, serait faire une grave erreur de diagnostic. On ne peut guérir un patient sur un diagnostic de complaisance. Ceux qui instrumentalisent les recommandations pour se défaire et alimenter l'eurosepticisme prennent une dangereuse responsabilité.

3-084-000

Pervenche Berès, *au nom du groupe S&D*. – Monsieur le Président, ce rapport nous permet de faire l'évaluation des recommandations spécifiques de l'année 2013. Que constate-t-on? C'est qu'à nouveau, dans ces recommandations spécifiques par pays, un des problèmes clés du fonctionnement de la zone euro, qui est la question des interdépendances entre la question économique et la question sociale, entre les États membres, ne peut pas être traitée de cette manière-là. Nous constatons aussi que beaucoup de ces recommandations sont très prescriptives. Je pense en particulier à certaines recommandations sur la réforme des retraites, un domaine où nous savons pourtant que dans chaque État membre, le dialogue social doit être au cœur de la capacité de ces États à réformer leurs dispositifs.

Je constate aussi que, pour la première fois, et nous nous en félicitons, des recommandations ont été formulées en matière de lutte contre la pauvreté. En revanche, en ce qui concerne la situation des femmes sur certains marchés du travail, il y a eu manifestement une censure. Nous le regrettons, car il est malhonnête d'examiner la situation de l'emploi dans tel ou tel État membre sans regarder aussi ce qui se passe du point de vue de la situation des femmes.

Nous avons aussi rendez-vous avec la Commission européenne pour lui dire comment nous envisageons l'examen annuel de la croissance qu'elle doit nous proposer pour l'année prochaine. Dans ce cadre-là, nous l'invitons d'abord à tenir compte de ces interdépendances, à tirer toutes les leçons de la procédure de déséquilibre macroéconomique, et aussi à faire en sorte que, même si ce domaine relève de la subsidiarité, les questions fiscales, qui doivent permettre de rééquilibrer la fiscalité entre le capital et le travail, soient aussi au cœur des propositions.

3-085-000

Philippe De Backer, *namens de ALDE-Fractie*. – In de eerste plaats mijn dank aan de rapporteur en de schaduwrapporteurs. Wij hebben moeilijke debatten gehad, maar wij hebben toch een verslag kunnen presenteren dat gezien mag worden.

Het werd zojuist al gezegd, wij hebben op dit moment een licht en zeer fragiel economisch herstel. Ik denk dat dit mede te danken is aan de stappen die op Europees niveau zijn gezet, nl. de stappen om landen te dwingen om begrotingsdiscipline aan te houden, hun balansen op te schonen en ook werk te maken van de noodzakelijke structurele hervormingen. Dus dit Europees semester heeft voor een stuk zijn al werk gedaan.

Ik denk echter dat wij vandaag in die fragiele economische situatie zeker niet mogen twijfelen om verder te gaan. Wij zullen opnieuw – en dat is daarjuist ook door de Commissie gezegd – moeten inzetten op die bankenunie. Ik denk dat, om het vertrouwen weer te herstellen, het cruciaal is dat wij werk maken van die bankenunie, van een resolutiefonds en van het opschonen van de balansen van die banken om ruimte te geven om opnieuw te kunnen investeren.

Ik denk dat het ook noodzakelijk blijft, en daar wend ik mij tot de Raad, dat elke regering, elk land zijn verantwoordelijkheid neemt en *ownership* toont voor de aanbevelingen die zij mede goedkeuren. Het kan niet zijn dat een aantal aanbevelingen hier worden goedgekeurd en deze enkele uren nadien in eigen land worden afgebroken. Men moet ook *ownership* durven tonen op wat men op Europees niveau met elkaar afspreekt. Dat is noodzakelijk om de muntunie in stand te houden, om de economische groei te genereren en uiteindelijk ook opnieuw aan te knopen met jobcreatie en nieuwe industrie.

Ik wil als laatste punt nog melden dat ik het heel belangrijk vind dat er ook een element van democratisering in dit debat wordt gebracht, o.a. ook door de Commissie, dat wij nagaan hoe wij opnieuw die communautaire methode kunnen versterken en hoe wij alle intergouvernementele aspecten van dit verhaal dat wij de afgelopen maanden en jaren met elkaar hebben opgebouwd, effectief weer onder de paraplu van de Europese communautaire methode kunnen brengen; het is dus zeer belangrijk dat wij dit volhouden en dat wij dit Europees gegeven blijven koesteren.

Ik denk dat het ook belangrijk is naar volgend jaar toe, want wij komen nu opnieuw in een cyclus van landen die begrotingen moeten indienen, landen die specifieke aanbevelingen zullen krijgen; wij moeten wél gedetailleerd en wél duidelijk zijn in de aanbevelingen die wij aan landen doen. Het is heel belangrijk, ook voor die regeringen, dat zij vanuit Europa duidelijke steun krijgen voor de soms moeilijke hervormingen die zij moeten doorvoeren.

Ik ben tot rapporteur benoemd voor de volgende cyclus van het semester en ik kijk er dan ook naar uit om met ieder van u, en ook de Commissie en de Raad, verder samen te werken. Maar ik denk dat wij echt op de ingeslagen weg verder moeten gaan en hopelijk hebben wij dan volgend jaar een sterker economisch herstel dan vandaag.

3-086-000

Philippe Lamberts, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, vous nous dites déjà depuis plusieurs semestres maintenant que vous avez les problématiques sociales vous tiennent à cœur, même en votre qualité de vice-président en charge des affaires économiques et monétaires. Je voudrais simplement vous rappeler qu'un quart des Européens – un quart, un sur quatre, 25 % – sont au seuil de pauvreté ou d'exclusion sociale ou en-dessous, ce qui est un chiffre colossal et qui a, grosso modo, augmenté d'un pour cent par an, c'est-à-dire 5 millions d'Européens en plus par an au seuil de pauvreté et d'exclusion sociale.

Ma question est donc très simple: vous me dites "le semestre comprend une dimension sociale et c'est principalement la dimension de l'emploi". Je vous répons: aujourd'hui, l'emploi est certes absolument essentiel pour l'insertion, mais il n'est plus une garantie pour mener une vie décente. En Allemagne, nous avons sept millions de travailleurs pauvres. L'Allemagne est la championne du taux d'emploi en Europe et, néanmoins, 22 % de sa population est au seuil de pauvreté ou d'exclusion sociale. Ce qui veut dire que l'emploi à lui tout seul ne suffit pas, une stratégie "emploi à tout prix" ne peut répondre seule à la problématique des inégalités.

Je voudrais donc vraiment vous encourager à ce que l'examen annuel de la croissance prévu au mois de novembre et le prochain semestre européen soient beaucoup plus orientés vers la réduction des inégalités.

Dernier point: je suis assez étonné que vous considériez nécessaire d'alléger les contraintes budgétaires sur les États membres quand ils recapitalisent leurs banques mais que vous ne voulez pas les alléger quand les inégalités explosent.

3-087-000

Syed Kamall, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, in the European Semester report, I am pleased to see that Parliament recognises the importance of reform and austerity. But what is austerity? Really, it is politician-speak for what my parents used to call simply living within your means. In my constituency of London, I support a couple of financial education projects such as PFEG and MyBank. But the first lesson of financial education is that you should not spend more money than you have coming in. Yet so many politicians have ignored this very simple rule. We need to relearn these lessons if we are going to fix our economies.

About ten years ago, the German Social Democrat Government introduced Agenda 2010. The German people tightened their belts, and today they are an economic powerhouse. In my own country – the UK – in 2010, the incoming Conservative-led government inherited a situation where one pound in four in taxes was being used to service our debt. We took tough decisions, we capped benefits and we cut the deficit by a third. These were tough decisions, but they also allowed us to cut income tax for 25 million people, create 1.5 million private sector jobs, and start to deliver growth again. However, we still have a long way to go. Before the EU lectures Member States about their budgetary situations, perhaps we should put our own house in order.

One of the reasons why so many people have so little faith in the EU is that we do not practise what we preach. We have a European Parliament that debates energy efficiency yet only last month told MEPs that they would be switching off TVs when we are not here in this building. We have a European Commission which tells countries how to manage their budgets, yet we have not seen the EU accounts signed off for eighteen years. Furthermore, we have a Commission which only two weeks ago told the Parliament that all was fine and now says it will run out of cash within a month. We have to learn to live within our means. Let us complete the single market, and let us cut red tape to allow companies to create jobs and sustainable growth.

3-088-000

Marisa Matias, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Senhor Presidente, seria injusta se não reconhecesse que há propostas positivas incluídas neste relatório. Mas seria igualmente irresponsável se o isolasse da política económica europeia. Os regulamentos até agora adotados configuram o que é a visão das instituições europeias em matéria de resposta à crise e, convenhamos, essa resposta tem sido um fracasso total e é por isso que, em face deste descalabro, o relatório tira conclusões ambíguas, diz uma coisa e o seu contrário. Ficámos reféns dos chavões e das vacuidades.

A austeridade é a verdadeira política desta União, o balanço da política faz-se a si mesmo e não podemos ignorar a realidade dos números. Em Portugal, a dívida aumentou 33 pontos percentuais em três anos de austeridade. É a isto que chamamos ajustamento? O ajustamento que tivemos foi 6 pontos percentuais em três anos de recessão e foram mais 320 mil desempregados em três anos de recessão. O ajustamento que faz falta é o da política económica que tem produzido estes resultados. O que é um desastre não é a política de

comunicação da troica, como se afirma no relatório, o que o desastre é a política da troica, ponto final.

Diz a Comissão que a competitividade não pode ser só pelos custos, mas a única política que conhecemos nos países ditos deficitários é a do massacre salarial. Diz a Comissão que é necessário promover o investimento e proteger as PME, mas continua a injetar rios de dinheiro nos mercados financeiros. Incompetência, insensibilidade e hipocrisia, este é o retrato da resposta da Comissão e dos governos à crise da zona euro.

A situação das economias periféricas é dramática e mostra que o tempo da tibieza e do debate sobre as escolhas da União Europeia está esgotado. A direita está a destruir a Europa. Eu não compactuo com consensos podres em vez de uma posição firme aos descabros desta política. Eu não serei cúmplice desta estratégia da direita.

3-089-000

Claudio Morganti, *a nome del gruppo EFD*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo di aver trovato una soluzione che potrebbe far risparmiare centinaia di milioni di euro ai cittadini europei: eliminare le elezioni politiche negli Stati membri.

La mia, ovviamente, è una provocazione, ma nei fatti mi sembra di vedere che tutte le misure di politica economica, sociale e fiscale sono ormai decise dai funzionari di Bruxelles, anche se non ho capito bene quale sia il loro mandato.

Dobbiamo essere onesti nei confronti dei nostri cittadini. Le loro scelte non contano ormai più niente, la democrazia è un concetto che viene lentamente superato. Noi siamo stati eletti per rappresentare le persone che ci hanno dato fiducia e io vorrei che ci fosse ancora spazio per portare le loro istanze e difendere i loro interessi. Siamo quasi in un regime di dittatura europea, con vincoli rigidissimi e indicazioni da rispettare alla lettera.

Mi auguro che i cittadini si ribellino già a partire dalle prossime elezioni europee e speriamo in una ribellione democratica, altrimenti credo che vedremo tanta gente nelle strade a combattere per riconquistarsi quella democrazia che l'Europa sta loro negando. I popoli vi odiano.

3-090-000

Auke Zijlstra (NI). - Voorzitter, de lidstaten hebben in artikel 5 van het Verdrag afgesproken om hun economisch beleid te coördineren, dit met het oog op het functioneren van de interne markt. De eurogroep heeft afgesproken om geen excessieve tekorten te hebben, dit met het oog op de houdbaarheid van de euro.

Maar wat wij niet hebben afgesproken is om de sociale politiek te coördineren, laat staan om dat centraal aan te gaan sturen, iets wat het Europees Parlement nu wil. Dat is een illegale politiek, en ook nog eens onverstandige politiek. Decennia van socialistisch beleid hebben het overheidsaandeel in de totale economie al tot onhoudbare hoogten gebracht en de belastingen om dat beleid te betalen knijpen het leven uit iedere economie. Het wordt ondertussen een gewoonte dat zowel de Europese Commissie als het Europees Parlement het Verdrag negeren. Men heeft voortdurend ideetjes die in de lidstaten slecht vallen, maar die Brussel toch wil doorzetten.

Als dit Parlement al tot iets moet oproepen, dan is dat tot een kleine overheid, kleine schulden, lage belastingen. Dat, Voorzitter, is het recept voor herstel van economische groei. En dan hebben wij dat Europees economisch semester helemaal niet meer nodig!

3-091-000

Corien Wortmann-Kool (PPE). - Het economisch herstel in Europa wint langzaam aan kracht. De storm van de crisis is gaan liggen, ook mede dankzij het nieuwe economisch bestuur waar ook dit Parlement een belangrijke rol in heeft gespeeld.

Maar, Voorzitter, de urgentie is nog steeds hoog, want het niveau van werkeloosheid in de lidstaten is onacceptabel. Dus voor herstel van vertrouwen is ook voldoende actie en *commitment* van de lidstaten nodig, die zich daarin gesteund moeten weten door hun parlementen.

De aanbevelingen die de Commissie heeft gedaan voor structurele hervormingen van de begroting van publieke diensten, van de arbeidsmarkt, zijn cruciaal. Want voor onze fractie, de PPE-Fractie, is een sociaal Europa een Europa dat banen biedt. En wat zien wij te vaak in de lidstaten? Dat gekozen wordt voor de korte termijn, voor lastenverzwaringen om de begroting voor het komend jaar op orde te brengen. Dat biedt echter geen perspectief voor solide groei. Dat kóst banen in plaats van dat het banen oplevert.

Commissaris Rehn, ik wil u aanmoedigen om in de beoordeling van de begrotingen komende maand goed te kijken naar de meerjarenplannen. Worden er voldoende structurele maatregelen genomen? Is er sprake van afbouw van de schuldenberg, want die kost onacceptabel veel rente en dat is kostbaar belastinggeld, van het op orde brengen van de concurrentiekracht. Kijk niet alleen naar de cijfertjes voor het volgend jaar, maar toets de begroting op de vraag of er voortgang wordt geboekt, of de lidstaten echt duurzaam en blijvend in de richting van economische groei gaan. Want wat wij nodig hebben is een gezonde voedingsbodem voor ons midden- en kleinbedrijf, voor onze banenmotor. Dat gaat ons de banen bieden die nodig zijn om de jeugd, die nu aan de kant staat, aan een baan te helpen.

3-092-000

Mojca Kleva Kekuš (S&D). - Razpravljamo o odličnem poročilu kolegice Ferreira, ki ugotavlja, da smo bili v zadnjem letu priča izboljšavam v samem procesu evropskega semestra, tako s strani Komisije kot nacionalnih parlamentov in Sveta.

Pozdravljam predvsem spoznanje, da je potrebno umiriti tempo izvajanja varčevalnih ukrepov in se osredotočiti v naložbe in konkurenčnost, da bi stabilizirali euroobmočje in Evropsko unijo na splošno.

Danes smo soočeni s počasnim, krhkim okrevanjem in veliko dela je še vedno potrebnega, da bodo investicijski programi v Evropski uniji, kot so na primer instrumenti za konkurenčnost in delovna mesta, prišli s papirjev v dejanja.

Predvsem pa je izjemnega pomena, da se v makroekonomski politiki euroobmočja in celotni EU ne izpostavlja in govori le o napakah držav s primanjkljaji, ampak tudi o ravnovesjih med državami članicami s primanjkljaji in tistimi, ki se na finančnih trgih še vedno praktično zadolžujejo skoraj zastonj.

Tega nam v samem procesu evropskega semestra na žalost še vedno primanjkuje.

3-093-000

Sylvie Goulard (ALDE). - Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je vous remercie, ainsi que Mme Ferreira et tous les rapporteurs, pour ce travail qui montre qu'on progresse. Je crois que le semestre se met en place petit à petit et que, d'une part, les

recommandations sont plus détaillées et, d'autre part, on commence à mieux prendre en compte les questions sociales. Je suis très sensible moi aussi au fait que vous ayez pris en compte la question de la pauvreté, ainsi que l'idée que les efforts doivent être symétriques dans les pays en excédent et dans les pays en déficit.

J'ai toutefois deux soucis. Le premier, c'est l'interdépendance. Je crois qu'il faut aller encore plus loin dans la prise en compte de la vision globale pour l'ensemble de la zone euro. On est un peu trop dans la logique du chacun doit faire ses devoirs à la maison, comme on dit de manière insupportable dans la presse. Il ne s'agit pas de faire ses devoirs, on n'est pas à l'école. Il s'agit d'avoir ensemble une bonne responsabilité pour l'ensemble de la zone.

Deuxièmement, il y a un problème de ce qu'on n'appelle pas en français *ownership*, c'est-à-dire l'appropriation par les autorités nationales et par les citoyens de ce qui est fait au niveau européen. Je ne suis pas d'accord avec l'idée que la Commission aurait été trop intrusive et je vous invite, Monsieur le Commissaire, à faire preuve de la plus extrême fermeté et de faire tout ce que vous demandent le Parlement et les ministres des finances sur la base du *six-pack* et sur la base du *two-pack*. Il faut que vous entriez suffisamment dans les détails pour que les États membres sachent ce qu'ils ont à faire. À eux ensuite de prendre leurs responsabilités.

Dernière chose, sur la troïka. Je n'ai pas de problème avec la politique menée, je dis simplement qu'en termes d'appropriation, il faudrait aussi qu'elle rende beaucoup plus de comptes.

3-094-000

Markus Ferber (PPE). - Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir müssen uns doch einmal real damit beschäftigen, womit wir es wirklich zu tun haben. Wenn ein Privathaushalt dauerhaft mehr Geld ausgibt, als er einnimmt, dann hat er ein Problem. Wenn ein Unternehmen dauerhaft mehr Geld ausgibt, als es einnimmt, hat es ein Problem. Aber bei Staaten soll das plötzlich möglich sein!

Liebe Kolleginnen, liebe Kollegen! Wir sollten doch hier etwas ehrlicher miteinander umgehen. Dauerhaft werden wir den Menschen keine Zukunft anbieten können, wenn nicht staatliche Aufgaben, Einnahmen und Ausgaben miteinander in Einklang gebracht werden können.

Wovor ich wirklich warnen will, ist die Lösung nach dem Motto: Wenn der Mitgliedstaat überfordert ist, dann geben wir das einfach auf die europäische Ebene. Da haben wir einen anderen Finanztopf, da haben wir andere Verantwortlichkeiten, da können wir alles hindelegieren. Das ist keine Lösung. Sie ist weder im Interesse der Bürgerinnen und Bürger noch im Interesse des Wirtschaftsstandorts Europa.

Deswegen, Herr Kommissar, ein herzliches Dankeschön an die Kommission, dass sie dieser Verantwortung gerecht wird, dort den Finger in die Wunde zu legen, wo sich Fehlentwicklungen in den Mitgliedstaaten, auch in der mitgliedstaatlichen Verantwortung, abzeichnen. Das ist der ganz entscheidende Punkt bei der Diskussion des Europäischen Semesters.

Wenn wir etwas miteinander hier in diesem Hause erreicht haben, dann doch das, dass wir nicht mehr erst hinterher die Haushalte anschauen, wie es im alten Stabilitäts- und Wachstumspakt war, sondern dass wir frühzeitig Fehlentwicklungen aufdecken wollen, damit es gar nicht zu den Problemen kommt, die wir leider erleben mussten. Deswegen

ein ganz herzliches Dankeschön, dass dieser Verantwortung hier wirklich Genüge getan wird.

Wir sollten hier auch selber einen Beitrag dazu leisten. Wenn wir den Erfolg Europas wollen, führt an diesem Weg des Europäischen Semesters und der Verpflichtung der Mitgliedstaaten, die eingegangenen Verpflichtungen auch umzusetzen, kein Weg vorbei. Ansonsten fahren wir an die Wand mit diesem Kontinent. Das sollten wir vermeiden!

3-095-000

Sergio Gutiérrez Prieto (S&D). - Señor Presidente, señor Rehn, ¿qué nos ha querido vender hoy aquí? ¿La recuperación? ¿Lo acertado de su estrategia? Más palabras de autocomplacencia, señor Rehn, que se ven superadas por una realidad que cada año se recrudece más.

Porque, señor Comisario, ustedes están empezando a crear un discurso de la recuperación sobre la base de unos datos de crecimiento que nos prometieron ya hace tiempo. ¿O no es verdad, señor Rehn, que usted, hace ya dos años, nos dijo que, en 2012, creceríamos al 0,4 % cuando volvimos a caer en la recesión? ¿O no es verdad que también prometió para este año un crecimiento del 1,4 % cuando, en realidad, lo vamos a hacer con tasas tres veces inferiores? ¿O no es acaso verdad que no ha acertado en ninguna de sus previsiones sobre Italia, Grecia, España o Portugal, cuando negaba los efectos de los multiplicadores fiscales?

No, señor Rehn, usted no puede liderar un discurso de la recuperación porque usted lidera la cara de un fracaso económico y social. Porque lo importante, señor Rehn, no es solo que la tasa de crecimiento sea más débil y más lenta de lo que había prometido; lo importante es todo lo que estamos dejando en el camino para conseguir ese crecimiento aplicando sus recomendaciones por país, ese doble mantra de austeridad y de reformas estructurales.

Porque sí, señor Rehn, suben las bolsas de valores pero bajan los salarios de los trabajadores. Se disminuyen los déficits comerciales pero se multiplican las divergencias económicas y sociales. Ganamos en competitividad, pero no porque seamos más innovadores o más productivos sino porque estamos derrumbando nuestro modelo social.

Y sí, señor Rehn, bajan las primas de riesgo pero aumentan, sin ninguna duda, los niveles de euroescepticismo y de eurofobia. Usted, señor Rehn, una vez más, no nos ha hablado de indicadores sociales ni de estabilizadores automáticos europeos ni de los destrozos de las reformas laborales en la calidad del empleo o en las prestaciones sociales. No nos ha hablado, en ningún momento, del exilio económico en que viven millones de jóvenes europeos. No nos ha hablado de las verdaderas consecuencias...

(El Presidente retira la palabra al orador)

3-096-000

Marianne Thyssen (PPE). - Het budgettair en sociaal-economisch beleidskader dat wij de laatste jaren hebben ontwikkeld, is indrukwekkend. Maar alles kan beter en dat geldt ook voor de uitvoering van de landenspecifieke afspraken die het voorwerp zijn van dit verslag.

De pijnpunten in de verschillende lidstaten zijn blootgelegd, maar met de indicaties gebeurt nog te weinig. Meer is nodig om de prille hervatting van de groei sterker te maken. Het is geen tijd om op onze lauweren te rusten. Een van de remedies tegen die nog té zwakke

resultaten kan worden gevonden door in de lidstaten meer draagvlak voor de landenspecifieke aanbevelingen te creëren en dat kan door:

- 1) iedereen duidelijk te maken dat de lidstaten zichzelf geëngageerd hebben, én in het *six pack* en in het *two pack* én in Europa 2020, enerzijds, én ook in de formulering van de landenspecifieke afspraken, anderzijds.
- 2) het betrekken van de nationale parlementen, en
- 3) het beter expliciteren van de sociale dimensie van de Economische en Monetaire Unie en waar mogelijk een goed overleg met het sociaal middenveld.

Voorzitter, ook de status van de aanbevelingen moet voor iedereen duidelijker zijn. Zij zijn niet vrijblijvend, maar het zijn evenmin oekazen. Zij leggen weliswaar doelstellingen vast, maar zij laten een beleidsmarge open voor de lidstaten wat instrumenten voor methodes en implementatie betreft.

Voorzitter, collega's, althans degenen die mij nog horen: wat wij ook nodig hebben is een mentaliteitsverandering. Lidstaten zien die jaarlijkse aanbevelingen nog té veel als kritiek, terwijl zij net bedoeld zijn om hen te helpen het juiste te doen, in het belang van de Unie in haar geheel, maar ook in het belang van de eigen mensen in de lidstaat in het bijzonder. Laat ons in de juiste richting verder evolueren en samen sterker worden om op duurzame wijze te gaan voor méér groei en goede banen.

3-097-000

Άννυ Ποδηματά (S&D). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, θέλω πρώτα από όλα να ευχαριστήσω και να συγχαρώ την εισηγήτρια, την κυρία Ferreira, για την εξαιρετική δουλειά της. Θα ασχοληθώ μόνο με ένα σημείο της έκθεσής της που το θεωρώ εξαιρετικά επίκαιρο και σημαντικό. Πρόκειται για το θέμα του εκδημοκρατισμού της οικονομικής διακυβέρνησης. Πρόκειται για ένα θέμα που αφορά όλους αλλά αφορά ασφαλώς πολύ περισσότερο τις χώρες που εφαρμόζουν πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής υπό την εποπτεία της Τρόικα. Είναι ένα θέμα που υπογράμμισε και η κυρία Goulard στην εισήγησή της πριν από λίγο, διότι, ακόμη και αν εκσυγχρονίσουμε τους θεσμούς και τα εργαλεία της οικονομικής διακυβέρνησης, εάν επιμένουμε να αγνοούμε το διευρυνόμενο αίσθημα επιβολής που έχουν οι πολίτες, τότε τα προβλήματα θα ανακυκλώνονται.

Κύριε Αντιπρόεδρε, έχουμε ζητήσει κατ' επανάληψη να συμπεριλάβετε τις χώρες που εφαρμόζουν πρόγραμμα προσαρμογής στις συστάσεις ανά χώρα προκειμένου να δημιουργηθεί επιτέλους ένα πλαίσιο διαλόγου και ανοικτής δημοκρατικής αξιολόγησης των εφαρμοζόμενων και προτεινόμενων πολιτικών. Είναι προτιμότερο αυτό από το να στέλνουμε συνεχώς αντιφατικά και αντικρουόμενα μηνύματα μέσω διαρροών ή δηλώσεων, όπως συνέβη πρόσφατα πάλι με την Ελλάδα.

3-098-000

Pablo Zalba Bidegain (PPE). - Señor Presidente, tras cinco años de crisis económica empezamos a ver señales positivas en nuestra economía. Esto se debe a los importantes procesos de reformas emprendidos por los Estados miembros y también a los procesos de consolidación fiscal. Esto ha generado una confianza que hace dos años no existía. Y esta confianza se debe también a que hemos sentado las bases de una verdadera unión económica y monetaria. Por eso este informe del Semestre Europeo es tan importante y me gustaría destacar el trabajo de la ponente, Elisa Ferreira, de los ponentes alternativos y de la Comisión Europea.

Pero también esta confianza se debe a la unión bancaria, que ayudará a desfragmentar los mercados financieros y a que el crédito llegue a las pequeñas y medianas empresas, porque sin crédito no se consolidará la recuperación económica. Tenemos que seguir trabajando. Ha sido una buena noticia que el Consejo haya aprobado el mecanismo único de supervisión, pero tenemos que seguir trabajando en el mecanismo único de resolución. Además, hace falta también —como se ha destacado en esta Cámara— mayor legitimidad democrática en todo el proceso. Y, por último, me gustaría también destacar la necesidad de emprender políticas activas para combatir el desempleo juvenil, esa lacra que asola a muchos países de Europa.

3-099-000

Alfredo Pallone (PPE). - Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, mi complimento con la relatrice e con i relatori ombra perché questo è un dossier che ha aperto un grande dibattito non soltanto fra i partiti politici, ma anche all'interno di essi.

È stato un grande foro di discussione. Ora, a prescindere dal Semestre, dalle raccomandazioni della Commissione e dalle azioni intraprese dai governi nazionali, penso che questo Parlamento debba discutere seriamente su come pensare e su cosa vogliamo da questa Europa. Tutti siamo d'accordo sull'importanza di dotarsi di finanze pubbliche stabili, ma fino a che punto siamo disposti a un ragionamento solo sui bilanci in ragione della stabilità fiscale, senza pensare allo sviluppo, all'occupazione e quindi anche agli investimenti?

In Europa, alcune riforme sono ormai inderogabili e non possiamo perdere altro tempo. Mi riferisco esattamente alla riforma dell'Unione bancaria, dove abbiamo seri problemi per le imprese e con il *credit crunch*, che sta soffocando le imprese in Europa. La crescita e i paesi in difficoltà devono essere al centro dei nostri dibattiti.

Dobbiamo agire su due assi. Il primo: responsabilità dei conti pubblici; il secondo: solidarietà europea. Dalla crisi si esce solo con un'Europa solidale, costruendo un'Europa dei popoli.

3-100-000

Olli Rehn, *Vice-President of the Commission* . – Mr President, first of all, many thanks for a very substantive and serious debate. Parliament has a very important role in the context of the European Semester and coordination of our economic policies. I am pleased to say that I will be back soon in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) and also in the plenary to discuss this further, but I want to thank you for this debate today.

I just want to make two or three comments on some of the key issues that Members raised in the course of today's debate. First, concerning the social dimension in the Economic Semester raised by the rapporteur Ms Ferreira, by Ms Cornelissen, Ms Goulard, Ms Matias and several others. You can rest assured that the Commission is laying a lot of stress on the social dimension, and this will be reflected in the next Alert Mechanism Report and in particular in the in-depth reviews of Member States. Beyond this, the Commission is proposing to create a scoreboard to follow key employment and social development indicators.

As Mr Gauzès said, the reinforced economic governance is having an effect and supporting consistent – not excessively hasty, but consistent – consolidation of public finances. We see that fiscal deficits are coming down and the credibility of the fiscal policy of Member States is indeed improving. I also want to draw your attention to the fact that the number

of Member States outside the excessive deficit procedure (EDP) was only three out of 27 two years ago. Today, 12 are outside it. This is not great and we should not shout for victory, but it is undeniably progress and shows that we are making progress in ensuring the sustainability of public finances. To Ms Trautmann I would say that the Commission has informed the Member States how productive public investments that support sustainable growth can be accommodated within our fiscal rules.

Finally, to Mr De Backer, who said – like Mr Gauzès – that reinforced economic governance has had an effect on economic policies, I would say that I believe this has been proved, for instance, in the Member State you know best, Mr De Backer. Belgium's fiscal policy is today clearly on a more sustainable footing than it was two years ago, when the country had been without a proper government for two years. I see too, in a very similar way, that it is about partnership. We need to support the EU Member States as they undertake often very difficult reforms to modernise and reform our social market economies.

I would like to return to the plenary debate at some point when more attention is being paid, and I would like to return to the ECON Committee.

3-101-000

Vytautas Leškevičius, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, being aware of the many roads ahead of you, I will be very short. First, while we continue to call the Semester a 'semester', in fact it has become a continuous exercise where the European and national phases overlap. Certainly, for a whole European Semester to be successful, I would like to stress again that we must put more emphasis on the implementation of policy advice, as many speakers have suggested during this debate. This in turn calls for a broader engagement of all the relevant actors in the whole process. Thirdly, it also calls for a strong message at European level from all the institutions.

To conclude, I am happy that the Council's and this Parliament's views are so close to one another on this particular issue, and I look forward to continuing this dialogue with you as we proceed towards the 2014 semester.

3-102-000

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet heute, 28. Oktober 2013, im Anschluss an diese Aussprache statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149 GO)

3-103-000

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), *raštu*. – Dėl ekonomikos ir finansų krizės padėtis Europos darbo rinkoje vis dar labai įtempta: ir toliau didėja bedarbių gretos, ypač jaunimo tarpe, gilėja socialinė atskirtis. Atsižvelgiant į šias aplinkybes, kova su nedarbu turi būti vienas svarbiausių Europos Sąjungos ir valstybių narių politikos prioritetų. Taigi, Europos Parlamentas ragina Komisiją ir valstybes nares užtikrinti, kad jos politikos gairėse ir konkrečiai šaliai skirtose rekomendacijose būtų toliau suteikiama kuo didesnė socialinė apsauga, kuri yra Europos socialinio modelio neatsiejama dalis, ir kad darbo rinkos reformomis būtų siekiama kokybiško darbo, geresnio socialinės rizikos valdymo, didesnio pažeidžiamų grupių įtraukimo į darbo rinką, skurdo darbe mažinimo, lyčių lygybės skatinimo. Be to, būtina skatinti sveikatą ir saugą darbe, stiprinti darbuotojų, dirbančių pagal netipines darbo sutartis, teises ir užtikrinti didesnę savarankiškai dirbančiųjų socialinę

apsaugą. Norėčiau dar kartą pabrėžti, kad bedarbių jaunų žmonių padėtis yra ypač rimta ir turime kuo skubiau imtis veiksmų, pavyzdžiui, sudaryti Europos jaunimo užimtumo paktą, pagal kurį būtų pradėtos įgyvendinti priemonės, dėl kurių seniai susitarta, taip pat skirti papildomų lėšų bei parengti naujas priemones jaunimo nedarbo problemai spręsti, mažinant niekur nedirbančio, nesimokančio ir profesiniame mokyme nedalyvaujančio jaunimo (NEET) skaičių ir jaunų žmonių skurdą.

3-104-000

Zuzana Brzobohatá (S&D), *písemně*. – V květnu Evropská komise zveřejnila doporučení jednotlivým státům Evropské unie, ve kterých Evropská komise shrnuje opatření na překonávání krize v jednotlivých státech. Tato opatření se vztahují na detailní analýzu situace každého státu a obsahují návrhy politik pro vlády jednotlivých států s výhledem na růst, konkurenceschopnost a vytváření nových pracovních míst v letech 2013 a 2014. Zpráva vítá doporučení Komise a zdůrazňuje skutečnost, že se Komise a Rada snaží neuplatňovat univerzální přístup a zajistit, aby doporučení citlivě zohledňovala specifika a potřeby jednotlivých států. Poté, co vstoupil v platnost balíček dvou právních aktů (Two-pack), doporučení Komise mají větší význam a domnívám se, že v současné ekonomické situaci Evropské unie je prohloubená spolupráce jednotlivých členských států Evropské unie a lepší koordinace jejich hospodářských politik důležitá. Zdůrazňuji přitom ale, že evropská konkurenceschopnost se nemůže zakládat pouze na škrtech, ale také na investicích ve prospěch podpory růstu a zvýšení zaměstnanosti, zejména zaměstnanosti mladých.

3-105-000

George Sabin Cutaș (S&D), *in scris*. – Semestrul european a fost conceput cu scopul de a coordona eforturile statelor membre de a formula și implementa politici de creștere economică și de creare de noi locuri de muncă. În cadrul recomandărilor Comisiei Europene pentru 2013, toate statele membre au primit sugestii cu privire la gradul de participare pe piața muncii. Din păcate, numărul șomerilor din Uniunea Europeană, în special în rândul tinerilor, înregistrează cifre tot mai mari de la un an la altul. În ceea ce privește România, rata șomajului în rândul tinerilor a fost de 22,7 % în 2012. În același timp, 40,3 % din populația României este expusă, conform ultimelor statistici disponibile, riscului de sărăcie și de excludiune socială, raportat la media europeană de 24,2 %. În acest context, doresc să pledez pentru o finanțare europeană care să contribuie la combaterea șomajului și a excludiunii sociale și, implicit, la depășirea decalajelor sociale și economice dintre statele membre.

3-106-000

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – O Semestre Europeu foi apresentado como um mecanismo de coordenação das políticas económicas e financeiras dos diferentes Estados-Membros. Porque a *coordenação* não é um fim em si mesma, interessa ver qual o conteúdo das políticas que se querem *coordenar*. Este não é mais do que um mecanismo para amarrar cada país a um caminho de retrocesso civilizacional, de ataque a direitos, de nivelamento por baixo das condições de vida e de trabalho na Europa. Um expediente que envolve o esvaziamento das instituições de soberania nacionais, democraticamente legitimadas, que pretendem transformar em mero verbo-de-encher, autênticas marionetas do diretório da União Europeia. Pesem os floreios *sociais* que a relatora – significativamente, uma socialista portuguesa - espalha pelo relatório, este *acolhe positivamente as recomendações específicas por país apresentadas pela Comissão*. Que recomendações são essas? Vejamos o caso

de Portugal: cumprimento das metas do défice estabelecidas pela troica, reduções suplementares da massa salarial, redução do consumo público, medidas ditas permanentes de *consolidação orçamental*, privatizações, entre outras que tais. Apresenta-se como grande avanço as recomendações para que os países excedentários invistam e aumentem salários, para assim comprarem o produto do trabalho de trabalhadores miseravelmente pagos, em países como Portugal, destinados a uma inserção cada vez mais subordinada e periférica no processo de divisão internacional do trabalho.

3-106-500

Evelyn Regner (S&D), *schriftlich*. – Herr Präsident! Ein ausgewogener Haushalt kann nicht durch einseitige Sparmaßnahmen erzielt werden! Der Bericht von meiner Kollegin Elisa Ferreira enthält viele gute Vorschläge und zeigt auf, dass die harte Sparpolitik in eine Sackgasse führt und keinen Ausweg aus der Krise darstellt. Das Bekenntnis zu einer gestärkten, sozialen Europäischen Union erweist sich durch konkrete Taten! Beim EU-Gipfel im Juni letzten Jahres wurde der Wachstums- und Beschäftigungspakt mit einem Gesamtvolumen von 120 Mrd. Euro beschlossen. Von diesen 120 Mrd. wurde jedoch bis jetzt nur ein Bruchteil für Wachstum und Beschäftigung ausgegeben. Wenn wir die soziale Spaltung in der EU verhindern wollen, brauchen wir konkrete und rasch umsetzbare Investitionsmaßnahmen! Was ich an dieser Stelle noch einmal ausdrücklich betonen möchte, ist die Rolle der Europäischen Sozialpartner und deren Einbindung in die wirtschafts- und beschäftigungspolitische Koordinierung. Weder im Rahmen des Europäischen Semesters noch in zukünftigen Gremien darf die Rolle der Sozialpartner untergraben werden. Eine vertiefte wirtschaftspolitische Steuerung kann nur mit mehr Demokratie und Solidarität gewährleistet werden. Damit meine ich die Mitwirkung und Kontrolle des Europäischen Parlaments, der nationalen Parlamente und die bessere Einbindung der Europäischen Sozialpartner in das Europäische Semester.

3-106-750

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE), *na piśmie*. – Europejski semestr, czyli europejski okres oceny i koordynacji polityki gospodarczej, został ustanowiony na mocy jednego z rozporządzeń sześciopaku w listopadzie 2011 r. Stanowi on podstawowe ramy wzmocnionego zarządzania gospodarczego w UE. Ma on na celu łączyć działania przewidziane w strategii „Europa 2020” oraz w tzw. pakcie euro plus. Obecnie mamy już czwarty cykl europejskiego semestru. Należy podkreślić, że priorytety przedstawione przez Komisję w ramach europejskiego semestru są podobne do tych z lat ubiegłych, tj. m.in. kontynuacja zróżnicowanej i pro wzrostowej konsolidacji fiskalnej, promocja wzrostu gospodarczego i konkurencyjności, zwalczanie bezrobocia i następstw społecznych kryzysu, poprawa funkcjonowania administracji publicznej. Co istotne, w tym roku widoczne są już pewne oznaki poprawy w europejskiej gospodarce. Pograżone w kryzysie kraje strefy euro, które podjęły trudne reformy, powoli opanowują sytuację. Zmniejsza się ich nierównowaga w kontaktach gospodarczych i rośnie konkurencyjność. To z kolei ma przełożenie na powolny powrót zaufania rynków finansowych i malejące koszty finansowania długu.

3-107-000

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME ISABELLE DURANT*Vice-présidente***9. Modification de l'ordre du jour**

3-109-000

La Présidente. - Monsieur Schlyter, vous voulez soulever une motion d'ordre?

3-110-000

Carl Schlyter (Verts/ALE). - Madam President, the electronic link between the amendments to the budget did not work in the system when we prepared the vote today. Only having paper copies makes it extremely difficult to find the right amendment corresponding to the right vote in the budget, since they are not in numerical order. In future, I would very much appreciate it if Parliament could have two sets of amendments: one in numerical order and one in the current order. Otherwise it is almost impossible for anybody not on the Committee on Budgets quickly to find each vote linked to each amendment.

3-111-000

La Présidente. - En effet, il y a bien eu quelques problèmes techniques, mais ce sera pris en compte dans les votes.

3-112-000

Ashley Fox (ECR). - Madam President, with the agreement of all the political groups I propose that tomorrow's session start at 08.30 to allow sufficient time to debate Draft Amending Budget No 6.

3-113-000

La Présidente. - Vous avez raison et ce sera mis en œuvre par les services demain à 8 h 30.

10. Composition des commissions et des délégations : voir procès-verbal**11. Heure des votes**

3-116-000

La Présidente. - L'ordre du jour appelle l'Heure des votes.

Je vous demande, chers collègues, d'être efficaces. Il y a beaucoup de votes. Avec de la discipline, nous pourrons avancer rapidement.

11.1. Projet de budget général de l'Union européenne pour l'exercice 2014 - toutes sections (vote)

3-118-000

- Avant le vote

3-119-000

Anne E. Jensen, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, I have a declaration to make prior to the budget vote. There are always some technical issues that we need to vote on in advance, and I will ask you to listen very carefully because I will say this just once.

(Laughter)

The only reference document for the figures is Doc. 6. In the case of amendments covering several budget lines, the vote refers to all the lines covered by them. There are errors in four amendments which need to be corrected.

Amendment 1083 on Item 16 03 01 01 – ‘Multimedia actions’: the amount for payment appropriations should read ‘EUR 29.895 million’ and not ‘EUR 29.395 million’.

In Amendment 1234 concerning the establishment plan for the EFSA Agency, the total for AST posts should read: ‘112’ instead of ‘110’, making a total of five permanent and 344 temporary agents, taking the overall total to 349 instead of 347.

Amendment 1238 concerning the establishment plan for the ACER Agency: the total for AD posts should read ‘73’ instead of ‘74’, making a grand total therefore of 96.

Amendment 1063 concerning a new line on the actual and desired state of the economic potential in regions outside the Greek capital Athens: this amendment refers to a new preparatory action and not a pilot project.

Then there were two amendments adopted within the incorrect MFF headings, so they should be changed as follows:

Amendment 1153 – ‘Preparatory action – E-Platform for Neighbourhood’ should be included in heading 1A and not heading 4.

Amendment 1078 – ‘Pilot Project – Your Europe Travel (YET) Application for Mobile Devices’ should be included in heading 2 and not heading 3.

Then there are two amendments on existing pilot projects that must be withdrawn and replaced with amendments to create new preparatory action lines. These are Amendment 1075 – ‘Preparatory action – Healthy diet: early years and ageing population’, and Amendment 1087 – ‘Preparatory action – Funding for the rehabilitation of victims of torture’.

Finally, to avoid duplication, technical corrections will need to be made to modify the budget line references of a number of new lines, mainly pilot projects and preparatory actions proposed in our amendments.

Parliament’s position does not take into account this year’s Amending Letter No 2 to the 2014 budget, adopted by the Commission on 16 October, which will be integrated during the conciliation. Thank you for your attention and I will ask for these proposals to be supported by the House.

3-120-000

La Présidente. - Je mets ces modifications techniques aux voix.

C’est adopté.

3-121-000

Lucas Hartong (NI). - Als lid van de Begrotingscommissie heb ik al deze enorme wijzigingen aangehoord en dan vraag ik mij als lid van deze Begrotingscommissie af waar wij de afgelopen dagen ... (*tumult*).

3-122-000

La Présidente. - Nous avons compris que vous trouviez ces descriptifs un petit peu longs, mais nous avançons.

3-123-000

Derek Roland Clark (EFD). - Madam President, I listened very carefully (or as carefully as I could) to what the rapporteur was saying on the various amendments to the amendments, but since our voting lists are not in numerical order of amendments it was impossible to follow, and we still do not know what those amendment alterations are. How can we possibly vote in that light?

3-124-000

La Présidente. - C'est ainsi qu'il est procédé à chaque fois. Nous poursuivons.

- À l'issue du vote

3-125-000

Alain Lamassoure (PPE), *Président de la commission BUDG.* – Merci Madame le Président, avant que le président du Conseil ne prenne la parole, je voudrais m'adresser à lui et au nouveau commissaire au budget, que je félicite de sa promotion. Je voudrais féliciter les deux rapporteurs, Giovanni La Via et Monika Hohlmeier, et remercier l'ensemble des collègues pour ces votes massifs.

Je me tourne à présent vers la présidence. Ce vote impressionnant est le plus fort des messages adressés au Conseil. Demain, ce Parlement votera sur un budget rectificatif pour sauver la Commission d'une panne complète de trésorerie. L'Union n'est pas menacée de shut down, contrairement à ce qui a été dit assez maladroitement du côté de la Commission. Mais elle n'est plus capable d'honorer ses engagements.

Le vote d'aujourd'hui ouvre donc une négociation budgétaire jumbo, qui va porter dans le mois qui vient sur le cadre pluriannuel, sur les paiements 2013 et sur le budget 2014. Chacun devra prendre ses responsabilités. Si le Conseil refuse de rétablir le milliard d'euros supplémentaire que nous venons d'adopter, l'Union ne sera plus seulement en panne de trésorerie, elle sera en cessation de paiement l'année prochaine. Aucun membre de ce Parlement ici présent ne peut accepter de laisser à ses successeurs une Union en cessation de paiement.

3-126-000

Algimantas Rimkūnas, *President-in-Office of the Council.* – Madam President, Parliament has just adopted amendments to the Council's position on the Draft budget for 2014. Consequently, in my capacity as President of the Council, I agree that the President of the European Parliament should convene the Conciliation Committee, as required by Article 314(4)(c) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

11.2. Projet de budget général de l'Union européenne pour l'exercice 2014 - toutes sections (A7-0328/2013 - Monika Hohlmeier, Anne E. Jensen) (vote)

11.3. Connaissance du milieu marin 2020 (A7-0295/2013 - Maria do Céu Patrão Neves) (vote)

11.4. Application et respect des règles du commerce international (A7-0308/2013 - Niccolò Rinaldi) (vote)

3-130-000

- Avant le vote sur la proposition législative:

3-131-000

Niccolò Rinaldi, *relatore*. – Signora Presidente, naturalmente ringrazio i relatori ombra, con i quali abbiamo lavorato in modo spedito per questo regolamento – molto atteso da chiunque faccia parte del commercio internazionale da parte europea – proprio per cercare di dotarci in tempi rapidi di queste misure di risposta a chi viola i patti commerciali nei confronti dell'Unione europea.

Propongo di posticipare il voto sulla risoluzione legislativa in modo da poter entrare in trilogio quanto prima.

3-132-000

(La proposition de renvoi en commission est adoptée)

11.5. Commerce des précurseurs des drogues entre la Communauté et les pays tiers (A7-0167/2013 - Franck Proust) (vote)

11.6. Fonds européen pour les affaires maritimes et la pêche (A7-0282/2013 - Alain Cadec) (vote)

3-134-001

- Avant le vote:

3-135-000

Lucas Hartong (NI). - Ik dacht dat de heer Schulz bij een van de vorige grote stemmingen had gezegd dat wij neit meer over tientallen pagina's met amendementen zouden stemmen; helaas kan ikzelf als niet-fractiegebonden lid niet om terugverwijzing naar de commissie vragen, maar misschien kan één van de collega's dat wél, want dit is werkelijk te gek!

3-136-000

La Présidente. - Nous prenons bonne note de votre demande.

- Après le vote sur l'amendement 193:

3-137-000

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE). - Le vote n'était pas clair, je vous demande de le reprendre, car c'était un peu confus.

3-138-000

(La demande est retenue)

- Avant le vote sur l'amendement 538:

3-139-000

Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE). - Madam President, I wish to move an oral amendment to 538 to include the words 'other stakeholders'. Doing so would more accurately reflect the current members of the advisory councils. I think most Members will know that it is absolutely essential to include all of them.

3-140-000

(L'amendement oral est retenu)

- Avant le vote sur l'amendement 570:

3-141-000

Dolores García-Hierro Caraballo (S&D). - Señora Presidenta, hay una enmienda oral que presenta el Grupo S&D: es la 570, referente al arte de pesca extractiva.

3-142-000

- Avant le vote sur l'amendement 570:

3-143-000

Gabriel Mato Adrover (PPE). - Señora Presidenta, es una cuestión de orden. Se ha votado una enmienda oral en el sitio que no es el adecuado. No estábamos hablando en ese momento de esa enmienda. La enmienda oral no era relativa a la enmienda 595, que es la que íbamos a votar ahora, sino posterior. Es la enmienda al artículo 3, apartado 2, después del punto 18. Ese es el momento en el que se planteará la enmienda oral y habrá que decidir si se vota o no, no en este momento, que no tiene nada que ver con esta enmienda.

3-144-000

- Après le vote sur l'amendement 615:

3-145-000

Alain Cadec, rapporteur. - Madame la Présidente, il y a eu confusion tout à l'heure, et le président Mato l'a bien expliqué. Positionné à cet endroit-là, l'amendement ne pose aucun problème. Je remercie quand même mes collègues de s'être levés massivement.

3-146-000

(L'amendement oral est retenu)

- Avant le vote sur l'amendement 189:

3-147-000

Guido Milana (S&D). - Signora Presidente, ritiro l'emendamento orale e do indicazioni al gruppo S&D di votare meno.

3-148-000

(L'amendement oral est retiré)

- Avant le vote sur la proposition de la Commission:

3-149-000

Alain Cadec, *rapporteur*. – Madame la Présidente, je souhaite informer mes collègues que l'adoption de la proposition de la Commission ainsi amendée permet à la commission de la pêche de commencer immédiatement les négociations avec le Conseil.

11.7. Précurseurs de drogues (A7-0153/2013 - Anna Hedh) (vote)

3-151-000

- À l'issue du vote:

3-152-000

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, the Commission would like to thank the rapporteur Ms Hedh for her work and efforts in processing this proposal. In the spirit of compromise and with a view to reaching a first reading agreement, the Commission will not stand in the way of an agreement between institutions and therefore welcomes this compromise package and looks forward to its rapid adoption.

However, the Commission does have concerns over the clearer commitment to reduce fees for SMEs and in particular for microenterprises, and has sent a statement to this effect to Parliament's services for the record of the plenary sitting.

3-153-000

Commission's position on amendments by Parliament

Report: Anna Hedh (A7-0153/2013)

The Commission regrets that the Council did not accept a clearer commitment to reduce fees for SMEs and in particular for micro-enterprises, in line with the objectives of the EU policy for SMEs. However, in a spirit of compromise and in order to conclude the adoption of the amendment, the Commission can agree to the proposed compromise calling on Member States to consider modulating the fees they impose according to company size.

11.8. Conférence sur le changement climatique (B7-0482/2013) (vote)

11.9. Criminalité organisée, corruption et blanchiment de capitaux (A7-0307/2013 - Salvatore Iacolino) (vote)

3-156-000

- Avant le vote sur l'amendement 32:

3-157-000

Marc Tarabella (S&D). - Madame la Présidente, je crois qu'il y a eu une confusion. Vous avez fait vérifier le vote sur l'amendement 68. Or, il était indiqué 32 à l'écran, me semble-t-il. Donc, il faut revoter sur le 68.

3-158-000

(La demande est retenue)

- Avant le vote sur le considérant AY

3-159-000

Salvatore Iacolino (PPE). - Signora Presidente, presento il seguente emendamento orale, da inserire dopo il considerando AY. Il nuovo testo è questo: "considerando che la presente risoluzione rappresenta un atto di indirizzo politico per la futura legislazione della Commissione europea e degli Stati membri;"

3-160-000

(L'amendement oral est retenu)

- Après le vote:

3-161-000

Sonia Alfano (ALDE). - Signora Presidente, sarò veramente molto breve.

Desidero ringraziare il mio gruppo, l'ALDE, che ha creduto in questa missione. Visto che oggi il lavoro della commissione CRIM è concluso, ringrazio tutti i gruppi che hanno creduto in questa impresa, che sembrava ardua, e invece siamo riusciti a condurre, per la prima volta in questo Parlamento, una battaglia seria nei confronti delle mafie e l'indirizzo politico che oggi è stato dato da questo Parlamento è di fondamentale importanza.

Chiedo agli onorevoli colleghi un po' di attenzione.

Ringrazio il relatore, i relatori ombra e i vicepresidenti. Penso che la relazione vada oggi dedicata a tutte le vittime innocenti della mafia: i numerosi magistrati, poliziotti e rappresentanti delle forze dell'ordine, che sono morti in tutti i paesi europei.

Oggi, 23 ottobre, sarà la Giornata europea che d'ora in poi ricorderà tutte le vittime innocenti della mafia e della criminalità organizzata.

11.10. Plan d'action relatif à la justice en ligne (2014-2018) (B7-0465/2013) (vote)

11.11. Politique européenne de voisinage, vers un renforcement du partenariat: position du Parlement européen sur les rapports de suivi de 2012 (B7-0484/2013) (vote)

3-164-000

- Avant le vote sur l'amendement 10:

3-165-000

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (PPE). - Madam President, I am proposing an amendment because the situation has changed and the two Eastern Partnership countries, namely Armenia and Azerbaijan, are no longer seeking association with the European Union. For that reason I propose the following phrasing for this paragraph 16 which you have in your papers – if you wish I can read it – but in fact it eliminates the words about Association Agreements and brings together the first part of this paragraph with the second by adding the words 'should comply with'. If the House would agree to that, it would mean that the split vote

is not necessary – the further vote 1 and 2 is not necessary if this oral amendment eliminating some words and adding three words is accepted. That would fit the factual state of affairs on association.

3-166-000

(L'amendement oral est retenu)

3-167-000

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (PPE). - Madam President, given that the amendment on initialling has been approved by the House – which I am happy with – there is a need to amend paragraph 39 to make it refer to signing an Association Agreement with Georgia. In this new formulation, it would read 'believes that Association Agreement signing should be conditional on tangible progress by Georgia in the area of the rule of law and of democracy and meeting European standards in the upcoming presidential elections'. The words 'is supportive of initialling the Association Agreement but' and 'including the issue of political prisoners' should be deleted. If this is approved, it would imply that in paragraph 40 we are deleting the word 'immediately' to make the whole thing logical.

3-168-000

(L'amendement oral est retenu)

3-169-000

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski (PPE). - Madam President, if I understand properly, my proposal to delete the word 'immediately' from paragraph 40, while now voting in favour of paragraph 40, is accepted in order to make the whole thing logical. I proposed this today while speaking about paragraph 39, but I anticipated that if paragraph 39 in my oral formula is adopted, that would imply that the word 'immediately' will be deleted from paragraph 40.

11.12. Semestre européen pour la coordination des politiques économiques (A7-0322/2013 - Elisa Ferreira) (vote)

3-170-001

- *Après le vote:*

3-171-000

Michael Cashman (S&D). - Madam President, I would like to congratulate you on the brilliant way that you have conducted this mammoth voting session.

(Applause)

11.13. Flux migratoires en Méditerranée, en particulier à la lumière des événements tragiques survenus au large de Lampedusa (RCB7-0474/2013, B7-0474/2013, B7-0475/2013, B7-0476/2013, B7-0477/2013, B7-0478/2013, B7-0479/2013, B7-0480/2013) (vote)

3-172-001

- *Avant le vote:*

3-173-000

Edward McMillan-Scott (ALDE). - Madam President, while I entirely agree with Michael Cashman, let me make the point that we were told by Mr Schulz, back in March after those ridiculous agriculture votes, that this sort of vote would never take place again. I appeal to the group leaders to assume their responsibilities – those who are still here, who have not gone to lunch or to the summit in Brussels – in future. There will be seven sessions here in Strasbourg and one mini plenary in Brussels before the elections. We must properly arrange our voting and our agenda so that we do not have to put you – or anybody else – through this ridiculous charade again.

(Applause)

11.14. Suspension de l'accord SWIFT en raison de la surveillance exercée par la NSA (B7-0471/2013, B7-0472/2013, B7-0481/2013, B7-0467/2013, RCB7-0468/2013, B7-0468/2013) (vote)

3-174-001

- *Avant le vote:*

3-175-000

Manfred Weber (PPE). - Frau Präsidentin, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Nicht wegen des Mittagessens, sondern aus sachlichen Gründen beantragt die EVP, dieses Thema noch einmal zu verschieben, weil wir nächste Woche eine Delegation des Innenausschusses haben, die die Vereinigten Staaten besuchen und vor Ort Gespräche führen wird. Und wir haben einen Untersuchungsausschuss im Europäischen Parlament, der sich mit dieser Frage beschäftigen wird. Wir alle im Haus wollen Klarheit in dieser Fragestellung, aber es sollte zunächst geredet werden, und dann sollten wir entscheiden. Deswegen bitten wir nochmals darum, diesen Antrag noch einmal zu verschieben und die Ergebnisse der Kollegen abzuwarten, wenn sie zurückkommen.

(Beifall)

3-176-000

Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra (PPE). - Señora Presidenta, suscribo, entre otras, la razón que ha dado el señor Weber, porque aún estamos a tiempo de poder hacer una resolución común que refleje el sentir generalizado de la Cámara. Y el aún está subordinado a que acabemos el trabajo de la Comisión Europea, el trabajo de investigación de la comisión del Parlamento y también el trabajo potente, inequívocamente claro, del señor Moraes.

Por eso, señora Presidenta, creo que es mejor tener una voz común, y no una voz parcial, antes de ir el día 28 a Washington. Y, por eso, creo que podemos darnos un margen negociador más amplio, seguramente, quizá, hasta el Pleno de noviembre.

3-177-000

Alexander Graf Lambsdorff (ALDE). - Frau Präsidentin! Ich bin dafür, dass wir jetzt abstimmen. Das Thema ist uns seit Langem bekannt. Ich würde mich auch sehr freuen, wenn wir hier nicht behaupten würden, es gäbe einen Untersuchungsausschuss. Wir haben eine sehr strittige Diskussion dazu gehabt. Es gibt eine Untersuchung durch den Ausschuss

für bürgerliche Freiheiten, weil bestimmte Kollegen gegen einen eigenen Untersuchungsausschuss gestimmt haben – nicht wahr, Kollege Weber?

Und das zweite, was ich sagen möchte: Wenn hier ein Ausschuss nach Washington fährt, dann wäre es schön, wenn er ein starkes Votum dieses Parlaments im Rücken hätte, dass das Verhalten der amerikanischen Behörden in dieser Frage nicht akzeptabel ist.

(Beifall)

3-178-000

(La demande est rejetée)

3-179-000

La Présidente. - Ceci clôt l'Heure des votes.

12. Explications de vote

12.1. Commerce des précurseurs des drogues entre la Communauté et les pays tiers (A7-0167/2013 - Franck Proust)

3-179-750

Explications de vote par écrit

3-179-781

Luís Paulo Alves (S&D), *por escrito*. – Aprovo o presente Relatório, tendo em consideração que os precursores de drogas são substâncias lícitas utilizadas no fabrico de drogas. Até ao presente, os medicamentos têm sido excluídos do âmbito do regulamento. Lamentavelmente, os medicamentos que contêm efedrina e pseudoefedrina, utilizados para tratar a constipação, os sintomas gripais ou as alergias, são desviados para sintetizar meta-anfetaminas. O facto de o regulamento não abranger os medicamentos impossibilita, a meu ver, os Estados-Membros de confiscarem ou intercetarem facilmente os carregamentos de medicamentos contendo efedrina ou pseudoefedrina, sobre os quais recaiam suspeitas de desvio. Sou da opinião, por conseguinte, que os medicamentos sejam incluídos na definição de substâncias inventariadas e que seja criada uma nova categoria de substâncias que permita matizar melhor o controlo aplicável às substâncias inventariadas. Além disso, considero que o facto de a definição de substâncias inventariadas estipular de forma precisa que o precursor tem de ser facilmente extraível da mistura para ser considerado uma substância inventariada contribui para limitar, significativamente, o número de medicamentos que poderiam eventualmente ser considerados substâncias inventariadas e, por conseguinte, o impacto sobre o comércio de medicamentos.

3-179-812

Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), *în scris*. – Deși sunt folosiți într-o serie de ramuri industriale, respectiv în industria farmaceutică, cosmetică, etc., precursorii de droguri pot fi utilizați și la fabricarea ilicită de stupefiante și de substanțe psihotrope. În mod constant, efedrina și pseudoefedrina, substanțe care stau la baza fabricării unor medicamente pentru diverse afecțiuni precum răceala, alergiile, sunt deturnate de către traficanții de droguri de la comerțul legal în vederea fabricării de stupefiante. Mecanismele pentru controlul medicamentelor care conțin efedrină sau pseudoefedrină prevăzute în Regulamentul de

monitorizare a comerțului cu precursori de droguri între Comunitate și țările terțe nu sunt suficiente. Se impunea așadar modificarea prevederilor actualului regulament în vederea, pe de o parte, a îmbunătățirii controlului acestor substanțe și, pe de altă parte, pentru menținerea unei circulații libere a medicamentelor care conțin efedrină sau pseudoefedrină în scopuri legitime între Uniune și țările terțe. Acordul în prima lectură votat astăzi de Parlamentul European va contribui la scăderea numărului tentativelor de deturnare a medicamentelor care conțin efedrină sau pseudoefedrină destinate unor scopuri ilegale. Datorită îmbunătățirii cadrului legislativ european în vigoare, autoritățile competente din statele membre nu vor mai fi nevoite să se bazeze pe legislații naționale diferite, atunci când acestea există, pentru a intercepta sau confisca astfel de produse.

3-179-815

Sophie Auconie (PPE), *par écrit*. – Dans le cadre de la lutte contre les narcotrafiquants, j'ai voté pour ce projet de résolution législative qui permettra plus de réactivité et d'efficacité dans l'encadrement du commerce des précurseurs de drogue entre l'UE et les pays tiers. Les précurseurs de drogue sont des produits licites qui sont utilisés dans la fabrication de la drogue, par leur commerce et par conséquent soumis à un contrôle lorsqu'ils sont exportés afin de prévenir tout détournement de ces produits par les trafiquants de drogue. Ce projet amende la proposition de la Commission européenne qui organise ce contrôle et qui détermine notamment quelles sont les substances contrôlées.

3-179-819

Regina Bastos (PPE), *por escrito*. – A presente proposta de revisão da Comissão visa colmatar um vazio jurídico no Regulamento (CE) n° 111/2005, que estabelece regras de controlo do comércio de precursores de drogas entre a União Europeia e países terceiros. Até ao presente, os medicamentos têm sido excluídos do âmbito do Regulamento. Infelizmente, os medicamentos que contêm efedrina e pseudoefedrina são desviados para sintetizar meta-anfetaminas. O facto de o regulamento não abranger os medicamentos impossibilita os Estados-Membros de confiscarem ou intercetarem facilmente carregamentos de medicamentos, contendo efedrina ou pseudoefedrina sobre os quais recaem suspeitas de desvio. Neste sentido, defende-se a inclusão dos medicamentos na definição de substâncias inventariadas e a criação de uma nova categoria de substâncias que permita um melhor controlo aplicável às substâncias inventariadas. Pelo acima exposto, apoiei o presente relatório.

3-179-827

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D), *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį siūlymą kuriuo keičiamas reglamentas, nustatantis prekybos narkotinių ir psichotropinių medžiagų pirmtakais tarp Bendrijos ir trečiųjų šalių stebėsenos taisyklės. Siūlymo tikslas – užkirsti kelią vaistų, kurių sudėtyje yra efedrino ar pseudoefedrino, naudojimui neteisėtai metamfetamino gamybai, įvedant šių vaistų kontrolę, kai jais prekiaujama tarp Sąjungos ir trečiųjų šalių, tačiau netrukdam jiems laisvai judėti. Deja, vaistai, kurių sudėtyje yra efedrino ar pseudoefedrino ir kurie yra naudojami gripo simptomams ar alergijoms gydyti, neteisėtai naudojami metamfetaminams gaminti. Iki šiol jiems nebuvo taikoma eksporto, importo ir tranzito kontrolė. Tai, kad jiems netaikoma reglamento tvarka, trukdo valstybėms narėms sulaikyti vaistus, kurie aiškiai bus naudojami neteisėtai, siuntas. Todėl pritariu siūlymui, tokio tipo vaistus įtraukti į medžiagų, kurioms taikytina kontrolė, sąrašą.

3-179-835

John Bufton (EFD), *in writing*. – My party abstained from voting here as while we are, of course, in favour of the control of illicit substances we are opposed to the monitoring and surveillance techniques outlined.

3-179-839

Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), *por escrito*. – Concordo com o relator na medida em que esta proposta é de extrema importância para preencher uma lacuna legal no regulamento. Os precursores de drogas são as substâncias lícitas utilizadas no fabrico de medicamentos mas também de drogas. Os precursores de drogas devem ser sujeitos a controlos de exportação, importação e trânsito, que sejam mais ou menos rigorosos, dependendo do risco de desvio.

3-179-843

Minodora Cliveti (S&D), *în scris*. – Prezenta propunere de revizuire urmărește în primul rând eliminarea unei lacune juridice din Regulamentul (CE) nr. 111/2005 al Consiliului de stabilire a normelor de monitorizare a comerțului cu precursori de droguri între UE și țările terțe. Până în prezent, medicamentele au fost mereu excluse din domeniul de aplicare al regulamentului. Din păcate, medicamentele care conțin efedrină și pseudoefedrină, utilizate în tratamentul răcelii, al simptomelor gripei sau al alergiilor, sunt deturnate pentru sintetizarea de metamfetamine. Din cauza faptului că medicamentele sunt excluse din domeniul de aplicare al regulamentului, statele membre întâmpină dificultăți la confiscarea sau interceptarea transporturilor de medicamente având în componență efedrină și pseudoefedrină și care urmează în mod evident să fie deturnate. Din acest motiv, Comisia Europeană a decis să includă medicamentele care conțin efedrină și pseudoefedrină în regulament. Autorităților competente din statele membre ar trebui să li se confere competența de a intercepta sau confisca astfel de produse, în cazul în care există motive întemeiate să se suspecteze că sunt destinate fabricării ilicite de droguri, atunci când sunt exportate, importate sau în tranzit.

3-179-859

Carlos Coelho (PPE), *por escrito*. – O controlo dos precursores de drogas é essencial no âmbito da luta contra os estupefacientes, para evitar que essas substâncias químicas, que têm uma grande variedade de utilizações legais como, por exemplo, no setor farmacêutico, de cosméticos e perfumes, etc., possam ser desviadas dos canais de distribuição legais para o fabrico ilegal de estupefacientes. Foi criado um enquadramento normativo específico, tanto a nível internacional como da UE, de forma a controlar a comercialização legal dos precursores de drogas, com o objetivo de impedir o seu desvio para fins ilícitos, contribuindo, desta forma, para reduzir a oferta de drogas ilegais. Porém, os medicamentos que contêm efedrina e pseudofedrina (utilizados para constipações ou alergias) e que permitem a produção ilegal de metanfetamina, não estão abrangidos. Por conseguinte, apoio esta iniciativa que pretende colmatar a lacuna existente em termos de controlo da UE sobre esses medicamentos, quando são exportados ou estão em trânsito através do território aduaneiro da UE. Os mercados de metanfetamina estão em expansão na Europa, tendo sido apreendidos pela primeira vez, em 2009, laboratórios ilegais de metanfetamina em vários países europeus, o que demonstra a necessidade e urgência de reforçarmos este controlo, permitindo aos Estados-Membros confiscar ou intercetar os carregamentos deste tipo de medicamentos, sobre os quais recaiam suspeitas de desvio para fins ilícitos.

3-179-860

Lara Comi (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Primo esportatore a livello mondiale di beni e servizi e principale partner commerciale per oltre 100 paesi in tutto il mondo, l'Unione Europea è un mercato estremamente aperto. Come noto, l'apertura delle frontiere interne dell'Unione europea ha creato benefici e opportunità a largo spettro. Meno noto è invece che molte organizzazioni criminali, su scala internazionale, riescono spesso a sfruttare l'apertura commerciale dell'UE per incrementare i loro traffici illeciti. Questo è quello che accade con i cosiddetti "precursori di droghe", ossia sostanze di per sé lecite, che possono essere utilizzate per fabbricare stupefacenti. Per combattere il narcotraffico e le attività criminali ad esso collegate, l'Unione ha previsto per i precursori di droghe controlli speciali nel caso di esportazione, importazione o transito. Finora i medicinali sono sempre stati esclusi dal campo di applicazione di questa normativa speciale. Molti farmaci sono però utilizzati per sintetizzare sostanze stupefacenti, alimentandone così indirettamente la produzione e il commercio. Ciò è assolutamente inaccettabile. Ho dunque votato a favore di questa proposta di risoluzione volta a sottoporre anche i farmaci a rischio di diversione a un regime normativo speciale e a fornire all'Unione capacità di risposta rapide ed efficaci in questo campo.

3-179-863

Rachida Dati (PPE), *par écrit*. – Les précurseurs de drogue sont des substances licites, parfois utilisés dans la fabrication de drogues illicites. Ils font l'objet de contrôles à l'importation et à l'exportation mais les médicaments en sont actuellement exempts. Pourtant, certains médicaments sont détournés pour fabriquer de la drogue. Le texte vise à porter une attention particulière aux médicaments concernés, en établissant leur suivi spécifique. C'est un pas important vers une lutte renforcée contre les drogues illicites dans l'UE.

3-179-865

Marielle de Sarnez (ALDE), *par écrit*. – Les précurseurs de drogue sont des substances licites, utilisées dans la fabrication des drogues. Deux substances en particulier, l'éphédrine et la pseudo éphédrine que l'on trouve dans les médicaments pour traiter le rhume, sont très facilement extractibles et utilisées par les narcotrafiquants pour fabriquer des métamphétamines. Les médicaments contenant de l'éphédrine et de la pseudo éphédrine, devraient donc faire l'objet de contrôles à l'exportation, à l'importation et au transit plus stricts. La lutte contre le trafic de drogue nécessite une vigilance constante et une réactivité de la part de l'Union européenne et de ses États membres. En coupant l'accès des narcotrafiquants à leurs ingrédients essentiels pour la fabrication de drogue, l'Union contribuera à traiter plus efficacement ce problème à la source.

3-179-867

Christine De Veyrac (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce texte car je suis favorable au renforcement de la lutte contre l'utilisation illicite de l'éphédrine pour la fabrication de drogues. Vu l'ampleur de ce phénomène, l'Union doit mettre en place une législation appropriée. C'est pourquoi je soutiens que toute exportation de médicaments contenant de l'éphédrine ou de la pseudo-éphédrine soit précédée d'une notification préalable à l'exportation, envoyée par les autorités compétentes de l'Union aux autorités compétentes du pays de destination, comme cela est déjà le cas pour d'autres substances.

3-179-868

Jill Evans (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – I voted against this report. The Commission proposal was to implement the World Health Organisation's recommendation that the EU control some medicines due to the possibility of extracting from them, illicit drugs. However I believe that the unlimited extension of control of trade in medicines goes too far. Medicines by and large serve health purposes and not illicit drug production, and it is important that the people of Wales always have access to these important medicines.

3-179-869

Diogo Feio (PPE), *por escrito*. – Os precursores de drogas são substâncias lícitas utilizadas no fabrico de drogas, sendo já objeto de controlo, no contexto da exportação, importação e trânsito, mais ou menos rigoroso na medida dos riscos de desvio. A presente proposta pretende colmatar um vazio jurídico no regulamento (CE) n.º 111/2005 do Conselho, o qual exclui os medicamentos do seu âmbito de aplicação. Sabendo que os medicamentos que contêm efedrina e pseudoefedrina, utilizados para tratar a constipação, os sintomas gripais ou as alergias, são frequentemente desviados para sintetizar meta-anfetaminas, surge a necessidade de os abranger na atual legislação.

3-179-014

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), *por escrito*. – Pelo que representa em termos de consolidação e atualização dos mecanismos de fiscalização e controlo sobre precursores de drogas entre a União Europeia e países terceiros, este relatório é um importante contributo na luta contra a proliferação de drogas e produtos estupefacientes. A presente proposta vem colmatar problemas de vazio jurídico na UE e no controlo das suas fronteiras ao nível de substâncias lícitas utilizadas no fabrico de drogas, como acontece com os medicamentos que contêm efedrina e pseudoefedrina, que se encontram excluídos da relação de substâncias sob controlo no contexto das exportações, importações e trânsito. São exemplos de medicamentos de uso comum para constipações, gripes e alergias, que podem ser manipulados e dos quais podem ser extraídos os chamados precursores de drogas. A criação de uma nova categoria para este tipo de produtos vem facilitar e simplificar o controlo sobre o tráfico destas substâncias.

3-179-870

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – A proposta da Comissão Europeia de revisão do Regulamento 111/2005 tem como objetivo colmatar um vazio jurídico nesse regulamento, que estabelece regras de controlo do comércio de precursores de drogas entre a UE e países terceiros. A Comissão decidiu incluir os medicamentos que contêm efedrina ou pseudoefedrina no âmbito do regulamento. Apesar de estar de acordo na generalidade com a proposta, o relator não concorda com a Comissão por continuar a não inscrever os medicamentos na definição de substâncias inventariadas. A Comissão criou um regime específico para estes medicamentos, que não corresponde a nenhum dos regimes previstos para as diferentes categorias. Estes medicamentos ficam apenas sujeitos à obrigação de notificação prévia de exportação. O relator propõe que os medicamentos sejam incluídos na definição de substâncias inventariadas e que seja criada uma nova categoria de substâncias que permita matizar melhor o controlo aplicável às substâncias inventariadas. O relator considera que a inserção de um novo medicamento no anexo do regulamento não deve passar pelo processo de codecisão. Isto porque os narcotraficantes são mais rápidos a

adaptar-se do que o processo de adoção do regulamento em processo de codecisão. Em geral, a posição defendida no relatório afigura-se justificada e correta.

3-179-871

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D), *písomne*. – Drogové prekurzory sú chemické látky so širokou škálou zákonných použití. Obchod s nimi je legitímny, ako na regionálnych, tak aj na celosvetových trhoch. Niektoré z nich však potenciálne môžu byť zneužitú na nedovolenú výrobu omamných látok. Ak chceme proti omamným látkam účinne bojovať, kontrola drogových prekurzorov je jedným z kľúčových konaní. Napriek zavedeniu regulačného rámca na medzinárodnej úrovni i na úrovni EU vznikla právna medzera, ktorú je potrebné vyplniť. Ide predovšetkým o preparáty určené na humánne použitie obsahujúce efedrín alebo pseudoefedrín, keď tieto lieky boli vyvážené z colného územia Únie alebo nim prechádzali v režime tranzitu, hoci bolo možné predpokladať, že dôjde k ich zneužitiu na nedovolenú výrobu metamfetamínu v krajine svojho určenia. I z tohto dôvodu sa od EU očakáva, že odstráni danú legislatívnu medzeru.

3-179-441

Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), *per iscritto*. – La relazione tratta il tema del commercio dei precursori di droghe tra i Paesi dell'UE e gli Stati terzi. I precursori di droghe sono sostanze lecite le quali vengono utilizzate per fabbricare stupefacenti che spesso vengono usati anche per scopi illeciti. Il mio voto alla relazione è favorevole in quanto la modifica al Regolamento è indispensabile per adeguare i controlli doganali in modo da impedire questo fenomeno criminale; è necessario, inoltre, aumentare il monitoraggio dell'esportazione, dell'importazione e del transito.

3-179-226

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), *per iscritto*. – I precursori di droghe sono sostanze lecite che tuttavia, se intercettate dalla criminalità e utilizzate in maniera impropria, possono essere utilizzate per produrre stupefacenti. Per questo, a livello dell'Unione, un regolamento del Consiglio prevede che i precursori di droghe, classificati ed elencati nell'allegato al regolamento stesso, siano sottoposti a controlli più o meno rigorosi in caso di importazione, esportazione e transito. Si è scoperto di recente che i medicinali contenenti efedrine e pseudoefedrine sono utilizzati talvolta per sintetizzare metamfetamine. Il fatto che i medicinali siano esclusi dal campo di applicazione del regolamento rende difficoltoso intercettarne o sequestrarne le spedizioni. La Commissione ha proposto di introdurre una normativa speciale per i medicinali a base di efedrine o di pseudoefedrine. In accordo con il relatore, sostengo, invece, la necessità di creare una nuova categoria di sostanze, in modo da snellire la procedura necessaria per estendere i controlli ad altri medicinali che potrebbero essere utilizzati in futuro come precursori di droghe. Adeguare il regolamento, mediante procedura legislativa ordinaria, ogniqualvolta un nuovo farmaco venga utilizzato come precursore di droghe comporterebbe, infatti, tempistiche troppo lunghe e minerebbe l'efficacia dei controlli

3-179-011

Jim Higgins (PPE), *in writing*. – This Commission proposal, amending Council Regulation (EC) No 111/2005 lays down rules for the monitoring of trade between the Community and third countries in drug precursors, seeks to fill a legal lacuna in the regulation.

I welcome the report, which I supported in its entirety. It makes the law more complete and is another tool in the battle against counterfeit medicines. I particularly welcome the introduction of the following: A monitoring mechanism which was introduced in order to be able to respond to new use of prescription drugs for recreational purposes by adding substances to a list in order to temporarily monitor them.

I also voted to introduce a rapid response mechanism which was introduced under Article 26 to allow for seizure in justified cases, where there is evidence that the drugs will be diverted to the black market. This is an essential weapon in the EU war on drugs.

3-179-872

Juozas Imbrasas (EFD), *raštu*. – Pritariau siūlymui, nes jo pagrindinis tikslas –visų pirma užpildyti teisinę reglamento spragą. Siūlymu nustatomos prekybos narkotinių ir psichotropinių medžiagų pirmtakais (prekursoriais) tarp Bendrijos ir trečiųjų šalių stebėsenos taisyklės. Į reglamentą bus įtraukti vaistai, kurių sudėtyje yra efedrino ar pseudoefedrino, naudojamų slogai, gripo simptomams ar alergijoms gydyti, kurie yra dar neteisėtai naudojami metamfetaminams gaminti. Tai, kad vaistams netaikoma reglamento tvarka, trukdo valstybėms narėms lengvai konfiskuoti ar sulaikyti vaistų, kurių sudėtyje yra efedrino ar pseudoefedrino ir kurie aiškiai bus naudojami neteisėtai, siuntas. Šiuo atveju, vaistai būtų įtraukti į medžiagų, įtrauktų į oficialų sąrašą, apibrėžtį ir būtų sukurta nauja medžiagų kategorija siekiant, kad būtų galima dar truputį geriau pritaikyti vykdytiną į oficialų sąrašą įtrauktų medžiagų kontrolę.

3-179-012

Philippe Juvin (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai soutenu le rapport de mon collègue Franck Proust, qui vise à créer une surveillance et un contrôle de certaines substances licites utilisées dans la fabrication des drogues lors de leur exportation, importation ou transit avec des pays tiers. Afin de limiter les risques de contournement de la législation, des clauses d'intervention rapide et de surveillance temporaire ont également été introduites. Je me félicite de la large adoption de ce rapport, à 583 voix pour, 58 voix contre et 39 abstentions.

3-179-873

Béla Kovács (NI), *írásban* – Alapvetően életcél és megélhetést kell biztosítani a fiataloknak, valamint nagyon lényeges a megelőző felvilágosítás. A jelentés a kábítószerrel előállításához felhasznált anyagoknak a Közösség és a harmadik országok közötti kereskedelembe való nyomon követéséről szól. Ezek gyakorta hétköznapi anyagok, az ecetsavat például a heroin előállításához használják.

Mostanáig a gyógyszerek nem tartoztak a rendelet hatálya alá, de már az efedrin- és a pszeudoefedrin-tartalmú gyógyszereket is a rendelet hatálya alá kellett vonni. A módosított jelentést a kábítószerrel újabb generációja elterjedésének megakadályozása, illetve mérséklése céljából el kellett fogadni.

3-179-005

David Martin (S&D), *in writing*. – I voted in favour of this report, along with my Labour colleagues. It is a good report and has, in my opinion, the right approach on how to include certain products under different categories.

3-179-874

Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport sur le commerce des précurseurs des drogues entre la Communauté et les pays tiers, qui fixe des règles pour la surveillance de substances licites mais qui sont utilisées dans la fabrication de drogues. Le texte prévoit d'étendre la surveillance temporaire à de nouvelles substances et introduit une certaine flexibilité pour s'adapter aux nouvelles tendances dans le détournement de ces substances. Un mécanisme d'intervention rapide permettrait également aux autorités de saisir des envois lorsque les soupçons de détournement sont suffisants.

3-179-438

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL), *par écrit*. – Ce rapport propose de combler un vide juridique dans le règlement fixant des règles pour la surveillance du commerce des précurseurs de drogue entre l'Union européenne et les pays tiers. Ces précurseurs ont une variété d'utilisations licites (médicaments, cosmétiques, etc.) et sont légalement commercialisés. Mais certaines de ces substances peuvent aussi être détournées des circuits de distribution licites et utilisées pour la fabrication de stupéfiants. La proposition vise donc à imposer des contrôles plus stricts sur ces produits et à en améliorer les contrôles aux frontières. Ce rapport a pour mérite de viser les trafiquants avant les consommateurs. Mais il propose néanmoins la création d'une base de données européenne contenant les informations relatives aux saisies et aux interceptions. Je vote pour.

3-179-492

Nuno Melo (PPE), *por escrito*. – Neste momento, existe uma lacuna grave na legislação da UE que regula o comércio de precursores de droga. O presente regulamento vem pôr termo a essa lacuna. Os precursores de drogas são substâncias lícitas utilizadas no fabrico de drogas. Por exemplo, o ácido acético é utilizado no fabrico de heroína. Os precursores de drogas são objeto de controlo, no contexto da exportação, importação e trânsito, mais ou menos rigoroso em função do risco de desvio. Os precursores que são objeto de controlo e constam do anexo ao regulamento são designados por substâncias inventariadas. Até ao presente, os medicamentos têm sido excluídos do âmbito do regulamento. Lamentavelmente, os medicamentos que contêm efedrina e pseudoefedrina, utilizados para tratar a constipação, os sintomas gripais ou as alergias, são desviados para sintetizar meta-anfetaminas. O facto de o regulamento não abranger os medicamentos impossibilita os Estados-Membros de confiscarem ou intercetarem facilmente os carregamentos de medicamentos contendo efedrina ou pseudoefedrina, sobre os quais recaiam suspeitas de desvio. Com a aprovação deste regulamento, tal lacuna fica colmatada. Daí o meu voto favorável.

3-179-547

Roberta Metsola (PPE), *in writing*. – A monitoring mechanism has been put in place to respond to new diversion trends by adding substances to a list in order to temporarily monitor them. The introduction of a rapid response mechanism to ensure that competent authorities can seize consignments of non-scheduled substances is another important step for the EU to take. I have supported this report in an effort to fight drug production and trade and to ensure the monitoring of trade between the Community and third countries in drug precursors.

3-179-410

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – No he podido votar a favor del presente informe porque, pese a contener un enfoque dirigido a impedir la actividad de los productores de metanfetamina, no incluye la norefedrina. El informe se centra en el control de los medicamentos que contienen efedrina y pseudoefedrina, componentes que se emplean en la fabricación de la metanfetamina. Propone listas de los medicamentos y mejores sistemas de control sobre los mismos. La metanfetamina produce estragos en numerosos barrios obreros de la Unión Europea y perseguir la actividad de los productores de este tipo de sustancia, a través del control en el suministro de sus componentes es indispensable. Sin embargo, excluir la norefedrina, que está siendo empleada actualmente en la producción, implica que esta iniciativa no tenga toda la efectividad posible. Por ello no he podido votar a favor del presente informe.

3-179-274

Louis Michel (ALDE), *par écrit*. – La lutte contre les drogues et les narcotrafiquants est un défi mondial. Les Etats fragiles sont les eldorados non seulement de la drogue mais aussi du trafic d'immigrants et d'armes légères, avant d'atteindre l'Europe. Les drogues ruinent la vie des individus et ont un coût élevé pour les sociétés. La surveillance du commerce des précurseurs, substances licites pour la synthèse des drogues, est dès lors un enjeu crucial dans cette lutte. Il faut agir vite et sur le long terme car le secteur évolue rapidement. C'est pour cela, que je salue le rapport de monsieur Proust qui opère un renforcement du contrôle de ces substances en créant une nouvelle catégorie à surveiller, les médicaments. Cette surveillance ne doit cependant pas entraver le commerce des médicaments qui est vital pour les populations en développement. Nous atteindrons nos objectifs plus efficacement et rapidement si nous renforçons notre coopération et nos mécanismes de contrôle en la matière et si la mise à jour de la base de données européenne des précurseurs est faite régulièrement.

3-179-265

Alexander Mirsky (S&D), *in writing*. – Drug precursors are chemical substances which have a wide variety of everyday uses such as in plastics, cosmetics, perfumes, detergents, or aromas. They are traded for legitimate purposes on global markets, but some of them can also be diverted from distribution channels for the manufacture of narcotic drugs. Taking into account the wide legitimate uses of drug precursors, their trade cannot be prohibited. This regulation seeks to regulate trade in ephedrine and pseudoephedrine which can be found in cold or allergy medicines. These two substances are also the main precursors for the manufacture of methamphetamine or 'crystal meth.' I am confident that any export of products containing ephedrine or pseudoephedrine should be preceded by a pre-export notification sent by the competent authorities in the Union to the competent authorities of the country of destination. In favour.

3-179-256

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Als Drogenausgangsstoffe bezeichnet man jene Stoffe, die legal sind und der Herstellung von Drogen dienen. Essigsäure etwa wird für die Herstellung von Heroin verwendet. Manche Drogenausgangsstoffe werden in der bestehenden Verordnung als erfasste Stoffe geführt, die in drei Kategorien eingeteilt sind: Kategorie 1 unterliegt strengen Formalitäten bei der Ausfuhr, Einfuhr und Durchfuhr, während für die erfassten Stoffe der Kategorie 3 nur gewisse Formalitäten für den Fall

gelten, dass sie in bestimmte Länder exportiert werden. Problematisch stellen sich Arzneien dar, die Ephedrin und Pseudoephedrin enthalten, da sie bis dato vom Anwendungsbereich ausgenommen waren – das soll sich nun ändern. Allerdings fallen ebensolche Arzneimittel nicht in die Kategorie der erfassten Stoffe, sondern für sie ist eine Sonderregelung vorgesehen. Ich habe für den Bericht gestimmt, da es unumgänglich ist, den Handel mit Drogen streng zu verfolgen. Dazu zählt auch schon der Handel mit den Stoffen, aus denen Drogen hergestellt werden können. Die EU muss darauf achten, dass es nicht Usus werden kann, in Wohnungen, Häusern, Lagerräumen relativ problemlos Drogenlabore einzurichten. Je schwieriger es wird, zu den Substanzen, die man für die Herstellung von Drogen braucht, zu gelangen, desto schwieriger wird in weiterer Folge auch der Zugang zu Drogen.

3-179-205

Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), *raštu*. – Prekybai narkotinių ir psichotropinių medžiagų pirmtakais (prekursoriais) tarp Bendrijos ir trečiųjų šalių taikomos griežtos stebėsenos taisyklės, kontroliuojami prekursoriai yra įtraukiami į oficialų sąrašą. Deja, esamas teisinis reguliavimas neapima vaistų. Pritariu pranešėjo pozicijai, jog būtina griežtinti kontrolę šioje srityje, nes kai kurie vaistai, pavyzdžiui, naudojami slogai ar gripui gydyti, savo sudėtyje turi efedrino ar pseudoefedrino, kurie gali būti panaudoti narkotinių ir psichotropinių medžiagų gamybai. Aiškesnis šios srities reglamentavimas ir sisteminis požiūris į prekybos prekursoriais stebėseną leistų pasiekti geresnių rezultatų kovoje su nelegalia narkotikų prekyba.

3-179-137

Tiziano Motti (PPE), *per iscritto*. – I precursori di droghe sono sostanze chimiche che hanno un'ampia gamma di usi leciti, quali la sintesi di materie plastiche, prodotti farmaceutici, cosmetici, profumi, detergenti o aromi. Sono scambiati a scopi legittimi sui mercati regionali e mondiali, ma alcuni di essi possono essere dirottati dai canali di distribuzione leciti ed essere destinati invece alla fabbricazione illecita di stupefacenti. Sebbene il controllo dei precursori di droghe sia pertanto un aspetto essenziale della lotta agli stupefacenti, i numerosi usi legittimi di cui sono suscettibili precludono la possibilità di proibirne il commercio. È stato istituito un quadro normativo specifico, sia a livello internazionale che a livello dell'Unione europea, per monitorarne il commercio lecito e individuare le transazioni sospette onde impedire che queste sostanze siano destinate a usi illeciti. Teniamo alta la guardia.

3-179-001

Cristiana Muscardini (ECR), *per iscritto*. – La recente legislazione sul commercio di precursori di droghe tra UE e paesi terzi va nella giusta direzione per regolare il traffico di sostanze chimiche e farmaceutiche sensibili, che sono spesso e volentieri utilizzate per la sintetizzazione di droghe in laboratori clandestini o spesso addirittura fra le mura domestiche.

Regole più stringenti, che indichino con chiarezza le informazioni relative ai prodotti importati od esportati, il loro peso, le loro componenti chimiche e i loro percorsi sono utili a tenere sotto controllo gli scambi dei precursori, e possono aiutare le forze dell'ordine a distinguere chi utilizza queste sostanze per scopi medicinali in maniera regolare e chi per produrre droghe.

Un maggior volume di documentazione e soprattutto un'etichettatura più precisa ed esaustiva possono dare un contributo a difendere il commercio legale ed a combattere quello illegale. Questo rischia di essere compromesso dalle sempre più gravi differenze tra le dogane ai confini dell'Unione europea, che non sempre effettuano gli stessi controlli e che spesso pur di sdoganare in fretta grandi quantità di merci permettono l'ingresso di sostanze illegali nel mercato unico.

Voto quindi a favore di questo testo, perché garantisce più sicurezza, trasparenza e legalità per i cittadini e le imprese del settore farmaceutico.

3-179-656

Γεώργιος Παπανικολάου (PPE), *γραπτώς*. – Η συγκεκριμένη απόφαση αποσκοπεί στην κάλυψη του νομικού κενού του κανονισμού 111/2005 σχετικά με τη θέσπιση κανόνων για την παρακολούθηση του εμπορίου προδρόμων ουσιών ναρκωτικών μεταξύ της ΕΕ και τρίτων χωρών. Με τον όρο "πρόδρομες ουσίες ναρκωτικών ουσιών" εννοούνται νόμιμες ουσίες που όμως χρησιμοποιούνται και για την παρασκευή ναρκωτικών. Χαρακτηριστικό παράδειγμα είναι το οξικό οξύ που χρησιμοποιείται για την παρασκευή ηρωίνης. Η πρόταση τροποποίησης του κανονισμού, την οποία και υπερψήφισα, προκρίνει την διαβάθμιση των ουσιών στις εξής κατηγορίες: σε εκείνες που υπόκεινται σε ουσιαστικές διαδικασίες ελέγχου κατά τις εξαγωγές, κατά τις εισαγωγές ή κατά την διέλευση και σε εκείνες που δεν υπόκεινται παρά σε κάποιες τυπικές διαδικασίες, αποκλειστικώς όταν εξάγονται προς ορισμένες χώρες. Παράλληλα, συμπεριλαμβάνονται νέα φάρμακα στον κατάλογο των πρόδρομων ουσιών. Το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο εκφράζει εντούτοις τον προβληματισμό του όσον αφορά τη διαβάθμιση που επιλέγεται σε κάθε περίπτωση διότι είναι πιθανόν να οδηγήσει σε χρονοβόρες ως προς τον έλεγχο τους διαδικασίες την ίδια στιγμή που οι έμποροι ναρκωτικών ουσιών εφευρίσκουν διαρκώς νέους τρόπους χρήσης φαρμάκων για τη δημιουργία ναρκωτικών ουσιών.

3-179-683

Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), *por escrito*. – Os precursores de drogas são substâncias lícitas utilizadas no fabrico de drogas. Por exemplo, o ácido acético é utilizado no fabrico de heroína. Os precursores de drogas são objeto de controlo, no contexto da exportação, importação e trânsito, mais ou menos rigoroso em função do risco de desvio. Os precursores que são objeto de controlo e constam do anexo ao regulamento são designados por substâncias inventariadas. Até ao presente, os medicamentos têm sido excluídos do âmbito do regulamento. Lamentavelmente, os medicamentos que contêm efedrina e pseudoefedrina, utilizados para tratar a constipação, os sintomas gripais ou as alergias, são desviados para sintetizar meta-anfetaminas. Por esta razão, a Comissão Europeia decidiu incluir os medicamentos que contêm efedrina ou pseudoefedrina no âmbito do regulamento. Atento o exposto, votei favoravelmente o presente relatório.

3-179-710

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – Against. Greens in Committee supported the original line of the COM to react to the requests of the WHO and create additional measures for the control of trade flows in medicines containing ephedrine and pseudoephedrine. However, we are against the unlimited extension of the control of the trade in medicines for a number of reasons. Medicines by and large serve health purposes and not illicit drug production purposes. Any addition of medicines to lists of controlled items need to be carried out carefully and proportionally. In the past, we have witnessed the licit trade in medicines being prevented under suspicion that the receiving country was

working on the manufacture of generics. Any powers of given to Member States to seize and detain shipments simply because 'sufficient evidence' of diversion is available could be easily misused for other purposes. Giving Member States the right to seize shipments under mere suspicion would constitute a return to pre-Lisbon Treaty times. Fighting organised drug-related crime should primarily focus on illicit money transfers and consumer information. The administrative costs of monitoring mechanisms could be considerable.

3-179-723

Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Ho ritenuto opportuno votare a favore della proposta della Commissione che modifica il regolamento (CE) n. 111/2005 del Consiglio recante norme per il controllo del commercio dei precursori di droghe tra la Comunità e i Paesi terzi. Innanzitutto perché tale proposta mira a colmare un vuoto giuridico nel regolamento. Ritengo necessario includere i medicinali nella definizione di sostanze classificate e di creare una nuova categoria di sostanze, affinché i controlli applicabili alle sostanze classificate siano effettuati in maniera lievemente più flessibile. Questo al fine di evitare di ricorrere alla procedura di codecisione che non dispone di una rapida capacità di risposta e dà modo ai trafficanti di stupefacenti di adattarsi alla situazione addirittura prima dell'approvazione del testo. Tale aspetto ci impedirebbe di conseguire, come invece dovremmo, i nostri obiettivi di contrasto nei confronti del traffico di stupefacenti e della criminalità organizzata.

3-179-737

Catherine Stihler (S&D), *in writing*. – I voted in favour of trade between the Community and third countries in drug precursors because drug precursors can be used to make harmful illegal narcotics.

3-179-751

Kay Swinburne (ECR), *in writing*. – Trade in illegal drugs sadly affects all Member States. Therefore it is right that we work together where we can to make sure that we have effective systems in place to monitor trade flows in drug precursors and identify misuse.

3-179-765

Marc Tarabella (S&D), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté pour ce texte. Je pense que les médicaments doivent être inclus dans la définition des substances classifiées et qu'il faut créer une nouvelle catégorie de substances qui permette de nuancer encore un peu mieux le contrôle qui doit s'appliquer aux substances classifiées. Les annexes seront adaptées par la voie d'actes délégués, ce qui permettra au Conseil de mettre son veto, si besoin en était, à une décision de la Commission d'ajouter un nouveau médicament.

Par ailleurs, la définition des substances classifiées précise bien que le précurseur doit pouvoir être extrait facilement du mélange pour être considéré comme une substance classifiée. Le rapporteur estime que cela devrait limiter très fortement le nombre de médicaments qui pourraient un jour être considérés comme des substances classifiées et donc restreindre l'impact du règlement sur le commerce des médicaments. En effet, à l'heure actuelle, seuls les médicaments contenant de l'éphédrine et de la pseudo-éphédrine remplissent cette condition.

3-179-778

Nuno Teixeira (PPE), *por escrito*. – Em setembro de 2012, a Comissão Europeia apresentou uma proposta que estabelece regras de controlo do comércio de precursores de drogas entre a União Europeia e países terceiros, tendo como principal objetivo salvaguardar a saúde pública através do controlo da produção, distribuição e utilização de medicamentos que contêm efedrina e pseudoefedrina, a fim de se garantir a sua qualidade, segurança e eficácia. Voto favoravelmente o presente relatório pois entendo que os medicamentos, à semelhança das restantes substâncias, também devem ser controlados, incluindo-se na categoria de substâncias inventariadas. Por fim, considero importante que seja assegurada uma maior segurança ao nível da comercialização dos medicamentos, por forma a garantir uma superior segurança para os consumidores.

3-179-792

Josef Weidenholzer (S&D), *schriftlich*. – Die Abänderung der Verordnung dient der besseren Bekämpfung des illegalen Handels mit chemischen Ausgangsstoffen zur Drogenproduktion, insbesondere des Stoffes Acetanhydrid, das zur Herstellung von Heroin verwendet wird. Die Anpassung der Richtlinie ist deshalb wichtig, weil die Kontrolle der großen Produktions- und Handelsmengen dieser Chemikalie sich sehr schwierig gestaltet, und obwohl drei Viertel der Beschlagnahmungen in der EU erfolgen, entspricht das nur einem Bruchteil der Menge, die jedes Jahr verschwindet. Eine stärkere Kontrolle, auch mit Hilfe der Registrierung der Erwerbsberechtigten, soll den illegalen Handel eindämmen. Ich konnte dem Antrag bedenkenlos zustimmen, nicht zuletzt weil hinsichtlich dieser Datenbanken auch umfassende Datenschutzbestimmungen Eingang gefunden haben.

3-179-820

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), *schriftlich*. – Es ist grundlegend, dass die Verordnung zur Festlegung von Vorschriften für die Überwachung des Handels mit Drogenausgangsstoffen zwischen der Gemeinschaft und Drittländern lückenlos funktioniert, um proaktiv gegen Drogenproduktion und –handel vorgehen zu können. Eine Aufnahme von Arzneimitteln, die zur Drogenherstellung verwendet werden können, in den Anwendungsbereich der Verordnung ist sinnvoll und unterstützenswert.

3-179-847

Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), *na piśmie*. – Wywóz prekursorów narkotyków, które wymagają zgłoszenia celnego, w tym wywóz prekursorów narkotyków opuszczających obszar celny Wspólnoty po ich składowaniu w wolnym obszarze celnym o kontroli typu I lub w składzie wolnocłowym przez okres przynajmniej 10 dni, wymaga uzyskania zezwolenia na wywóz. Wywóz prekursorów narkotyków kategorii 3 wymaga uzyskania zezwolenia na wywóz w przypadkach, gdy wymagane jest powiadomienie przed wywozem lub gdy te substancje wywożone są do niektórych krajów przeznaczenia (załącznik IV do rozporządzenia Komisji (WE) nr 1277/2005).

3-179-854

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – A proposta da Comissão Europeia de revisão do Regulamento 111/2005 tem como objetivo colmatar um vazio jurídico nesse regulamento, que estabelece regras de controlo do comércio de precursores de drogas entre a UE e países terceiros. A Comissão decidiu incluir os medicamentos que contêm efedrina ou pseudoefedrina no âmbito do regulamento. Apesar de estar de acordo na generalidade

com a proposta, o relator não concorda com a Comissão por continuar a não inscrever os medicamentos na definição de substâncias inventariadas. A Comissão criou um regime específico para estes medicamentos, que não corresponde a nenhum dos regimes previstos para as diferentes categorias. Estes medicamentos ficam apenas sujeitos à obrigação de notificação prévia de exportação. O relator propõe que os medicamentos sejam incluídos na definição de substâncias inventariadas e que seja criada uma nova categoria de substâncias que permita matizar melhor o controlo aplicável às substâncias inventariadas. Estamos de acordo.

12.2. Précurseurs de drogues (A7-0153/2013 - Anna Hedh)

3-179-906

Explications de vote par écrit

3-179-913

Luís Paulo Alves (S&D), *por escrito*. – Aprovo e apoio amplamente a proposta, uma vez que apenas são necessárias pequenas quantidades de precursores de drogas para a produção de drogas ilícitas e, dado esses precursores serem produzidos globalmente em grandes quantidades, é necessário muito cuidado a fim de assegurar que os precursores de drogas não são desviados do comércio legal na União Europeia. A ação da UE neste domínio forçará, por conseguinte, os traficantes a transferirem as suas atividades para outras partes do mundo, encorajando outras regiões do mundo a seguir o exemplo da União Europeia. Para além disso, a meu ver, a proposta permite o comércio legal e a utilização lícita de anidrido acético, sem impor encargos administrativos desnecessários às empresas. Simultaneamente, permite que as autoridades competentes acompanhem mais de perto os fluxos comerciais, por forma a detetar e bloquear os desvios ilegais.

3-179-914

Laima Liucija Andrikiėnė (PPE), *raštu*. – Balsavau už šią rezoliuciją. Kaip yra žinoma, narkotinių ir psichotropinių medžiagų pirmtakai (prekursoriai) yra cheminės medžiagos, kurios dažnai naudojamos įvairiuose pramonės procesuose (pavyzdžiui, gaminant plastmasę, vaistus, kosmetiką, kvepalus arba ploviklius). Vis dėlto, jos taip pat gali būti netinkamai panaudojamos neteisėtai narkotikų gamybai. Neretai šios medžiagos yra vagiamos ar perkamos neteisėtai veiklai vykdyti. Nepaisant to, kad pagal galiojančią teisinę bazę yra nustatyta licencijavimo ir registravimo sistema, kuri yra skirta prekybai pirmtakais stebėti Europos Sąjungoje, vis dėlto taikomos kontrolės priemonės yra nepakankamai griežtos. Sutinku su pranešėjos nuomone, kad, siekiant užkirsti kelią neteisėto narkotinių ir psichotropinių medžiagų pirmtakų įsigijimui, būtina sugriežtinti registracijos taisykles, sukurti Europos narkotinių ir psichotropinių medžiagų pirmtakų duomenų bazę ir daugiau dėmesio skirti prekybos acto rūgšties anhidridu, kuris yra pagrindinė medžiaga gaminant heroiną, stebėsenai.

3-179-921

Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), *în scris*. – Evoluțiile înregistrate pe piețele drogurilor din Uniunea Europeană în ultimii ani de zile, au impus revizuirea Regulamentului nr. 273/2004 privind precursorii drogurilor, în special a prevederilor legate de folosirea substanței denumite anhidridă acetică (AA), substanță care pe de o parte este folosită în mod legal la fabricarea de parfumuri, materiale plastice, coloranți, dar care în același timp este și

principalul precursor al heroinei. Măsurile propuse de Comisia Europeană și sprijinite atât de Parlamentul European cât și de Consiliul UE au în vedere o mai bună monitorizare a comerțului cu anhidridă acetică (AA) precum și consolidarea normelor privind înregistrarea acestei substanțe. Salut adoptarea în primă lectură a acestui acord, care va contribui la combaterea traficului ilicit de droguri și la prevenirea și scăderea tentativelor de deturnare pe piața internă a UE, limitând astfel cantitățile de substanțe care sunt deturnate spre a fi folosite pentru producția de droguri ilicite, mai precis de heroină.

3-179-923

Pino Arlacchi (S&D), *in writing*. – I fully support this report because it strengthens the control of trade in drug precursors, especially of acetic anhydride which is often used for the illicit production of heroin.

It is very important to create an EU system of licensing and registration capable of monitoring the trade of substances which are widely used in various legitimate industrial processes, but which can also be misused by criminals. The harmonisation of licencing requirements across the EU is essential for the prevention of market fragmentation and illegal transactions. In addition I hope that effective EU action in this field will encourage other regions in the world to follow the EU's example.

3-179-015

Sophie Auconie (PPE), *par écrit*. – Afin d'encourager la lutte contre le trafic de drogue, en particulier contre le détournement des précurseurs de drogues, ces substances licites qui, comme l'anhydride acétique, interviennent dans la fabrication d'amphétamines, de cocaïne ou encore d'héroïne, j'ai voté en faveur de ce projet de résolution législative. Celui-ci soutient la proposition de la Commission européenne, en particulier en ce qu'elle vise à empêcher la fragmentation du marché européen qui permettrait aux organisations criminelles de s'attaquer à ses maillons les plus faibles. De plus cette résolution législative entend également renforcer quelques éléments de la proposition de la Commission, notamment en ce qui concerne la protection des données.

3-179-925

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D), *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį siūlymą dėl Narkotinių medžiagų pirtakų (prekursorių). Prekursoriai – įvairiuose produktuose (vaistuose, kvepaluose ir plastike) esančios cheminės medžiagos, kurias galima neteisėtai panaudoti narkotikams gaminti. Siūlymu siekiama vidaus rinkoje ir ES pasienio muitinėse sustiprinti šių cheminių medžiagų kontrolę. Naujomis taisyklėmis bus vykdoma išankstinė neteisėtos narkotikų gamybos prevencija. Pritariu muitinėms suteikti įgaliojimus konfiskuoti efedrino ar pseudoefedrino turinčius vaistus, jeigu joms kyla pagrįstas įtarimas, kad jie gali būti panaudoti neteisėtais tikslais. Taip pat svarbu sugriežtinti taisykles, kuriomis reguliuojama ES acto rūgšties anhidridą – iš jo gaminamas heroinas – naudojančių įmonių veikla. Pramoniniu būdu acto rūgšties anhidridą naudojančios įmonės turėtų užsiregistruoti valdžios institucijose. Taip pat svarbu sukurti Europos prekursorių duomenų bazę, kad būtų paprasčiau rinkti duomenis apie konfiskuotas ir sulaikytas siuntas.

3-179-927

Regina Bastos (PPE), *por escrito*. – Os precursoras da droga são substâncias químicas amplamente utilizadas para diferentes processos industriais, produção de plásticos, produtos farmacêuticos, cosméticos, etc, mas também podem ser utilizados para a produção de

drogas ilícitas. O quadro normativo em vigor definiu um sistema de licenciamento e registo para acompanhar o comércio de precursores de droga na União Europeia, impondo obrigações específicas às empresas envolvidas e às autoridades públicas. Todavia, nos últimos anos, a União Europeia enfrentou algumas críticas internacionais devido às suas medidas de controlo, alegadamente brandas. No sentido de se reforçar o controlo, defende-se a necessidade de simplificação e harmonização dos requisitos de registo e licenciamento em toda a União de modo a evitar a fragmentação do mercado e impedir os criminosos de recorrer ao “elo mais fraco” do mercado interno da União. Defende-se também a criação de uma base de dados europeia, que proporcione a transparência necessária e melhoria do acompanhamento de todos os precursores de drogas na União Europeia. Pelo exposto, apoiei o presente relatório.

3-179-929

Mara Bizzotto (EFD), *per iscritto*. – Ho sostenuto col mio voto la relazione Hedh sui “precursori di droghe” perché credo che il potenziamento del sistema di controllo e raccolta dati sugli operatori e gli acquirenti di sostanze che potrebbero essere utilizzate per la preparazione di droghe illegali costituisca un elemento di fondamentale importanza.

3-179-933

Vito Bonsignore (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Mi complimento con la relatrice per avere centrato l’obiettivo qualificante per il Parlamento, ossia quello di integrare la proposta della Commissione con disposizioni stringenti a tutela della privacy e per la corretta gestione dei dati personali.

Va riconosciuta alla Commissione una particolare attenzione nel risolvere un dilemma delicato, bilanciando le ragioni del contrasto al traffico di droga con delicati aspetti di libertà di impresa e, più in generale, di diritti fondamentali così come definiti nel trattato di Lisbona. In particolare, è importante non ostacolare le normali attività economiche, nel settore chimico soprattutto, sconfinando nella sfera della gestione minuta delle misure di sicurezza e polizia.

La circostanza per cui piccole quantità di precursori sono sufficienti a produrre grandi quantitativi di droga certo non aiuta e ci metteva di fronte al rischio di intervenire con misure distruttive ovvero inefficaci. La Commissione ha saputo trovare una soluzione proporzionata e adeguata con il ricorso alla sottocategoria specifica che interessa anche gli utilizzatori finali dei precursori.

Se le autorità competenti sapranno assicurare una gestione corretta dei dati, potremo dire di aver fatto quanto era ragionevolmente possibile dal punto di vista della riforma della regolamentazione. Esprimo pertanto un voto favorevole.

3-179-007

John Bufton (EFD), *in writing*. – I voted against this report as it represents yet another regulatory burden on any company or enterprise which makes or deals with these drug precursors. Furthermore, previous experience demonstrates that such databases do little in reality to curb crime or have the intended effect.

3-179-123

Alain Cadec (PPE), *par écrit*. – J’ai soutenu le rapport Hedh qui a pour objectif de contrer le détournement des substances chimiques des circuits de distribution licites. La politique

anti-drogue de l'Union est une priorité. J'estime que la surveillance et le contrôle, des échanges de substances chimiques pouvant servir à la fabrication de stupéfiants, doit être renforcée. L'anhydride acétique est le principal précurseur de l'héroïne. Je salue donc la proposition du rapport imposant l'enregistrement obligatoire, auprès des autorités compétentes, des opérateurs qui commercialisent de l'anhydride acétique, mais aussi des utilisateurs qui en détiennent pour leurs propres usages.

3-179-239

Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), *por escrito*. – Esta proposta é muito importante para evitar o desvio do comércio interno de anidrido acético, o principal precursor de droga usado para o fabrico de heroína, assim como ao estender a exigência de registo para incluir os usuários da substância.

3-179-355

Lara Comi (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Ho votato a favore delle presente relazione che appoggia la linea generale adottata dalla Commissione per affrontare il problema della deviazione illecita dei precursori di droghe (ossia sostanze di per sé lecite, che possono essere utilizzate per fabbricare stupefacenti). Bisogna infatti mettere in atto sistemi di vigilanza efficaci che evitino che tali sostanze siano deviate dal commercio lecito dell'UE per andare a fomentare il narcotraffico. A questo riguardo, la proposta di rafforzamento delle norme in materia di registrazione dei precursori di droghe e l'istituzione di una banca dati europea su tali sostanze costituiscono un importante miglioramento rispetto alla situazione attuale, spuntando le armi della criminalità organizzata e indebolendone così le possibilità di radicamento illecito sul mercato europeo.

3-179-471

Rachida Dati (PPE), *par écrit*. – Les précurseurs de drogue sont des substances licites, mais qui sont parfois détournées pour produire des drogues illicites. En adoptant ce texte, nous prévoyons la mise en place d'un cadre réglementaire plus strict, en prêtant une attention particulière à la collecte des données et à l'enregistrement des précurseurs de drogues. C'est une avancée dans la lutte européenne contre les stupéfiants.

3-179-935

Christine De Veyrac (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de ce texte car je suis favorable à renforcer la lutte contre le détournement illicite de l'anhydride acétique pour la fabrication de l'héroïne. Je considère notamment qu'il est légitime d'imposer aux utilisateurs finaux de cette substance une obligation d'enregistrement, tout comme aux opérateurs qui la commercialisent. Cette mesure me semble ainsi cohérente pour prévenir le trafic de drogue, et notamment la fabrication d'héroïne en Europe.

3-179-818

Jill Evans (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – I abstained from this vote because of fears that this proposal leaves far too much flexibility in the hands of the Commission to decide which drugs could be included in the Annex of substances. Furthermore, a list of all licensed or registered operators and end-users of drug precursors in the EU raises serious data protection concerns. These are concerns that my constituents in Wales and I both share.

3-179-006

Diogo Feio (PPE), *por escrito*. – Pese embora os precursores de drogas serem substâncias lícitas, na sua maioria produzidos por entidades absolutamente idóneas, a verdade é que a sua utilização no fabrico de drogas ilícitas leva a que estas substâncias sejam frequentemente desviadas. Para além disso, uma vez que apenas são necessárias pequenas quantidades de precursores de drogas para a produção de drogas ilícitas e dado esses precursores serem produzidos globalmente em grandes quantidades, é necessária uma fiscalização apertada para assegurar que os precursores de drogas não são desviados do comércio legal na UE. É isso que a presente proposta vem fazer, tornando mais rigorosas as regras aplicáveis aos precursores de drogas.

3-179-122

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), *por escrito*. – A União Europeia deve assegurar um quadro legal eficaz no combate ao tráfico de produtos estupefacientes. Nesse âmbito, os produtos que constituem os chamados precursores de drogas merecem uma particular atenção e preocupação, reforçada por se tratarem de substâncias químicas que, para além de poderem ser usadas para produção de drogas ilícitas, são amplamente utilizadas para diferentes processos industriais, como produção de plásticos, produtos farmacêuticos, cosméticos, perfumes e detergentes. Impõe-se, por isso, um quadro legal capaz de conciliar os interesses, os objetivos e a competitividade da atividade industrial europeia com a necessidade de melhorar a capacidade de resposta das instituições no âmbito do controlo e fiscalização do tráfego dos precursores de drogas na UE, como ocorre no caso particular do anidrido acético, utilizado legalmente para a produção de plásticos, têxteis, corantes, agentes fotoquímicos, perfumes, explosivos e aspirina, mas também usado ilicitamente para a produção de anfetaminas, cocaína e sobretudo heroína, com forte impacto na mortalidade associada ao consumo de droga na UE.

3-179-238

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – A União Europeia tem sido criticada internacionalmente pela ausência de medidas de controlo sobre precursores de drogas ou pelo carácter permissivo da legislação nalguns Estados-Membros. A crítica tem-se concentrado sobretudo no anidrido acético, substância que é legalmente utilizada para a produção de plásticos, têxteis, corantes, fotoquímicos, perfumes, explosivos e aspirinas, mas também pode ser utilizada de forma ilegal na produção de heroína, cocaína e anfetaminas. Este é o principal precursor de droga para a produção de heroína (que, por sua vez, é responsável pela maior parte do consumo, com enormes taxas de mortalidade associadas). Concordamos com a necessidade de reforçar o controlo de operações que possam conduzir ao uso ilegal de substâncias, combatendo o desvio de produtos químicos a partir da corrente de comércio lícito para a produção ilícita de drogas. Isso pode ser conseguido através do registo mais transparente e requisitos de licenciamento mais restritivos. Seria importante que alguns passos pudessem ser dados ao nível do reforço da legislação de cada país.

3-179-936

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D), *písomne*. – Ako prekursori drog sa označujú tie chemické latky, ktoré sa síce vyrábajú na zákonné účely, no dajú sa zneužiť na výrobu omamných a psychotropných látok. Obchod s prekursorami drog nie je zakázaný. Tieto latky sú totiž využívané v rámci mnohých štandardných priemyselných postupov. Aby sa

však zabránilo zneužívaniu prekursorov na nezákonnú výrobu drog bol na medzi národnej úrovni vytvorený regulačný rámec, ktorého EU je zmluvnou stranou. Rozsiahla sieť výrobcov, distribútorov, sprostredkovateľov, dovozcov, vývozcov či veľkoobchodníkov s chemickými látkami, ktorí pôsobia v zákonnom obchode, musí prijať opatrenia proti krádeži, kontrolovať svojich zákazníkov, odhaľovať podozrivé transakcie a oznamovať ich príslušným orgánom. Práve preto i predmetné partnerstvo medzi výrobným odvetím a orgánmi má v zmysle efektívneho fungovania regulačného rámca nezastupiteľný význam.

3-179-702

Lorenzo Fontana (EFD), *per iscritto*. – La relazione si concentra sul trattamento dei dati, che deve essere condotto in forma anonima sotto la sorveglianza del Garante europeo della protezione dei dati. Voto a favore in quanto l'obiettivo è quello di aumentare i controlli e garantire la privacy, in modo da ridurre l'offerta di droghe illecite preparate con l'utilizzo dei precursori di droghe.

3-179-469

Kinga Gál (PPE), *írásban* – A mai napon szavazatommal támogattam a drogprekursorokról szóló jelentést, amely a témával foglalkozó 273/2004/EK rendelet módosítását tárgyalja. A drogprekursorokra, azaz az illegális anyagok előállításához szükséges vegyszerekre már eddig is vonatkoztak nemzetközi szabályok, de a kábítószer-forgalmazók eddig sikeresen „sorolták be” alapanyagaikat a legális kereskedelem soraiba. Ezért lényeges pontja a mostani javaslatnak, hogy regisztrációs kötelezettséget vezet be az illegális anyagok előállításához szükséges vegyszereket forgalmazókra, illetve felhasználókra is. Központi elem továbbá, hogy egy kábítószer-előállításához szükséges vegyszerekre vonatkozó európai adatbázis létrehozására is javaslatot tesz a szöveg. A kábítószeres világ egy gyorsan változó világ, ezért nagyon fontos, hogy a közösségi szabályozás lépést tartson a terület sajnálatos „fejlődésével”, illetve lényeges a megelőző célokat szolgáló tájékoztatás a drogok előállításához szükséges újabb vegyszerekről. Bízom benne, hogy e jelentés mihamarabb jóváhagyásra kerül a Tanácsban is, így a jogszabály hatályba léphet, ezáltal is hozzájárulva az ilyen vegyszerek által függővé váló drogfogyasztók számának csökkenéséhez.

3-179-352

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), *per iscritto*. – L'UE è stata recentemente criticata a livello internazionale per la presunta debolezza delle misure di controllo sul mercato europeo dei precursori di droghe. Queste sostanze chimiche sono impiegate in numerosi processi industriali, ma capita che il loro commercio lecito sia deviato verso la produzione illecita di sostanze stupefacenti. Raramente i precursori di droghe sono prodotti dai criminali, perché la loro fabbricazione richiede infrastrutture importanti: normalmente essi vengono rubati o acquistati legalmente. Con il voto di oggi, il Parlamento si è espresso positivamente sulle proposte avanzate dalla Commissione europea per contrastare la deviazione di queste sostanze verso scopi illegittimi: l'istituzione di un sistema di rilascio delle licenze e di registrazione rafforzato e armonizzato, la creazione a livello europeo di una banca dati che contenga informazioni sui sequestri di precursori di droghe nell'UE e l'elaborazione di un elenco di tutti gli operatori autorizzati o registrati e di tutti gli utilizzatori finali di precursori di droghe nell'UE. Questi strumenti consentiranno di controllare in maniera più attenta i flussi commerciali, senza imporre inutili oneri amministrativi a carico delle imprese.

3-179-002

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (S&D), *na piśmie*. – Jak wszystko, co dotyczy narkotyków, kontrowersje budzi także sprawa ich potencjalnych prekursorów. Z jednej strony musimy mieć na uwadze możliwość nielegalnego zastosowania tych substancji na czarnym rynku, z drugiej zaś to, że są to legalne komponenty wielu legalnych produktów. Ich produkcją zajmują się też często małe i średnie przedsiębiorstwa, dla których zaostrzone przepisy dotyczące monitoringu i rejestracji tych substancji mogą stanowić dodatkowe obciążenie. Należy więc rozważyć wyważyć proporcje między kontrolą ich „wycieków” na nielegalny rynek a obciążeniami z nią związanymi dla wytwórców legalnie korzystających z tych substancji.

W sprawozdaniu szczególnie nacisk położono na bezwodnik octowy, który jest legalnie wykorzystywany do produkcji np. perfum czy aspiryny, ale może posłużyć też do nielegalnej produkcji heroiny, amfetaminy i kokainy. Według Centrum Monitorowania Narkotyków i Narkomanii jest to jeden z najczęściej używanych i przechwytywanych prekursorów w Europie. Popieram wniosek komisji dotyczący lepszego monitorowania handlu bezwodnikiem octowym, jednakże bez nakładania dodatkowych biurokratycznych obciążeń administracyjnych dla przedsiębiorców. Stworzenie europejskiej bazy danych o prekursorach narkotykowych także uważam za zasadne. Moje wątpliwości budzą jedynie zastosowane liczne akty delegowane pozostawiające, moim zdaniem, zbyt wiele mocy decyzyjnej w rękach Komisji, co w przyszłości może prowadzić do wprowadzania zaostrzeń dotyczących kolejnych substancji, bez wyraźnych podstaw oraz bez konsultacji z Radą i Parlamentem.

3-179-703

Juozas Imbrasas (EFD), *raštu*. – Acto rūgšties anhidridas teisėtai naudojamas plastmasės, tekstilės, dažų, fotochemijos, kvepalų, sprogmenų ir aspirino gamyboje, tačiau neteisėtai gali būti panaudotas gaminant heroiną, amfetaminą ir kokainą. Jis yra pagrindinis heroino, dėl kurio ES patiriama daugiausiai su narkotikų vartojimų susijusių mirčių, pirmtakas. Pritariau tam, kad būtina spręsti neteisėto narkotinių ir psichotropinių medžiagų pirmtakų įsigijimo problemą. Būtina geresnė prekybos acto rūgšties anhidridu stebėseną: taikomi reikalavimai būtų griežtesni, kompetentingose institucijose turės registruotis acto rūgšties anhidrido galutiniai naudotojai, nors iki šiol buvo registruojami tik gamintojai ir ūkio subjektai, tvarkantys acto rūgšties anhidridą. Reikalinga sugriežtinti registracijos taisykles, t.y. sugriežtinti naudojamas apibrėžtis ir nustatyti labiau suderintas registracijos sąlygas ir (arba) reikalavimus, užtikrinant tam tikrą lankstumą, kad būtų galima kategorijas pritaikyti prie besikeičiančių aplinkybių. Reikia sukurti Europos narkotinių ir psichotropinių medžiagų pirmtakų (prekursorių) duomenų bazę, kurioje būtų nurodyta informacija apie ES konfiskuotus pirmtakus, ir parengti visų ES licencijuotų arba registruotų su pirmtakais dirbančių ūkio subjektų ir naudotojų sąrašą. Pagal pasiūlymą leidžiama teisėtai prekiauti acto rūgšties anhidridu ir jį naudoti ir įmonėms nesukuriamą jokios nereikalingos administracinės naštos. Tuo pačiu sudaroma galimybė kompetentingoms institucijoms atidžiau stebėti prekybos srautus ir taip nustatyti bei sustabdyti neteisėtą įsigijimą.

3-179-732

Livia Járóka (PPE), *in writing*. – I would like to welcome the legislative proposal aiming at preventing the diversion of acetic anhydride, the primary drug precursor of heroin, from the European Union's internal trade. Strengthening this regulatory framework is extremely important because, despite the significant decrease in the past few years, heroin still accounts

for the greatest share of drug-related morbidity in the EU. It is difficult to find a balance between avoiding unnecessary barriers to the legitimate trade in precursors and reducing administrative burdens for operators and competent authorities on the one hand, and reinforcing the monitoring and control of operators and users on the other. This initiative is a step in the right direction and I also welcome the proposal to extend the registration requirements – currently only applying to operators placing the precursor on the market – to include users of the substance and also to enhance the harmonised registration provisions to avoid the adoption of divergent national measures.

3-179-746

Philippe Juvin (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport de ma collègue Anna Hedh dont le but est d'empêcher le détournement du commerce interne à l'UE de produits servant à la fabrication de l'héroïne. Le texte aboutira à une obligation d'enregistrement des utilisateurs des substances, et à une plus grande harmonisation des dispositions concernant cet enregistrement. Je me félicite de l'adoption de ce rapport à une très large majorité de 575 voix pour, 34 voix contre et 54 abstentions.

3-179-753

Giovanni La Via (PPE), *per iscritto*. – I precursori di droghe sono sostanze chimiche utilizzate in molti processi industriali che possono essere utilizzate impropriamente per la produzione illecita di droghe. Ultimamente sono state mosse delle accuse all'Unione europea per le deboli misure di controllo che regolano, soprattutto, l'uso dell'anidride acetica. Al fine di migliorare il controllo della deviazione illecita dei precursori di droghe, ho votato favorevolmente questa relazione, appoggiando la volontà di sopperire al problema attraverso il rafforzamento della sorveglianza del commercio di anidride acetica, delle norme in materia di registrazione e l'istituzione di una banca dati europea che raggruppi gli operatori autorizzati alla produzione. Ritengo, infatti, che una revisione del regolamento in questa direzione sarà in grado di consentire dei controlli più ad ampio raggio e, di conseguenza, ne migliorerebbe sia la capacità che l'efficacia.

3-179-757

Agnès Le Brun (PPE), *par écrit*. – Les précurseurs de drogues sont des substances utilisées par les industries chimiques et pharmaceutiques qui entrent également dans la composition de drogues illicites, comme l'éphédrine utilisées pour produire des amphétamines ou les PMK qui entrent dans la composition de l'ecstasy. Les trafiquants de drogues inventent sans cesse de nouvelles manières de contourner la réglementation très stricte concernant le commerce de ces produits, en créant par exemple des sociétés écrans. Le Parlement européen a donc mis à jour la législation pour tenir compte des innovations des trafiquants, sans pour autant empêcher le commerce de ces produits par des opérateurs économiques légitimes. J'ai voté en faveur de ce texte car il renforce les moyens de l'Union européenne en matière de lutte contre le trafic de drogues. Les États membres pourront saisir les produits médicaux en cas de suspicion d'utilisation illicite. Une base de données européenne sera créée sur les expéditions et les saisies de marchandises. Enfin, un mécanisme de réponse rapide permettra à la Commission européenne et aux États membres de prendre en compte le plus tôt possible les nouvelles manœuvres de diversions utilisées par les trafiquants.

3-179-761

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D), *na piśmie* . – Dzisiaj podczas posiedzenia plenarnego głosowaliśmy w sprawie prekursorów narkotykowych. Są to substancje chemiczne powszechnie wykorzystywane w różnych procesach przemysłowych (w produkcji tworzyw sztucznych, produktów farmaceutycznych, kosmetyków, perfum czy detergentów), które to substancje mogą być jednak stosowane w sposób niezgodny z przeznaczeniem, tzn. do produkcji narkotyków. Przestępcy rzadko samodzielnie wytwarzają prekursory narkotykowe, które zamierzają wykorzystać do nielegalnego wytwarzania narkotyków, ponieważ ich produkcja często wymaga rozbudowanej infrastruktury. Zamiast tego często próbują nielegalnie pozyskiwać prekursory narkotykowe z legalnej wymiany handlowej albo też przez kradzież.

Uważam, iż powinniśmy utworzyć europejską bazę danych o prekursorach narkotykowych, której celem będzie m.in. ułatwienie państwom członkowskim zgłaszania konfiskat i zatrzymanych wysyłek w miarę możliwości w sposób zanonimizowany oraz jak najmniej uciążliwy pod względem przetwarzania danych osobowych, z uwzględnieniem zasady ograniczania dostępności danych i nowoczesnych technologii ochrony prywatności. Należy również stworzyć europejski rejestr podmiotów gospodarczych i użytkowników posiadających stosowne zezwolenia, co ułatwi weryfikację legalności transakcji handlowych z udziałem substancji sklasyfikowanych oraz umożliwi przedsiębiorstwom podawanie właściwym organom informacji o ich legalnych transakcjach z udziałem substancji sklasyfikowanych.

3-179-783

Monica Luisa Macovei (PPE), *in writing* . – The amendments proposed to the Commission Regulation on drug precursors, notably Acetic Anhydride, make great strides toward further diminishing the presence of heroin in the Member States. According to a report produced by EUROPOL earlier this year, three-quarters of drug-related deaths in Europe can be linked to opioids or a combination thereof. Increased cooperation and information exchange between countries and organisations have achieved significant success. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime convened Operation TARCET in 2008 to, among other things, ‘...focus on information collection and sharing, risk profiling and analysis, and joint precursor control operations...’. Under the guidance of this operation, regional authorities in Central Asia made numerous sizable seizures upwards of 19 tonnes of Acetic Anhydride, the most important precursor in heroin production. Though the European market for heroin has steadily been declining over the past decade, deaths and treatment costs have remained a significant burden. By establishing more effective data parameters to optimise Member State and Institutional cooperation, these amendments will facilitate the further reduction in illicit drug precursor manufacturing and sales, thereby disrupting heroin markets across Europe.

3-179-805

David Martin (S&D), *in writing* . – I voted in favour of this report because drug precursors are often used in the development of illicit drugs. I supported this report because it had clear purpose limitations and strict restrictions on sharing information with third parties. By registering all operators and end-users trading in and using particular precursors, the EU will be better able to control the spread of illegal drugs.

3-179-849

Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur du rapport afin de lutter contre le trafic de drogue, en particulier d'héroïne. Une substance chimique est concernée: l'anhydride acétique, qui est utilisée comme précurseur dans la fabrication de l'héroïne et dont 75 % des saisies réalisées dans le monde révèlent qu'elle a été fabriquée en Europe. Il est essentiel de remédier à cette situation. Si les précurseurs sont fabriqués en vue d'un usage légal, comme pour des produits pharmaceutiques, il faut éviter leur détournement au service du trafic de drogue et donc renforcer le contrôle de ce commerce. L'enregistrement des opérateurs qui vendent l'anhydride devra être harmonisé au niveau européen, et l'enregistrement des utilisateurs devra être obligatoire afin de mieux contrôler ce marché.

3-179-926

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL), *par écrit*. – Le détournement de produits chimiques à partir de la chaîne du commerce licite pour la production illicite de drogues est un phénomène que nous devons combattre. La surveillance des transactions réalisées grâce à des exigences d'autorisation claire d'enregistrement peut en être le moyen. Pour autant, la mise en place d'une base de données à l'échelle européenne, dont les fins d'utilisation ne sont pas clairement établies, est très discutable. D'autant plus que les types de données à caractère personnel pouvant être traitées et conservées dans la base de données européenne présentent le risque traditionnel en la matière. D'autant que les procédures relatives à l'information, à l'accès, à la rectification, à l'effacement et au verrouillage des données traitées dans ladite base sont laissées à la discrétion de la Commission par le biais d'actes délégués. Je m'abstiens.

3-179-924

Nuno Melo (PPE), *por escrito*. – Os precursores de drogas são substâncias químicas amplamente utilizadas para diferentes processos industriais (produção de plásticos, produtos farmacêuticos, cosméticos, perfumes ou detergentes), mas que também podem ser utilizadas para produção de drogas ilícitas. Os precursores de drogas raramente são produzidos para fins criminosos, que pretendem utilizá-los na produção de drogas ilícitas, uma vez que o fabrico de precursores de drogas exige uma infraestrutura industrial substancial. Em vez disso, os criminosos tentam, frequentemente, desviar o comércio legal de precursores de drogas, quer por meio de roubo, quer por meio de compra. Este regulamento propõe-se criar uma nova base de dados, a nível da UE, com informações relativas às apreensões de precursores de drogas na UE, com uma lista de todos os operadores e utilizadores finais, licenciados ou registados, de precursores de drogas na UE. Sou da opinião que este novo regulamento apresenta melhorias significativas em relação ao anterior e que prevenirá, de melhor forma, a utilização dos precursores de drogas para fins ilícitos.

3-179-920

Roberta Metsola (PPE), *in writing*. – I agree with this report and have voted in favour of amending the Regulation on Drug Precursors to enable the European Union and its Member States to continue to have all the tools necessary to continue to combat drug cartels and, ultimately, save lives.

3-179-917

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – He votado en contra del presente informe porque no supone una acción lo suficientemente contundente como para tener un efecto en el comercio de sustancias potencialmente empleadas para la fabricación de narcóticos. El informe llama la atención sobre el problema de las sustancias químicas comercializadas por las diferentes industrias europeas y sus usos potenciales en la fabricación de narcóticos. Pero tan solo propone la creación de una base de datos sobre cuáles son estos productos, una nueva base de datos que no tiene ningún efecto real en el tráfico de estos productos. Consideramos que resultan necesarias medidas más coercitivas para imponer un verdadero control. Debido a que considero que no incrementa el control real sobre estas sustancias, he votado en contra de este informe.

3-179-016

Alexander Mirsky (S&D), *in writing*. – This rather technical report and proposed first-reading agreement seeks to amend existing Regulation 273/2004 on drug precursors (which are substances frequently used in the manufacture of illicit drugs). The principle purpose of the revision of the regulation is to strengthen control of the trade in acetic anhydride which is often used in the illicit production of heroin. The Commission proposes a registration scheme for all operators and end-users trading in and using this particular precursor. In my view this proposal is worthy of support. In favour.

3-179-916

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Drogenausgangsstoffe oder auch Vorläuferstoffe sind Chemikalien, die zur Herstellung von Betäubungsmitteln verwendet werden können. Dazu gehören Stoffe, die bei Einnahme nicht abhängig machen, aber in ein Betäubungsmittel überführt werden können (z. B. Ephedrin, Lysergsäure). Zu den Vorläuferstoffen im weiteren Sinne werden andere chemische Grundstoffe wie Säuren, Basen und organische Lösungsmittel gezählt. Sie eignen sich zur Herstellung von Betäubungsmitteln und psychotropen Stoffen, ohne aber im hergestellten Betäubungsmittel selbst noch enthalten zu sein. Da für die Herstellung von harten Drogen nur geringe Dosen von Drogenausgangsstoffen vonnöten sind, sind ein sorgfältiger Umgang und eine strikte Kontrolle dieser Stoffe unumgänglich. Da es zu teuer wäre, diese Stoffe, die meist in großen Mengen unter hohem industriellen Aufwand hergestellt werden, selber zu produzieren, müssen Mechanismen geschaffen werden, wie etwa die Einführung einer EU-weiten Datenbank der betroffenen Stoffe. Darum habe ich für den Bericht gestimmt.

3-179-915

Claudio Morganti (EFD), *per iscritto*. – Oggi abbiamo votato due relazioni che riguardano i precursori di droghe, ovvero sostanze chimiche ampiamente utilizzate in diversi processi industriali, ad esempio nella produzione di materiali plastici, in ambito farmaceutico o nell'industria cosmetica, che possono tuttavia essere utilizzate impropriamente per la produzione illecita di droghe.

Era assolutamente giusto e doveroso intervenire in questo ambito, poiché la legislazione europea era assai lacunosa. La proposta della Commissione europea per migliorare la situazione attuale si basa sostanzialmente su tre principi, ovvero un rafforzamento della sorveglianza del commercio di questi prodotti, un miglioramento delle norme in materia di registrazione ed infine l'istituzione di una banca dati europea sui precursori di droghe.

L'altro testo legislativo serve invece a regolare il commercio di queste sostanze tra l'Unione europea e i paesi terzi: anche in questo ambito si è scelto giustamente di applicare misure più rigide. Queste sostanze, usate in maniera illecita, servono principalmente per la produzione di droghe pericolosissime come cocaina, anfetamine o anche eroina, che rappresenta oggi la più elevata percentuale di mortalità correlata al consumo di stupefacenti in tutta l'UE.

Ben vengano quindi misure di questo tipo, volte a prevenire tutte le enormi problematiche causate ancora oggi dal consumo di stupefacenti in Europa.

3-179-931

Katarína Neveďalová (S&D), *písomne*. – Drogové prekurzory sú chemikálie bežne používané v rôznych priemyselných procesoch, napríklad pri výrobe plastov, liekov, kozmetiky alebo čistiacich prostriedkov, ktoré je však možné zneužiť na výrobu nelegálnych drog. Medzi nechválne známe patrí napríklad takzvaná soľ do kúpeľa alebo „bath salts“. Tento typ drog sa mnohokrát vyskytuje vo veľkom množstve v internetových obchodoch a jeho predaj je prakticky legálny. Syntetické drogy sú totiž predávané ako produkty na iné použitie, napríklad ako prostriedky na čistenie. Tieto látky majú však mnohokrát hrozivejšie účinky ako „konvenčné“ drogy vyrábané z prírodných látok. Tento typ drog je masovo populárny približne posledné štyri roky. Z dostupných informácií sme mohli viackrát vidieť, že tieto látky majú nepredvídateľný vplyv na ich užívateľov, často spojeným s násilnou trestnou činnosťou. V priebehu niekoľkých posledných rokov bola EÚ terčom medzinárodnej kritiky pre jej údajne príliš mierne kontrolné opatrenia. Táto kritika sa zamerala najmä na jednu látku, acetanhydrid – AA. Množstvá AA zadržaného v rámci Európy v roku 2008 by stačili približne na pokrytie polročného dopytu AA potrebného na výrobu heroínu v Afganistane. Je preto veľmi dôležité zabezpečiť, aby sa drogové prekurzory ako AA nedostali do nesprávnych rúk.

3-179-932

Antigoni Papadopoulou (S&D), *in writing*. – This is a technical report that seeks to amend existing Regulation 273/2004 on drug precursors which are substances frequently used in the manufacture of illicit drugs. The revised regulation aims to strengthen trade control and improve definitions and licensing. Moreover, it aims to strike a balance between preventing the illicit use of drug precursors and the commercial needs of legitimate operators. We do need strong legislation for regulating the production, distribution, purchase, transportation, import and export of precursor chemicals and preventing precursor substances from being used in manufacturing drugs and psychotropic substances. I voted in favour of this report because it brings significant improvements compared to the previous regulations of 2004 and 2005. For example, it establishes a European database on drug precursors, and a list of EU licensed or registered operators as well as of legally trading users of drug precursors. The improved legislation aims to combat the diversion of drug precursors and thus contributes to the overall fight against the supply of illegal drugs.

3-179-816

Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), *por escrito*. – Os precursores de drogas são substâncias químicas amplamente utilizadas para diferentes processos industriais (produção de plásticos, produtos farmacêuticos, cosméticos, perfumes ou detergentes), mas que também podem ser utilizadas para produção de drogas ilícitas. Os precursores de drogas são raramente

produzidos por criminosos que pretendem utilizá-los na produção de drogas ilícitas, uma vez que o fabrico de precursores de drogas exige uma infraestrutura industrial substancial. Em vez disso, os criminosos tentam desviar o comércio legal de precursores de drogas, quer por meio de roubo, quer por meio de compra. No relatório em anexo, a Comissão propõe a criação de uma nova base de dados, a nível da UE, com informações relativas às apreensões de precursores de drogas na UE, com uma lista de todos os operadores e utilizadores finais, licenciados ou registados, de precursores de drogas na UE. Pretende-se um combate mais eficaz a este problema e a proposta contém melhorias valiosas relativamente à situação atual. A introdução de atos delegados proporcionará à Comissão a flexibilidade necessária para reagir rapidamente à evolução das circunstâncias, bem como para lidar com os traficantes de drogas engenhosos, assegurando-se uma supervisão parlamentar adequada de eventuais alterações. Em face do exposto, votei favoravelmente a presente proposta.

3-179-009

Aldo Patriciello (PPE), *in writing*. – Drug precursors used for industrial production can be used by criminals for the production of illegal drugs. In Europe, there have been concerns regarding the control measures used in the monitoring of the trade in drug precursors, particularly acetic anhydride which is used for producing plastics, dyes, perfumes, etc. but can also be used for the production of heroin, amphetamine and cocaine. Therefore, it is important to make sure chemicals that are major components of illegal drugs are not diverted from legal trade in EU. I voted in favour of this proposal because it sets up a legal framework to better tackle drug-trafficking and prevent market fragmentation relating to drug precursors.

3-179-934

Crescenzo Rivellini (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Oggi in plenaria è stata votata la relazione dell'onorevole Hedh sui precursori di droghe.

I precursori di droghe sono sostanze chimiche ampiamente utilizzate in diversi processi industriali che possono tuttavia essere usate impropriamente per la produzione illecita di droghe. Nonostante l'esistenza di un sistema di rilascio di licenze e registrazione per controllarne il commercio, l'UE è stata oggetto di alcune critiche a livello internazionale a causa delle sue presunte deboli misure di controllo. Le critiche si sono concentrate sull'anidride acetica ("AA"), il principale precursore di droghe per l'eroina.

Sono d'accordo con la relatrice nell'appoggiare la proposta della Commissione secondo cui, facendo in modo che tali precursori non siano deviati dal commercio lecito nell'UE, gli utilizzatori finali dell'AA dovranno essere registrati presso le autorità competenti e secondo cui ancora dovrà essere istituita una banca dati che contenga informazioni sui sequestri di precursori di droghe nell'UE, non dimenticando tuttavia il rispetto e la protezione dei dati personali.

3-179-701

Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), *per iscritto*. – In merito all'uso improprio dei precursori di droghe ho ritenuto opportuno votare a favore del rafforzamento delle definizioni utilizzate e dell'introduzione - ai fini della registrazione - di condizioni/requisiti più armonizzati e flessibili in modo da adattare le diverse categorie all'evoluzione della situazione. Ho accolto favorevolmente la proposta della Commissione di istituire a livello

europeo una nuova banca dati che contenga informazioni sui sequestri di precursori di droghe nell'UE, e un elenco di tutti gli operatori autorizzati o registrati e di tutti gli utilizzatori finali di precursori di droghe nell'UE. Lo snellimento e l'armonizzazione della registrazione e dei requisiti concernenti il rilascio delle licenze all'interno dell'UE vanno appoggiati per evitare la frammentazione del mercato e impedire ai criminali di prendere di mira "l'anello più debole" nel mercato interno dell'UE. Infine, l'istituzione di una banca dati europea deve essere accolta positivamente, in quanto apporterà la necessaria trasparenza e rafforzerà il controllo di tutti i precursori di droghe nell'UE.

3-179-468

Catherine Stihler (S&D), *in writing*. – I voted in favour of legislation against drug precursors, as I am in favour of improved public health.

3-179-235

Kay Swinburne (ECR), *in writing*. – Effective tackling of the diversion of substances from legal trade for use in drug production can be an important tool in the fight against illegal drugs and one in which we must do all that we can to support. I welcome this Commission proposal and I hope it will strengthen our ability to identify when substances produced for legal purposes are being misused for illegal drug production.

3-179-003

Marc Tarabella (S&D), *par écrit*. – Je me suis prononcé en faveur de ce texte. Il faut savoir que les précurseurs de drogues sont des substances chimiques qui sont employées dans un large éventail de processus industriels (fabrication de plastiques, de produits pharmaceutiques, de cosmétiques, de parfums, de détergents, etc.), mais qui peuvent aussi être détournées aux fins de la production illicite de stupéfiants. Elles sont rarement fabriquées par les trafiquants qui les destinent à un usage illicite, car cette fabrication nécessite une infrastructure importante. C'est pourquoi elles font souvent l'objet de tentatives de détournement des circuits commerciaux licites, sous la forme soit de vols, soit de rachats. C'est la raison pour laquelle le cadre réglementaire en place prévoit un régime d'agrément et d'enregistrements des précurseurs de drogues. Ce régime contrôle les échanges commerciaux de ces substances dans l'Union européenne, en imposant des obligations spécifiques aux entreprises concernées (prévention des vols, vérification des clients, détection des transactions suspectes) et aux pouvoirs publics (procédures administratives et visites dans les entreprises). La rigueur des contrôles varie en fonction des catégories des produits.

3-179-470

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), *schriftlich*. – Eine intensive Überwachung der Drogenausgangsstoffe ist ein wichtiger Beitrag zur Bekämpfung von Drogensucht und –kriminalität. Besonders Essigsäureanhydrid (Grundstoff für Heroin) muss genau überwacht werden, um eine illegale Verarbeitung zu vermeiden. So kann die Europäische Union maßgebliche Schritte setzen, die sie als Standort für Drogenproduktion unattraktiv machen.

3-179-586

Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), *na piśmie*. – Prekursorami nazywa się główne składniki służące do wytwarzania narkotyków syntetycznych i półsyntetycznych. Mimo że większość osób nie zdaje sobie z tego sprawy, stanowią kluczowy segment przestępczości narkotykowej. Polska ustawa o przeciwdziałaniu narkomanii penalizuje produkcję, przemysł, handel,

posiadanie i przechowywanie prekursorów. Każda z tych czynności wykonana w celu nielegalnej syntezy narkotyków jest karana grzywną lub karą pozbawienia wolności do lat 5. W tym wypadku dla organów ścigania najważniejsze jest udowodnienie, że znalezione prekursory mają służyć produkcji narkotyków. Bez tego możliwe jest zastosowanie jedynie kary grzywny. Kolejnym mankamentem jest brak w akcie prawnym jakichkolwiek zapisów odnośnie znaczenia ilości prekursorów. Oznacza to, że w świetle ustawy osoba, która przemycała tonę BMK może być traktowana tak samo jak osoba przemycająca tylko litr tej substancji. Istnieje również artykuł karzący grzywną za niedopełnienie obowiązków ewidencyjnych osób legalnie produkujących, przewożących lub handlujących prekursorami. Jest to bardzo istotne, ponieważ większość prekursorów to substancje podwójnego zastosowania, niektóre bardzo powszechnie stosowane w przemyśle. Taki zapis w prawie daje Państwu pewne pole działania w zakresie przeciwdziałania wyciekom prekursorów z obrotu legalnego na czarny rynek.

3-179-673

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Nos últimos anos, a UE tem sido criticada internacionalmente pela ausência de medidas de controlo sobre precursores de drogas ou pelo carácter permissivo da legislação em alguns Estados-Membros. A crítica tem-se concentrado sobretudo no anidrido acético, substância que é legalmente utilizada para a produção de plásticos, têxteis, corantes, fotoquímicos, perfumes, explosivos e aspirinas, mas também pode ser utilizada, de forma ilegal, na produção de heroína, cocaína e anfetaminas. Este é o principal precursor de droga para a produção de heroína. É evidente a necessidade de reforçar o controlo de operações que possam conduzir ao uso ilegal destas substâncias, combatendo o desvio de produtos químicos a partir da corrente de comércio lícito para a produção ilícita de drogas. A criação de uma base de dados a nível da UE para o efeito não é uma condição *sine qua non* para alcançar esse objetivo. Para além dos riscos associados à proliferação de bases de dados cuja proporcionalidade, finalidade e utilização levantam sérias suspeitas de possíveis violações das liberdades e garantias dos cidadãos - como a existência de outras bases de dados e o seu acesso tem demonstrado - esse objetivo pode ser mais facilmente atingível com o reforço da legislação de cada país.

12.3. Plan d'action relatif à la justice en ligne (2014-2018) (B7-0465/2013)

3-179-968

Explications de vote par écrit

3-179-970

Luís Paulo Alves (S&D), *por escrito*. – Aprovo a presente proposta de Resolução, entendendo que a justiça eletrónica tem um importante papel a desempenhar no reforço da confiança e da compreensão mútuas e, deste modo, no suporte do reconhecimento mútuo das decisões judiciais e administrativas, grande princípio do sistema jurídico da União Europeia. Neste sentido, saliento que os sistemas de justiça eletrónica, pela sua própria natureza, tendem a reduzir os custos dos procedimentos judiciais e administrativos, em especial através da automatização do intercâmbio de informações, da notificação de documentos e da tradução de determinados atos processuais. Considero que são do interesse de todas as partes interessadas no sistema jurídico e que, por considerações de custo-eficácia, os projetos devem permanecer voluntários. Ao mesmo tempo, aplaudo o desenvolvimento de ferramentas de justiça eletrónica para facilitar a utilização de determinados instrumentos da União Europeia, como o procedimento europeu de injunção de pagamento e o processo

européu para ações de pequeno montante, bem como de sistemas de informação no domínio da Justiça e dos Assuntos Internos, nomeadamente o Sistema Europeu de Informação sobre os Registos Criminais (ECRIS) e o Sistema de Informação Schengen (SIS II).

3-179-976

Elena Oana Antonescu (PPE), *în scris*. – Îmbunătățirea accesului la justiție, a cooperării între autoritățile judiciare și a eficacității justiției sunt elemente care stau la baza dezvoltării și consolidării spațiului judiciar european. Introducerea tehnologiei informațiilor și comunicațiilor (TIC) în administrarea justiției oferă soluții de îmbunătățire a funcționării justiției, contribuind în același timp atât la simplificarea procedurilor, cât și la diminuarea costurilor. Dezvoltarea e-justiției este un element cheie al modernizării sistemelor judiciare. În ultimii ani de zile s-au făcut pași importanți în acest domeniu, atât prin lansarea, în anul 2010, a portalului e-justiție, cât și prin dezvoltarea unor instrumente care facilitează utilizarea sistemelor informatice din domeniul justiției, precum Sistemul de Informații Schengen SIS II. Prin propunerea de rezoluție votată astăzi, Parlamentul European subliniază importanța continuării eforturilor susținute depuse în acest domeniu atât de Comisia Europeană, cât și de statele membre. Îmbunătățirea eficacității activității judiciare și facilitarea accesului cetățenilor la justiție reprezintă obiectivele principale pe care Comisia trebuie să le aibă în vedere la alcătuirea viitorului plan de acțiune în materie de e-justiție pentru perioada 2014–2018.

3-179-977

Zigmantas Balčytis (S&D), *raštu*. – Balsavau už šį siūlymą dėl e. teisingumo veiksmų plano 2014–2018 m. priėmimo. Pirmasis Europos e. teisingumo veiksmų planas taikytas 2009–2013 m. ir juo siekta sudaryti geresnę prieigą prie teisinės ir teisminės informacijos bei teisminių ir administracinių procesų tiek piliečiams, tiek teisininkams. E. teisingumui tenka svarbus vaidmuo gerinant tarpusavio pasitikėjimą ir supratimą, taigi ir įtvirtinant abipusį teisminių ir administracinių sprendimų pripažinimą, kuris yra vienas pagrindinių ES teisinės sistemos principų. E. teisingumo sistemos nulemia mažesnes teisminių ir administracinių procesų sąnaudas, ypač automatizuojant keitimąsi informacija, dokumentų įteikimą ir procedūrinių aktų vertimą. Pritariu raginimams valstybėms narėms ir Komisijai mažinti tarpvalstybinę biurokratiją dažniau keičiantis dokumentais elektroniniu būdu, naudojantis vaizdo konferencijomis ir labiau susiejant teisminius ir administracinius registrus. Atitinkamas dėmesys turėtų būti skiriamas teisminėms institucijoms skirtoms e. mokymosi priemonėms plėtoti, bei turėtų būti numatytos sąlygos finansuoti sėkmingus Europos ir nacionalinius e. teisingumo projektus, kurie duotų piliečiams tikros Europos pridėtinės vertės.

3-179-010

Vilija Blinkevičiūtė (S&D), *raštu*. – Balsavau dėl šio pranešimo, kadangi svarbu, jog teisingumas ir teisinė sistema būtų piliečiams prieinamesni ir kad teisininkai geriau suprastų vieni kitus, suteikiant elektronines informacijos ir bendradarbiavimo priemones. 2010 metais pradėjo veikti e. teisingumo portalas ir dabar atėjo metas priimti sprendimą dėl e. teisingumo veiksmų plano 2014–2018 metų laikotarpiui. Svarbu, kad planas būtų parengtas remiantis laisvos prieigos principu ir visos valstybės narės būtų skatinamos dalyvauti. E. teisingumui tenka svarbus vaidmuo gerinant tarpusavio pasitikėjimą ir supratimą, taigi ir įtvirtinant abipusį teisminių ir administracinių sprendimų pripažinimą, kuris yra vienas pagrindinių ES teisinės sistemos principų. Pastebima e. teisingumo svarba teikiant

daugiakalbes standartines formas ir taip mažinant tarpvalstybinę biurokratiją bei siekiant sukurti tikrą europietišką teisminę kultūrą, nes jame talpinamos internetinės teismo mokymo priemonės ir jis tarnauja kaip žinių valdymo ir sąsajų priemonė. Svarbu kuo dažniau naudoti elektronines taikomas programas, teikti dokumentus elektroniniu būdu, naudoti vaizdo konferencijas ir labiau susieti teisinius ir administracinius registrus, kad būtų toliau mažinamos teisminių ir kvaziteisminių procesų sąnaudos. ES teisingumo programoje 2014–2020 m. turėtų būti numatytos sąlygos finansuoti sėkmingus Europos ir nacionalinius e. teisingumo projektus, kurie turėtų piliečiams tikros Europos pridėtinės vertės.

3-179-980

Sebastian Valentin Bodu (PPE), *în scris*. – Lansat în 2010, portalul e-Justice are nevoie de un plan de acțiune pentru perioada 2014-2018. Toate statele membre ar trebui încurajate să participe la această acțiune. Astfel se va facilita accesul deschis la utilizarea anumitor instrumente ale UE, cum ar fi ordinul european de plată și procedura europeană privind cererile cu valoare redusă, precum și a sistemelor informatice din domeniul justiției și afacerilor interne, în special a Sistemului european de informații cu privire la cazierele judiciare (ECRIS) și a Sistemului de Informații Schengen (SIS) II. Sistemele de e-Justiție vor reduce costurile procedurilor judiciare și administrative, în special prin automatizarea schimburilor de informații, a serviciului de documente și a traducerii anumitor acte procedurale, acest lucru fiind în interesul tuturor părților din sistemul judiciar. Furnizarea de formulare standard multilingve va contribui astfel la reducerea birocrăției transfrontaliere.

3-179-008

John Bufton (EFD), *in writing*. – I voted against this report as it represents yet another attempt to create a unified, homogenised EU law designed to replace individual Member States' national legal provisions.

3-179-495

Alain Cadec (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai soutenu cette proposition de résolution permettant une transparence totale du système judiciaire européen. Lancé en 2008, le portail e-Justice procure aux citoyens européens une accessibilité large sur le droit et la jurisprudence de l'Union. Cette proposition de résolution a le mérite de proposer d'élargir toujours davantage cet accès à l'information juridique de l'Union tout en fournissant certains outils facilitant le fonctionnement efficace et rapide de la justice européenne. Par exemple, la procédure européenne d'injonction de payer ou encore la procédure de règlement des petits litiges.

3-179-616

Maria Da Graça Carvalho (PPE), *por escrito*. – Concordo com este plano de ação, que na sequência do plano de ação que abrangia o período de 2009-2013, irá contribuir para um sistema jurídico mais acessível aos cidadãos e melhorar a compreensão mútua entre profissionais e administrações, facultando ferramentas eletrónicas de informação e cooperação.

3-179-982

Minodora Cliveti (S&D), *în scris*. – Având în vedere că portalul e-Justiție a fost lansat în 2010, a venit momentul luării unei hotărâri cu privire la Planul de acțiune în materie de e-Justiție pentru perioada 2014-2018. E-Justiția este un mijloc care permite un acces sporit

la informațiile juridice și judiciare, precum și la procedurile judiciare și administrative, atât pentru cetățeni, cât și pentru practicieni. Sistemele de e-Justiție au tendința de a reduce costurile procedurilor judiciare și administrative, în special prin automatizarea schimburilor de informații, a serviciului de documente și a traducerii anumitor acte procedurale. Acest lucru este în interesul tuturor părților interesate din sistemul judiciar și, ținând cont de considerentele legate de eficiența din punctul de vedere al costurilor, proiectele ar trebui să rămână cu caracter voluntar. Programul UE pentru justiție pentru perioada 2014-2020 ar trebui să permită finanțarea proiectelor europene și naționale de succes în materie de e-Justiție, care ar trebui să aibă o valoare adăugată europeană reală pentru cetățeni. Activitatea legislativă, proiectele în materie de e-Justiție și planificarea programelor financiare ar trebui să fie raționalizate și, totodată, este important să fie furnizate formulare standard multilingve, pentru a reduce astfel birocrăția transfrontalieră.

3-179-983

Carlos Coelho (PPE), *por escrito*. – A entrada em vigor do Tratado de Lisboa permitiu avançar na criação de um espaço europeu comum de justiça, no qual as autoridades policiais e judiciárias poderão confiar e contar, de facto, umas com as outras. Contribuindo, assim, para aumentar a confiança dos cidadãos na equidade dos procedimentos, em particular na proteção dos seus direitos caso estejam perante um tribunal noutra Estado-Membro ou sejam vítimas de um crime. O recurso às tecnologias de informação e comunicação nesta área, a chamada *e-justice*, tem contribuído para melhorar o acesso dos cidadãos à justiça, facilitar procedimentos na esfera europeia, reduzir os respetivos custos, tornar mais efetiva a resolução de litígios, bem como a punição de atos criminosos. A parte mais visível da justiça eletrónica europeia é o Portal Europeu da Justiça que funciona, desde 2010, como um balcão único na área da justiça. Permite um acesso mais fácil a informações sobre diferentes sistemas de justiça e à justiça em geral na UE. Precisamos de avaliar cuidadosamente a implementação do atual Plano de Ação, que está a terminar, e ver quais as melhorias que deverão ser introduzidas no próximo plano de ação (2014-2018), uma vez que cerca de 73 % dos cidadãos acreditam que ainda muito há a fazer para facilitar o seu acesso à justiça noutras Estados-Membros.

3-179-738

Lara Comi (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Ho votato a favore di questa proposta di risoluzione che si propone di rendere la giustizia e il sistema giudiziario più trasparente e accessibile ai cittadini, tramite la digitalizzazione degli atti e l'istituzione di strumenti di giustizia elettronica. Credo, infatti, che la giustizia elettronica possa dare un contributo importante a snellire e velocizzare i procedimenti giudiziari e amministrativi e ridurre i costi. Un piccolo passo, su una strada ancora molto lunga da percorrere. Soprattutto per l'Italia, che proprio a causa di un sistema giudiziario non in grado di garantire il diritto a una durata ragionevole del processo - diritto sancito anche nella Carta dei Diritti Fondamentali dell'Unione Europea - è stata più volte condannata dalla Corte Europea dei Diritti dell'Uomo.

3-179-493

Diogo Feio (PPE), *por escrito*. – Um velho aforismo jurídico recorda a todos que *o desconhecimento da lei não aproveita a ninguém*. Não obstante esta posição de princípio, que frisa a impossibilidade de alguém arguir a ignorância da lei como causa exculpatória, a verdade é que esse desconhecimento prejudica muitos cidadãos na União Europeia (e é ilegítimamente aproveitado por outros) e nem sempre pode ser afastado de modo tão liminar no momento de aferir da bondade das suas condutas concretas. Devem ser saudadas

quaisquer medidas tendentes a tornar mais perceptíveis os ordenamentos jurídicos da União Europeia e, com particular ênfase, as iniciativas que apostam no suporte eletrónico para a sua difusão. Este conhecimento permitirá que as relações jurídicas sejam mais seguras e que os cidadãos conheçam mais cabalmente e de um modo direto e acessível os seus direitos e deveres e os melhores modos de interagirem com as administrações e os sistemas judiciais dos Estados-Membros. A aposta na justiça eletrónica é mais um passo nesse caminho.

3-179-248

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE), *por escrito*. – O conhecimento dos instrumentos da justiça civil da UE e dos procedimentos transfronteiriços é relativamente reduzido. E é precisamente tendo em vista facilitar o acesso à justiça civil noutros Estados-Membros que uma grande maioria dos cidadãos (73%) considera necessárias medidas adicionais ao nível da União Europeia. Os sistemas de justiça eletrónica constituem um meio de permitir maior acesso a informações legais e jurídicas, e a procedimentos judiciais e administrativos, tanto por cidadãos como por profissionais. Tendem a reduzir os custos dos procedimentos judiciais e administrativos, em especial através da automatização do intercâmbio de informações, da notificação de documentos e da tradução de determinados atos processuais. Importa, por isso, que Estados-Membros e Comissão reforcem os seus trabalhos sobre cooperação eletrónica no domínio da justiça.

3-179-187

João Ferreira (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – O uso de meios eletrónicos é uma inevitabilidade dos nossos dias. No domínio da justiça, a *justiça eletrónica* constitui um meio para permitir maior e mais fácil acesso a informações legais e jurídicas e a procedimentos judiciais e administrativos, tanto por cidadãos como por profissionais. Há, todavia, exigências de confidencialidade que aconselham muita prudência neste campo. Ainda mais se se tratar de matérias da área criminal e/ou assuntos internos (ponto 4 da Resolução). Os sistemas de justiça eletrónica, pela sua própria natureza, tendem a reduzir os custos dos procedimentos judiciais e administrativos, em especial através da automatização do intercâmbio de informações, da notificação de documentos e da tradução de determinados atos processuais. Mas apesar dessa redução de custos, da celeridade e dos alegados ganhos de produtividade estão longe de estar assegurados os necessários mecanismos de segurança dos sistemas informáticos. E sobre isto nada é dito na resolução. Portugal é um bom exemplo de um país no qual têm sido detetados vários problemas e falhas ao nível da segurança e confidencialidade dos dados e dos processos. Não apoiámos esta resolução.

3-179-004

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D), *písomne*. – Akčný plán zastrešujúci problematiku elektronickej justície pokrýval obdobie 2009 – 2013. V súčasnosti je na mieste rozhodnúť o akčnom pláne pre roky 2014 – 2018. Elektronickú justíciu možno oprávnene považovať za prostriedok, ktorý občanom i vykonávateľom právnickej profesie uľahčuje prístup k právnym a justičným informáciám a tiež zároveň k súdnym a správnym konaniam. Vzájomné uznávanie súdnych rozhodnutí v rámci členských štátov Únie je tiež jednou z podstatných zásad fungujúceho právneho systému EU.

3-179-249

Elisabetta Gardini (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Il primo piano europeo di azione pluriennale in materia di giustizia elettronica ha coperto il periodo 2009-2013. Con il voto di oggi, il

Parlamento ha esortato la Commissione ad avanzare un nuovo piano per il periodo 2014-2020, in modo da rilanciare l'azione dell'Unione in materia di giustizia elettronica, procedendo al contempo a una razionalizzazione dell'attività legislativa, dei progetti e della programmazione finanziaria che la riguardano. La giustizia elettronica vuole essere uno strumento finalizzato a rendere il sistema giuridico più accessibile tanto ai cittadini, quanto ai professionisti del settore. Le potenzialità da sfruttare sono molte: i sistemi di giustizia elettronica possono facilitare il mutuo riconoscimento delle decisioni giudiziarie e amministrative, aiutare a ridurre i costi dei procedimenti giudiziari e amministrativi e accrescere la consapevolezza circa gli strumenti di giustizia civile dell'UE e le procedure transfrontaliere. Interessante e da approfondire nel nuovo piano sarebbe l'elaborazione di strumenti di apprendimento elettronico per la magistratura.

3-179-494

Juozas Imbrasas (EFD), *raštu*. – Pritariau šiam pasiūlymui, kadangi ES civilinės teisenos priemonių ir tarptautinių procedūrų žinomumas palyginti menkas ir kadangi 73 proc. piliečių mano, jog reikia papildomų priemonių, kad jiems būtų lengviau prieinama civilinė teisena kitose valstybėse narėse. E. teisingumas yra priemonė sudaryti geresnę prieigą prie teisinės ir teisminės informacijos bei teisminių ir administracinių procesų tiek piliečiams, tiek teisininkams. E. teisingumui tenka svarbus vaidmuo gerinant tarpusavio pasitikėjimą ir supratimą, taigi ir įtvirtinant abipusę teisminių ir administracinių sprendimų pripažinimą, kuris yra vienas pagrindinių ES teisinės sistemos principų. ES teisingumo programoje 2014–2020 m. turėtų būti numatytos sąlygos finansuoti sėkmingus Europos ir nacionalinius e. teisingumo projektus, kurie turėtų piliečiams tikros Europos pridėtinės vertės. Todėl dabar atėjo metas priimti sprendimą dėl e. teisingumo veiksmų plano 2014–2018 m. ir šis e. teisingumo veiksmų planas turėtų būti parengtas remiantis laisvos prieigos principu ir visos valstybės narės turėtų būti skatinamos dalyvauti.

3-179-876

Philippe Juvin (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de cette résolution qui reconnaît les bienfaits que pourrait apporter aux citoyens une convergence entre les nouvelles technologies et la justice, tout en permettant une réduction des coûts. Elle appelle à une meilleure accessibilité à la justice en ligne, que ce soit par le biais d'applications électroniques ou l'usage de la visioconférence. Je me félicite de l'adoption de cette résolution.

3-179-739

Béla Kovács (NI), *írásban* – Normálisan működő országokban az e-igazságszolgáltatás a polgárok és a jogászok számára egyaránt a jogi és igazságszolgáltatási információkhoz, valamint a bírósági és közigazgatási eljárásokhoz való jobb hozzáférést elősegítő eszköz.

Az állásfoglalás szerint a projektekben való részvételnek továbbra is önkéntes jellegűnek kell maradnia. Nagyban függ a kormányzati hozzáállástól, hogy mennyire lesz a rendszer polgárbarát, azonban az internet rohamos terjedése mellett meg kellett adnom az esélyt, hátha ez javítani fog a jelenlegi bürokratikus rendszeren, így megszavaztam.

3-179-800

Agnès Le Brun (PPE), *par écrit*. – Le Parlement européen a adopté une résolution sur le plan d'action sur la justice en ligne 2014-2020 présenté par la Commission européenne. Nous avons salué le rôle du portail e-Justice lancé en 2010, qui vise à rendre la justice et le système juridique plus accessibles aux citoyens, ainsi qu'à améliorer la coopération entre

les professionnels et les administrations des États membres. Les systèmes de justice en ligne permettent de réduire le coût des procédures judiciaires et administratives, en particulier grâce à l'automatisation des échanges d'informations, à la distribution de documents officiels et à la traduction de certains actes de procédure. Nous avons souligné le potentiel de la justice en ligne afin de faciliter l'utilisation de certains instruments européens, tels que la procédure européenne d'injonction de payer ou le système européen d'information sur les casiers judiciaires (ECRIS). La mise à disposition de formulaires types multilingues pourrait également faciliter les procédures administratives. J'ai voté en faveur de ce texte qui adresse un signal positif pour la poursuite des travaux européens sur le thème de la justice en ligne.

3-179-861

Véronique Mathieu Houillon (PPE), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de la résolution relative à la justice en ligne afin d'encourager le développement d'un outil efficace qui permet d'élargir l'accès aux informations juridiques et judiciaires et qui contribue à réduire les coûts des procédures judiciaires et administratives, en particulier grâce à l'automatisation des échanges d'informations. Le portail internet e-Justice, qui fournit des informations sur les systèmes juridiques dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne, en vingt-deux langues, devrait être développé et proposer de nouvelles applications, comme des outils de formation en ligne.

3-179-891

Erminia Mazzoni (PPE), *per iscritto*. – La giustizia è diventata uno dei maggiori costi nella UE. All'intuitibile onere sociale si sommano significative perdite economiche. Tempi lunghi dei processi e conseguente insicurezza producono una consistente riduzione del PIL. In tale contesto il Piano per la Giustizia Digitale 2014/18 punta ad essere fattore di promozione di una maggiore efficienza delle procedure grazie all'automazione dello scambio di informazioni, della notificazione di documenti e della traduzione di alcuni atti procedurali. Gli obiettivi sono la riduzione della burocrazia, in particolare di quella transfrontaliera, e lo sviluppo di strumenti di apprendimento elettronico per la magistratura e il personale. Con la relazione degli onn. Lehne e López Aguilar il Parlamento chiede che il settore digitale nel campo della giustizia sia considerato tra le priorità nel programma europeo sulla giustizia per il periodo 2014/20. Condivido pienamente le esigenze sottese alla iniziativa parlamentare dei colleghi relatori e, con il mio voto favorevole, ho voluto esprimere il mio sostegno al percorso intrapreso.

3-179-922

Jean-Luc Mélenchon (GUE/NGL), *par écrit*. – La justice en ligne est un projet défendable s'il a pour but de faciliter l'accès des citoyens à la connaissance de leurs droits ou encore une meilleure coopération judiciaire entre professionnels, et uniquement lorsque les libertés sont garanties. Ce n'est manifestement pas le cas ici. Cette résolution avance une idée déshumanisée de la justice via la visioconférence. Elle représente également une menace sérieuse contre les libertés du fait de l'interconnexion des fichiers. On voit bien l'avantage en terme de réductions des coûts publics mais cela s'accommode du développement d'un marché lucratif et laissé aux mains du privé. Je vote contre.

3-179-694

Nuno Melo (PPE), *por escrito*. – O primeiro Plano de Ação plurianual sobre a justiça eletrónica europeia abrangeu o período de 2009-2013 e procurou tornar a justiça e o sistema jurídico mais acessíveis aos cidadãos e melhorar a compreensão mútua entre profissionais e administrações, facultando ferramentas eletrónicas de informação e cooperação. Temos agora que definir o plano de ação sobre justiça eletrónica para o período de 2014-2018. A justiça eletrónica tem um importante papel a desempenhar no reforço da confiança e da compreensão mútuas e, deste modo, no suporte do reconhecimento mútuo das decisões judiciais e administrativas, grande princípio do sistema jurídico da UE. A justiça eletrónica é muito importante para o acesso de todos à justiça com menores custos e maior eficiência. Daí o meu voto favorável.

3-179-580

Willy Meyer (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – He votado a favor de la presente resolución debido a que supone una mejora en la transparencia y en el acceso a la información sobre el funcionamiento de las instituciones de justicia en los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea. Las administraciones de justicia de los Estados miembros muchas veces carecen de la transparencia necesaria para poder garantizar la participación de todos los ciudadanos. Ante un colapso de los sistemas tradicionales, que llegan a alarmantes plazos de espera, los sistemas de justicia electrónica deben servir para permitir un mayor acceso a la justicia por parte de los ciudadanos europeos y para que puedan defender sus derechos de manera más ágil y adaptada a las nuevas tecnologías. Por ello he votado a favor de la presente resolución.

3-179-467

Louis Michel (ALDE), *par écrit*. – Considérant l'Union européenne comme un espace de liberté, de sécurité et de justice où le droit à la libre circulation est considéré comme fondamental, je salue la résolution sur le plan d'action relatif à la justice en ligne. Cette avancée est un progrès non seulement pour les citoyens, mais aussi pour les entreprises. La liberté, la sécurité et la justice se trouvent au cœur de notre travail parlementaire et j'encourage tous les États membres à progresser sur la voie de la justice. Ces progrès montreront le renforcement de la cohésion européenne, la construction d'un espace judiciaire et la concrétisation de l'espace de justice, de sécurité et de liberté.

3-179-353

Alexander Mirsky (S&D), *in writing*. – The Council is in the process of drawing up a draft Action Plan on e-Justice for 2014-2018. There is no longer any possibility of drawing up an initiative report, as the JURI committee did in 2008, on the current Action Plan. Neither the oral question nor the resolution is balanced completely. The oral question focuses on experience with the current e-Justice Action Plan, the conclusions that can be drawn from it, and what the EP cannot expect from the future Action Plan.

3-179-240

Andreas Mölzer (NI), *schriftlich*. – Der intelligente Einsatz von Technologien ist sicherlich eine Möglichkeit, Kosten zu senken. Ebenso begrüßenswert ist das neue E-Justiz-Portal, das eine große Informationserleichterung schaffen kann, sofern noch offene Fragen gelöst werden können und eine entsprechende kontinuierliche Datenbankenpflege erfolgt. In einem gewissen Ausmaß mag auch ein Mehr an Bürgerservice dadurch entstehen. Allerdings

nur, solange die Menschen nicht dazu zwangsbeglückt werden. Allzu leicht werden da nämlich einfach die Kosten auf den Empfänger überwältigt. Zum anderen muss gerade angesichts des jüngsten NSA-Skandals durch entsprechende Sicherheitsmaßnahmen gewährleistet sein, dass die USA nicht bei sämtlichen Schriftstücken gleich mitlesen und sensible Daten so in die falschen Hände gelangen. Diese Punkte wurden meiner Ansicht nach zu wenig berücksichtigt, sodass ich dem vorliegenden Aktionsplan nicht vorbehaltlos zustimmen kann.

3-179-183

Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE), *raštu*. – Pritariu EP rezoliucijai dėl e. teisingumo veiksmų plano 2014–2018 m. E. teisingumas yra priemonė, kuria gerinama prieiga prie teisinės ir teisminės informacijos, palengvinama prieiga prie teisminių ir administracinių procesų, be to, prisideda prie biurokratijos mažinimo. Tokie projektai kaip e. teisingumas ar „e. Codex“ padėjo sumažinti teisminių ir administracinių procesų sąnaudas, o ES piliečiai galėjo paprasčiau ir lengviau susipažinti su ES civiline teiseną. Remdami tokius projektus prisidedame prie europietiškos teisminės kultūros kūrimo ir ES piliečių teisinio išprusimo.

3-179-154

Tiziano Motti (PPE), *per iscritto*. – La giustizia elettronica è uno strumento atto a consentire un maggiore accesso alle informazioni giuridiche e giudiziarie e ai procedimenti giudiziari e amministrativi sia per i cittadini che per i professionisti del settore. Siamo dell'avviso che la giustizia elettronica possa svolgere un ruolo importante per il rafforzamento della fiducia e della comprensione reciproche e, quindi, a sostegno del mutuo riconoscimento delle decisioni giudiziarie e amministrative tra Stati, che rappresenta un principio fondamentale dell'ordinamento giuridico dell'Unione. I sistemi di giustizia elettronica tendono, per loro natura, a ridurre i costi dei procedimenti giudiziari e amministrativi, in particolare grazie all'automazione dello scambio di informazioni, della notificazione di documenti e della traduzione di taluni atti procedurali. Riteniamo che ciò sia nell'interesse dei vari soggetti interessati nell'ambito del sistema giudiziario e, sulla base di considerazioni sul rapporto costi/efficacia, riteniamo che i progetti debbano continuare.

3-179-126

Younous Omarjee (GUE/NGL), *par écrit*. – J'ai voté en faveur de cette résolution car elle met très clairement en avant le souhait du Parlement européen de suspendre l'accord SWIFT, cet accord permettant l'échange de données en masse avec les USA au nom de la lutte contre le terrorisme. Mais les actions des services secrets américains ont balayé toutes les libertés individuelles et les droits fondamentaux de nos concitoyens. Cependant, la résolution ne propose que la suspension de l'accord SWIFT en attendant des explications concernant les actes dont les autorités américaines sont accusées. J'aurais souhaité, purement et simplement, la suppression de cet accord tout comme les négociations sur le traité de libre-échange UE-USA.

3-179-013

Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), *por escrito*. – Votei favoravelmente a presente proposta de resolução referente ao Plano de Ação sobre a justiça eletrónica para 2014-2018 por concordar com os seus pressupostos, designadamente que a justiça eletrónica é um meio para permitir maior acesso a informações legais e jurídicas, e a procedimentos judiciais e administrativos, tanto por cidadãos como por profissionais, e que tem um importante

papel a desempenhar no reforço da confiança e da compreensão mútuas e, deste modo, no suporte do reconhecimento mútuo das decisões judiciais e administrativas, princípio-base do sistema jurídico da UE. Neste sentido o Parlamento Europeu sublinha que o Programa Justiça para o período de 2014 a 2020 da UE deve prever o financiamento de projetos de justiça eletrónica europeus e nacionais bem-sucedidos. Estes projetos devem ter um real valor acrescentado europeu para os cidadãos.

3-179-953

Pavel Poc (S&D), *pisemně*. – Snad nejčastěji je Evropské unii vyčítáno, že nejedná ve věcech, ve kterých by měla jednat, anebo že jedná až příliš tam, kde je lepší nedělat nic. Překračování smluvních vztahů je dle mého názoru jedna z oblastí, kde je nutno jednat a nejenom mluvit. Spojené státy svým vyspělým špehovacím mechanismem totálně překračují důvěru, kterou jsme jim projevili uzavřením dohody SWIFT. Proto si myslím, že nestačí – jak navrhuji kolegové v pravém spektru tohoto parlamentu – si jen postesknout nad možným porušováním dohody. Musíme rezolutně jednat a ne jenom krčit rameny. Pozastavení dohody SWIFT do doby, dokud nebudou objasněny nepovolené přístupy k finančním údajům, je proto čin adekvátní a čin mající potenciál vyvolat reakci na straně USA. Věřím, že zájmem USA je stále boj proti terorizmu a ne bezbřehé špehování. Pro EU jsou USA stále rodinou, ale EU má radši strýčka Sama, ne velkého bratra Sama.

3-179-958

Raül Romeva i Rueda (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – In favour. Joint JURI-LIBE initiative on the e-Justice portal launched in 2010 for enabling greater access to legal and judicial information, and to judicial and administrative proceedings, for both citizens and practitioners. Greens expect procedure rights to be guaranteed through this process.

3-179-963

Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), *per iscritto*. – Ritengo che la giustizia elettronica sia uno strumento atto a consentire un maggiore accesso alle informazioni giuridiche e giudiziarie e ai procedimenti giudiziari e amministrativi, sia per i cittadini che per i professionisti del settore. Serve un maggior ricorso alle applicazioni elettroniche, alla trasmissione elettronica dei documenti, alle videoconferenze e all'interconnessione dei registri giudiziari e amministrativi, al fine di ridurre ulteriormente i costi dei procedimenti giudiziari o quasi giudiziari. Questo strumento potrà portare ad una notevole semplificazione burocratica, per questi motivi ho dato parere favorevole.

3-179-966

Catherine Stihler (S&D), *in writing*. – I voted in favour of the European Semester for Economic Policy Coordination as I believe in greater economic growth between Member States and more harmonisation.

3-179-969

Kay Swinburne (ECR), *in writing*. – It is important that we take stock of the effectiveness of EU initiatives such as this e-justice Action Plan to ensure that they are functioning effectively and to evaluate how they can be improved. Therefore I welcome this opportunity for the European Parliament to make recommendations for the e-justice programme for 2014-2018.

3-179-972

Marc Tarabella (S&D), *par écrit*. – La justice en ligne a un rôle majeur à jouer dans le renforcement de la confiance et de la compréhension mutuelles, et donc dans le soutien de la reconnaissance mutuelle des décisions judiciaires et administratives, ce qui constitue un principe majeur du système juridique européen. Soulignons que les systèmes de justice en ligne, par leur nature même, contribuent à réduire les coûts des procédures judiciaires et administratives, en particulier grâce à l'automatisation des échanges d'informations, à la distribution de documents officiels et à la traduction de certains actes de procédure. Tout cela sert l'intérêt de toutes les parties prenantes du système judiciaire.

3-179-973

Nuno Teixeira (PPE), *por escrito*. – O primeiro Plano de Ação plurianual sobre a justiça eletrónica europeia (2009-2013) procurava tornar a justiça e o sistema jurídico mais acessíveis aos cidadãos e melhorar a compreensão mútua entre profissionais e administrações, facultando ferramentas eletrónicas de informação e cooperação. Concordo com a resolução apresentada pois entendo que a justiça eletrónica tem realmente de representar um reforço da confiança dos cidadãos, reforçar a utilização de aplicações eletrónicas e o fornecimento eletrónico de documentos. Entendo ainda como positivo que se facilite a audição de testemunhas e demais pessoas envolvidas nos processos judiciais através do uso da videoconferência e da interligação dos registos judiciais e administrativos, reduzindo-se assim o custo dos procedimentos judiciais ou para-judiciais.

3-179-975

Derek Vaughan (S&D), *in writing*. – I voted for the e-Justice Action Plan 2014-2018. I did so because I believe that e-justice has an important role to play in enhancing mutual trust and understanding in judicial and administrative decisions.

I think the e-justice Action Plan should be developed on an open-access basis and all Member States should be encouraged to participate. I support this plan because e-justice systems have a tendency to decrease the costs of judicial and administrative proceedings.

Furthermore, I believe that this plan will be an important step towards building a true European judicial culture by hosting online tools for judicial training, and will serve as a knowledge management and interconnection instrument.

3-179-978

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE), *schriftlich*. – Terrorismusbekämpfung ist – leider – nach wie vor ein wichtiges sicherheitspolitisches Thema, dessen Notwendigkeiten jedoch immer mit jenen der Menschenrechte und des Datenschutzes abgewogen werden müssen. Es ist grundlegend, dass die persönliche Freiheit der Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Europäischen Union geschützt und bewahrt wird, insbesondere auch im Hinblick auf Zahlungsverkehrsdaten.

3-179-979

Glenis Willmott (S&D), *in writing*. – This resolution calls for the suspension of the EU-US Terrorist Finance Tracking Programme (TFTP) and for an investigation to be carried out into allegations that US authorities have had unauthorised access to SWIFT information.

The SWIFT agreement gives the US Treasury Department access to data on European Citizens' financial transactions as part of the TFTP. MEPs were cautious about the SWIFT agreement when it was first negotiated, but eventually we gave our support on the basis that the agreement provided a balanced approach to fighting terrorism whilst at the same time guaranteeing EU citizens' right to privacy. However, reports of the NSA tapping into the SWIFT data mean that there are now serious doubts that this agreement offers any real legal guarantees and safeguards.

Labour MEPs supported this resolution as we believe that suspending the agreement would put the necessary political pressure on the US to appropriately respond to the allegations and to ensure adequate safeguards for EU citizens.

3-179-981

Jacek Włosowicz (EFD), *na piśmie*. – Europejski portal „e-Sprawiedliwość” ma pełnić rolę „punktu kompleksowej obsługi” dostarczającego informacje na temat europejskiego wymiaru sprawiedliwości i europejskich postępowań sądowych. Portal skierowany jest do obywateli, przedsiębiorców, przedstawicieli zawodów prawniczych oraz pracowników wymiaru sprawiedliwości.

3-179-017

Inês Cristina Zuber (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Sendo verdade que a justiça eletrónica constitui um meio de permitir maior acesso a informações legais e jurídicas, e a procedimentos judiciais e administrativos, tanto por cidadãos como por profissionais; sendo verdade que os sistemas de justiça eletrónica, pela sua própria natureza, tendem a reduzir os custos dos procedimentos judiciais e administrativos, em especial através da automatização do intercâmbio de informações, da notificação de documentos e da tradução de determinados atos processuais e que o uso de meios eletrónicos é uma inevitabilidade dos nossos dias, não podemos, no entanto, deixar de sublinhar que, em matéria de Justiça, há exigências de confidencialidade que aconselham muita precaução neste campo, sobretudo se se tratar de matérias da área criminal e/ou assuntos internos. Em Portugal têm sido detetados vários problemas e falhas ao nível da segurança e confidencialidade dos dados e dos processos. Em nome da redução de custos, da celeridade e dos alegados ganhos de eficiência, não podemos permitir que não sejam assegurados os necessários mecanismos de segurança dos sistemas informáticos.

13. Corrections et intentions de vote: voir procès-verbal

3-180-000

IN THE CHAIR: LÁSZLÓ SURJÁN

Vice-President

14. Approval of the minutes of the previous sitting : see Minutes

15. Main aspects and basic choices of the common foreign and security policy and the common security and defence policy (Article 36 TEU) - Annual report from the

Council to the European Parliament on the common foreign and security policy in 2012 (debate)

3-183-000

Elmar Brok, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Vizepräsidentin, Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich bin froh darüber, dass wir heute diesen Jahresbericht diskutieren können, und das in Anwesenheit der Hohen Beauftragten/Vizepräsidentin der Kommission. Wir sind jetzt in einer wichtigen Analysephase der Entwicklung der europäischen Außenpolitik nach dem Inkrafttreten des Vertrags von Lissabon, und wir wollen darauf auch eine klare Botschaft schicken, dass diese Außenpolitik demokratisch legitimiert sein muss. Nach meiner Auffassung ist es so, dass die Europäische Union mehr und mehr in der Erwartungshaltung der Welt steht, selbst ein globaler Akteur zu werden und nicht, wie wir es bisher waren, ein *global payer*. *We want to become a global player*.

Frau Hohe Beauftragte, Sie haben hier in manchen Punkten wichtige und positive Schritte erreicht. Die Rolle, die Sie gegenwärtig in der Iran-Frage spielen, bei dem, was mit Kosovo und Serbien gelaufen ist, auch bei dem, was im Zusammenhang mit Ägypten und Syrien läuft, wissen wir, dass in den Fragen, auf die wir reagieren müssen, bei denen wir zur Konfliktlösung beitragen müssen, Sie und die europäische Außenpolitik inzwischen eine wichtige und positive Rolle spielen.

Aber wir müssen auch sehen, dass das in manchen Bereichen unserer Auffassung nach noch nicht genug ist. Nach unserer Auffassung ist europäische Außenpolitik bisher zu sehr reaktiv und nicht mit einer konstruktiven Strategie nach vorne versehen. Wir sagen, wir haben zu viele Strategien, aber keine Strategie. Dies ist jetzt keine Kritik an Ihnen persönlich. Wir müssen das als eine Entwicklungsphase sehen. Sie sind jetzt seit drei Jahren im Amt, mussten in dieser Zeit einen Auswärtigen Dienst aufbauen, und in dieser Zeit kann nicht alles geleistet werden. Deswegen ist das keine Kritik, sondern eine Frage, wie wir nach vorne weitergehen und hier eine Fortentwicklung der europäischen Politik betreiben.

Ich meine, dass diese Frage, die damit zu tun hat, dass wir eine vorwärtsweisende präventive Strategie entwickeln müssen, auch bedeutet, dass die Synergieeffekte zusammengefasst werden müssen, die aus den drei Hüten entstehen – Vizepräsidentin des Rates, Hohe Beauftragte und Vorsitzende des Außenministerrates –, und dass diese Strategie weiter fortentwickelt werden muss, um diesen drei Aufgaben gerecht zu werden und Führung zu erreichen. Dabei sehen wir ja, dass es schwierig ist, denn leider Gottes ist die Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik immer noch ein Bereich, der im Wesentlichen Einstimmigkeit im Rat erfordert – daher auch die Schwierigkeit, das dann wirklich operationell zu machen. Aber ich glaube auch hier, dass dies unter Nutzung des Dienstes und der Bereitschaft zur engen Kooperation, der Synergieeffekte zwischen Auswärtigem Dienst und Kommission, wo Sie ja in der Lage sind, in beiden Institutionen führend tätig zu sein, weiter vorangebracht werden kann. Ich halte das für eine ganz entscheidende Frage, dass wir eben nicht nur reaktiv tätig sind, wo wir jetzt erfolgreich sind, sondern hier strategisch nach vorne gehen können.

Dazu gehört natürlich auch nicht nur die Aufforderung an uns oder an die Kommission und an den Auswärtigen Dienst, sondern auch eine Aufforderung an den Rat und die Mitgliedstaaten. Wenn ich sehe, in welcher Weise die Mitgliedstaaten ihrer vertraglichen Verpflichtung nachkommen, konstruktiv die Außenpolitik der Europäischen Union zu stützen und zu implementieren, habe ich die kritische Frage, ob der Rat der Außenminister und die Mitgliedstaaten dieser vertraglichen Bedingung gerecht werden, und ob Fragen des

politischen Willens, gemeinsam Dinge zu tragen, hier nicht vorangehen können. Es ist wichtig, dass wir diese Frage angehen.

Wir haben hier wichtige Fragen zu lösen, die mit den externen Finanzinstrumenten und deren demokratischer Kontrolle und Entscheidungsmöglichkeiten verbunden sind. Ich hoffe, dass Sie uns helfen können, hier in den nächsten Tagen und Wochen eine Lösung zu finden.

Für uns ist es außerordentlich wichtig, dass der Verteidigungsgipfel im Dezember ein Erfolg wird. Vom SEDE-Ausschuss wird ja noch ein eigener Bericht kommen. Aber die Frage der strukturellen Kooperation und manche anderen Fragen, auch die Fragen, die mit der industriellen Basis zu tun haben, scheinen mir von großer Wichtigkeit. Wir fordern eine tiefere Integration. Wir hätten gerne ein Weißbuch, um in diesen Fragen entsprechend Fortschritte zu erreichen.

70 % der europäischen Bürger wollen eine gemeinsame europäische Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik! In keinem Bereich wollen die Bürger mehr Europa als in diesem Bereich. Gerade in diesem Bereich sind wir institutionell und aufgrund der Lage der Mitgliedstaaten nicht in der Lage, das zu lösen.

3-184-000

Catherine Ashton, *Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, can I begin by thanking Elmer Brok for his comments and the rapporteurs for the reports that have been put before Parliament today. I think it is very fitting, after the Lisbon Treaty in which we talk about a comprehensive approach, that we are using this opportunity to discuss CFSP and CSDP together in one debate. Our ability to use both actions at the same time and to link them with the work we do with development and with other Commission policies is a key factor in the unique way in which the European Union operates internationally.

The honourable Members have heard me say many times that over the course of my time in office I have had three broad priorities: to set up the Service; to strengthen relations with, and effect a lasting change in, our neighbourhood; and to deepen and strengthen our relations with our strategic partners. All of these are covered in the reports.

Of course I cannot cover every aspect of the report, or indeed the whole world, in the time available in the way that Mr Brok's report does. Nor can I cover CSDP in the same depth as Ms Koppa's report, but I will focus, if I may, on a limited number of areas. But I would like to reassure this House that this does not mean that I do not consider all of the areas covered in the reports to be of enormous importance.

I want to say a little bit about the External Action Service, because it was with the strong support of this House that we established a functioning 21st-century EU External Action Service. It represents and projects Europe's policies and values across the world. When I was writing the EEAS Review earlier this year, I was struck by just how much we had achieved – against the odds in many cases – and by the solid basis we have now laid for the future.

The network of 141 delegations, the professional staff in Brussels with global expertise: I want to pay tribute to all of them. I believe we have the best of the Commission, Council Secretariat and Member States combined. And soon we will also have the best from the European Parliament.

This allows us to be represented collectively and to show that, in today's world, we are better when we operate together. I have said many times that this does not mean that we seek to detract from the role of national diplomacy, but rather – as has been acknowledged by all EU Member States – there are things we can do together that we cannot do alone.

We are particularly well placed to influence events and to promote stability and democracy in our own Neighbourhood – both in the South and in the East. I have said many times before that we should be judged by the effectiveness of what we can achieve in our own neighbourhood. What we do and how we work with the people and countries around us is crucial for them, but it is also extremely important for our own economic and security interests.

In the South we have seen dramatic changes, and our response to those events has been designed to strengthen the move towards positive change and to embed deep and lasting democracy. Political and economic support has been targeted to incentivise reform, to promote inclusiveness – with particular reference to the role of women and young people – and to mobilise all forces in society, including civil society and the private sector.

As recognised in the report, I developed the idea of task forces that bring together European institutions, international financial institutions and the private sector to develop tailor-made solutions for each country, not just in the area of economics but also to give support to civil society and human rights groups, to help them develop the institutions that will enable deep democracy to take root – democracy that goes beyond elections, that is based on institutions, the rule of law and a society that gives equal chances to everyone.

That approach has been important in our cooperation with Tunisia and Jordan. Of course, I would highlight how much more we need to do in Libya. Colleagues will know that I have been in contact with the Prime Minister of Libya in New York and beyond, but there is much that our missions are currently engaged in aimed at bringing stability and security to that country.

A lot of my time in recent months has also been spent in Egypt, where I believe we have a unique role. We have built a strong reputation and we are a trusted interlocutor. I remain able to speak with all sides in Egypt, and my message remains unchanged: an inclusive process is the best guarantee of future stability, and stability is required if we are to deal with the country's political and economic problems.

This is not only a message to take to political leaders. During my last visit I also met with the Grand Imam and the Coptic Pope to talk to them from a religious perspective. Many honourable Members have been concerned about what has happened to Christians in Egypt, so my meeting with the Coptic Pope was especially important as it allowed me to deliver those messages directly from you to him.

I should also mention, whilst on the subject of our neighbourhood, the work that is currently going on with the Middle East Peace Process, the close collaboration that I have established with US Secretary John Kerry, and the work that we are doing by engaging directly with both parties in support of these negotiations. We know that our objective is to find a lasting solution to this conflict that is based on two states. Tomorrow, President Abbas will visit me in Brussels. He and I will discuss progress. We will also continue to engage with the team that is putting together the economic programme that can help to bring a long-term economic solution to the challenges in the West Bank and beyond. Honourable Members

will know that Gaza and the issues and problems there are never far from my thoughts, and that they also represent a large part of the work in which we are engaged.

We are, of course, looking now to support the process which will bring us to what we call Geneva II and the prospect of bringing together those from inside and outside Syria in support of a process that will try to bring ceasefires and, eventually, a lasting peace. Honourable Members will know too that we continue to engage with Syria. I recently sent a mission from Brussels to Damascus to meet with many of the groups with which we have continued to work. The reports from that mission were as alarming as they could be regarding what is happening in terms of malnutrition to people in the country and what needs to happen to help restore the city following the terrible destruction that has taken place there. We will continue to do all that we can to push forward, but I say now, honourable Members, that we will need to engage in the long term with Syria if we are to support the country into the future. That means remaining the largest donor in order to deal with this humanitarian emergency. EUR 2 billion in humanitarian development and stabilisation assistance has gone both to Syria and to its neighbours, and we still need to continue to do more.

We are working with the Syrian Opposition coalition to try to improve their capacity to operate, and we are working – as I have already indicated – with a wide range of people engaged in trying to support the future directly on the ground in Syria. We have worked too in helping to support OPCW as it seeks to deal with the chemical weapons in Syria. We have also provided logistical support and the vehicles that they are using. I have been in touch with the Secretary-General to make it clear that we will continue to help in any way that we can.

But I also want to talk about what is happening in our Eastern Neighbourhood. Honourable Members are very focused on the Vilnius Summit, which will take place next month. Our aim is to have a common future that will ensure prosperity and security and guarantee long-term stability, and to bring our partners as close as possible to the European Union.

In New York, together with my colleague Commissioner Füle, we hosted a meeting with the six Eastern Partnership countries to take stock of progress towards the signing or initialling of agreements. It also gave us an opportunity to reiterate the need to implement all necessary reforms and to meet the benchmarks. In recent days, I have met with the Foreign Ministers of Armenia and Ukraine in order to make it clear once more what needs to happen.

With Ukraine, in particular, we have made it absolutely clear that we need to see delivery on three issues as crucial signals of Ukraine's determination: improved legislation on the electoral process, moving to adopt ambitious reform of the General Prosecutor's Office, and, of course, dealing with the issue of selective justice.

We need to see definitive progress in the case of Yulia Tymoshenko, and I want to welcome and fully support the efforts of Mr Cox and Mr Kwaśniewski and to pay tribute to them for the number of visits they have made and the work that they are doing.

Elsewhere, we have also continued to engage with Serbia and Kosovo. I met with the leaders for the 17th time in recent days as we prepare for the elections on 3 November. We continue to deal with the issues as they arise, working closely on the elections with the OSCE, which I want to thank for the work that it is doing. We have come an extremely long way in a

very short time, and I hope that we will be able to sit down after the elections at our meeting, which will take place three days later, to work out the next stages of the agreements.

But again, as I have done many times before, I want to pay tribute to the leadership in Pristina and in Belgrade for their courage in wanting to move forward in the way that they have. I have talked many times about what I call the comprehensive approach, and this is really fundamental to answering part at least of the question that Mr Brok raised when he opened this debate. This is about how, in the future, we will do things differently to how we have done them in the past and about what makes the European Union unique, namely its ability to bring together all of the different elements that we have at our disposal, from our missions – be they military or civilian – through to the development work which we do, the political engagement at all levels, our security engagement, our work with civil society, the underpinnings of our values of the rule of law, human rights and justice. All of these are brought to bear on some of the greatest challenges that exist in the world. I think that these are important and significant ways in which we are distinct, unique and increasingly recognised across the world. I would argue that we are at the beginning of what can be, and what will be, in the years to come.

We have thought about this in particular in the context of countries which are going through transition. It was a great joy to be here yesterday to see Aung San Suu Kyi finally receive the Sakharov Prize, and in three weeks' time I will meet her again as we go to the Task Force meeting which we have arranged in Myanmar/Burma. This country is on a journey of reform, but it needs to deal with a legacy of conflict, poverty, oppression and weak institutions, and it will take time. We are committed to demonstrating the EU's long-term commitment to supporting that journey and to continuing to say to all those who hold positions of responsibility that there is much that they need to do. There can be no complacency if the country is to continue to move forward. Good beginnings, but by no means enough.

We are also, when we think about that region, significantly developing and strengthening our relations with Asia. I am very pleased with the positive momentum we have had in EU-ASEAN relations in the past 18 months. We have scaled up and re-directed this relationship from one focusing heavily on trade and development to a much more strategic partnership for the future. In the next few weeks, I will visit the region for the third time in seven months.

When I co-chair the next EU-ASEAN Foreign Ministers meeting, which will take place in March 2014, I want us to be able to demonstrate that both sides see the strategic case for investment in this real partnership for the future.

I want to say something about the terrible events which took place in the Westgate Shopping Centre in Nairobi and to express again our horror at what happened there. What is happening in nearby Somalia, which has a direct effect on this, is really significant as the country moves from failure towards being able to show the beginnings of regaining the capacity to operate as a state. I was really pleased to co-host the Brussels Conference with the President of Somalia. This was a milestone in our efforts to reconstruct a peaceful, federal state, and in the willingness of the international community to support it.

Honourable Members, this was not only about raising money – important though money is – it was about identifying, with Somalia, the benchmarks, the milestones and the issues in which we can engage directly with them and our colleagues in countries across the world to try to help to ensure success at every level. We also have three CSDP missions operating

there, and the New Deal Compact that we made in Brussels provides a framework to help with reconstruction, to really ensure that we are able to help them to develop and provide support. There is the EUR 1.8 billion, as I have indicated, but much greater than this is the genuine long-term commitment.

But of course, this is only one of the countries in Africa in which we are active. We are supporting efforts to combat insecurity, terrorism and organised crime in Western Central Africa; reducing tensions in the Great Lakes; and in Mali we continue to work with many partners, including ECOWAS, in order to provide support for MINUSMA. Our efforts are part of our broader strategy for the Sahel to ensure security and development across the region, and part of the broader concept that we have to help support peace-building in different parts of Africa. This includes in Sudan, in South Sudan and in the Central African Republic, where we are working to support the transition process and the restoration of the rule of law.

We will have the African Union/EU Summit in April, and this will be a real opportunity to set a stronger forward-looking agenda for our relations with the African Union, something that Madam Zuma and I have discussed many times and which I hope we will turn into a reality in the months between now and April, in order to make this the most successful summit ever.

This is also true of our relations with Latin America and the Caribbean. This is a region that is increasingly influential in world affairs. Last January we had the successful EU-CELAC Summit in Santiago, which was an opportunity to reinforce the partnership and to get the agenda set for the coming years. In the Caribbean, too, we have commissioned and put together a joint strategy that emphasises that our relations are about more than traditional development cooperation and trade, important though these are.

Again, it is important to develop strategic relations with regions across the world that move from traditional relationships to forward-looking strategic political partnerships. I fully agree with what Mr Brok has said: we need to operate in a world in which we forge strong partnerships with our strategic allies – the USA, of course; Brazil, India, China and Russia – and with international and regional organisations as well.

I have invested, and will continue to invest, a lot of time in those key relationships with those strategic partners across the world. This is not just because they matter bilaterally, but because they matter in terms of what we are able to do in terms of influencing and dealing with some of the issues which face us – not just far away, but in our own neighbourhood too. I agree that the relationship with the United States is vital in this. That partnership is essential for us – and, I would say, for them – and I also believe that signing the TTIP will make that even stronger.

But I also want to welcome the strong emphasis in the report on universal values. These need to be always at the core of our work. They are central to helping achieve peace and prosperity, promoting deep democracy underpinned by human rights, and ensuring that the roots of democratic freedoms are well established and cannot be removed. Our election observation missions play a vital part in doing that: seven on-going missions right now, and five completed already this year. Our promotion and protection of human rights, too, is at the centre of our policies, developing the range of instruments that we have. The Strategic Framework and Action Plan on Human Rights and Democracy are designed to be a guiding reference for our action.

We have also established guidelines on the promotion and protection of the enjoyment of all human rights by lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex people. Let me once again stress that this is integral to our human rights efforts and a central aspect of our engagement with all our partners. But as the report says, we need to work together to improve our effectiveness. I was pleased to appoint the first ever Special Representative for Human Rights. He has made an outstanding contribution, and I want to thank him and this Parliament for your pro-active role and support and cooperation.

I would also like to say something about CSDP in the context of what it brings in terms of its unique contribution. It is an important and integral part of our policy options. We have strong relationships with the UN, NATO and the African Union. We have considerable operational expertise: 30 missions on three continents in the last 15 years, changing the fortunes of people and countries and protecting or promoting our values.

We currently deploy more than 7 000 civilian and military personnel, and this is producing results: our EU maritime operation ATALANTA has drastically reduced the problem of piracy off the Somali coast. Security in Somalia has greatly improved, thanks to the training provided by our mission to 3 000 Somali recruits and the EU funding of AMISOM. In Afghanistan, our police mission has trained 5 000 Afghan police officers, and EULEX Kosovo plays a key role in the accompanying implementation of the recent Belgrade-Pristina agreement.

Honourable Members will know that the European Council last December asked me to develop proposals and actions to further strengthen CSDP. In July 2013, I presented my interim report, and on the basis of discussions that took place from that, I issued a final report on 11 October 2013. This contains a range of proposals and actions in line with that mandate, and I have shared these reports with Parliament.

There is no question that the changing geostrategic context, rising security challenges and continuing squeeze on national defence budgets, seen in the light of increased spending in other parts of the world, make the strategic debate at the December European Council a real priority. I believe that leaders must address the crucial question of the political will to develop and deploy capabilities.

Between 2005 and 2010, European defence spending declined by almost 10 %, and it is estimated to have declined by a similar amount over the last three years. Global growth is predicted to rise by 6.8 % in the years 2011 to 2015 as we see accelerated defence spending in emerging markets, Russia and China. In 2012, Asian defence spending overtook Europe's for the first time. We know too that the US is also expected to make changes in the region of at least 10 %.

This points, I would argue, to more European inter-dependence. We have to do more together and identify ways of using the EUR 200 billion we spend on defence each year more effectively, developing and enhancing cooperation and common approaches. When I look at the work of the Commission in its July document 'Towards a more competitive and efficient defence and security sector', as Vice-President of the Commission, I would say that we tried to set out the importance of working together and of seeing a joined-up and coherent effort. I thank Michel Barnier and his team, and Antonio Tajani, for the work that they have done.

We know the defence industry is a driver for jobs, growth and innovation: EUR 96 billion in 2012. It brings major contributions to the wider economy, directly employs 400 000 highly-skilled people and generates nearly 960 000 indirect jobs.

So the message of my report is clear: we need to be able to act, through the CSDP, as a security provider in the neighbourhood and, at international level, to protect our interests and project our values. The Member States' commitment to this is required, so I hope that we will see a successful European Council where leaders can come together and make the decisions that can drive this further forward for the future.

Honourable Members, thank you for listening to what has been quite a long speech covering these reports. I would again like to thank the rapporteurs for the work that they have done and to thank you for listening to this report.

3-185-000

President. – There are some privileges as the High Representative, but from that point of view your chair will be rather severe. Anyhow, for a good foreign policy we need highly-educated diplomats, a good policy – and we also need money. Therefore I now give the floor to the rapporteur from the Committee on Budgets, Ms Neynsky, for one minute.

3-186-000

Nadezhda Neynsky, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Budgets*. – Mr President, one minute is not really enough time to try to explain the significance of the financing of everything that the European Union is doing in this context. I will change to Bulgarian.

Целта на този дебат е да бъдат начертани действия, които максимално да защитят интересите на Съюза и позиционирането му като важен международен играч. Като докладчик за финансирането на външната политика в бюджетната комисия, няма как да не бъде обезпокоена от намаляващите средства за следващия програмен период.

Съкращенията неминуемо ще се отразят върху ангажиментите на Европейския съюз към международната сигурност, особено в съседни страни като Косово и Грузия, и съответно върху авторитета на Съюза. Поради тази причина съм на мнение, че малкото пари за външна политика трябва да бъдат изразходвани изключително ефективно.

Приоритетно е разрешаването на отдавнашните проблеми с управлението, логистиката и финансирането на мисиите за сигурност и отбрана чрез създаването на механизъм, който да анализира дали и как целите на мисиите са постигнати. Важно е чрез диалог и обмяна на идеи непрекъснато да бъдат търсени начини за подобряване изразходването на средства за външна политика в интерес, забележете, най-вече на европейските граждани.

3-188-000

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra, *en nombre del Grupo PPE*. – Señor Presidente, señora Vicepresidenta/Alta Representante, Señorías, en primer lugar quisiera felicitar al señor Brok, al ponente, por un informe equilibrado que, sin exaltar luces ni ocultar sombras, hace una radiografía certera del estado de la política exterior y de seguridad común.

Aspectos positivos: la presencia en Ucrania, la negociación nuclear con Irán, la capacidad de interlocución con Egipto, las *task forces* de Túnez, Egipto, Jordania y, ahora, como se nos ha anunciado recientemente, Myanmar y, por supuesto, la ayuda humanitaria a Siria. El problema, señora Ashton, es que muchas veces damos la impresión de ser más una especie

de Cruz Roja Internacional abocada a la firma del cheque de los grandes dramas internacionales que de tener una capacidad propositiva y preventiva. Yo creo que, por el momento, estamos más bien reaccionando que anticipándonos a los acontecimientos.

Señor Presidente, la Unión Europea es un gran mercado de más de 500 millones de consumidores, 300 millones de los cuales utilizan la misma moneda. Somos el principal bloque importador y exportador de bienes y servicios del mundo y el principal donante de ayuda humanitaria y es evidente que tenemos que tener la aspiración de pesar en la escena internacional con arreglo a nuestro peso económico, comercial, financiero e industrial. Y, por eso, señora Alta Representante, este Parlamento en general y mi grupo en particular la hemos venido apoyando en el ámbito de nuestras capacidades, así como al Servicio Europeo de Acción Exterior —acabamos de escuchar la intervención de la colega de presupuestos—; también les hemos apoyado en los aspectos presupuestarios y celebro que usted lo haya reconocido en su declaración al principio.

Pero —como dice el ponente en su informe— tenemos que defender eficazmente nuestros intereses y tenemos que afirmar nuestros valores y también tenemos que hacer una cosa que en este Parlamento solemos soslayar y es pedir a los Estados miembros que tengan una actitud constructiva a la hora de coordinar la posición de la Unión Europea en los organismos internacionales. Solo así podremos construir la Europa potencia y ser un factor de estabilidad en el mundo, en un mundo globalizado en el que el viejo lema del imperio romano de que la unión hace la fuerza es más verdadero que nunca y en el que el unilateralismo, incluso el de los más prósperos o el de los más poderosos, es hoy, señora Alta Representante, un sueño imposible.

(El orador acepta responder a una pregunta formulada con arreglo al procedimiento de la «tarjeta azul» (artículo 149, apartado 8, del Reglamento))

3-189-000

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD), *blue-card question* . – Mr Salafranca, thank you for taking the intervention.

At the present time, there is no proper free movement between Spain and Gibraltar, which I have the honour to represent. This has been going on for months. Is it not clear to you that, until proper free movement between Spain and Gibraltar is reinstated by your government, any concept of the EU having weight on the international stage – to use your own phrase – is a complete impossibility?

3-190-000

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra (PPE), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»* . – Quisiera decirle, querido colega, que, por la palabra, el hombre es superior al animal pero, por el silencio, se supera a sí mismo.

Ha perdido usted una excelente ocasión de superarse a sí mismo —lo cual no es muy difícil— y quiero decirle que Gibraltar es la última colonia que existe en el territorio de la Unión Europea y que es un anacronismo el hecho de que haya una colonia de un Estado miembro dentro del territorio de otro Estado miembro.

3-191-000

Ioan Mircea Paşcu, *on behalf of the S&D Group* . – Mr President, today the EU is in a situation which is similar to that of the British Cabinet when Churchill told its Members:

'Gentlemen, we have run out of money; now we must think'. That is exactly what Mr Brok's report is trying to make us do: pause a little and reflect, trying to instil some order in the multitude of challenges and opportunities confronting us today. The report is correct in stating that a new world order, based on a new distribution of power, is in the making. The problem is whether we will shape it or will be shaped by it – in other words, whether it will be based on our values or on somebody else's values.

Equally, the report is asking for a new and credible EU foreign policy provided, on the one hand, that we can rise above the mundane daily business making up the current substance of the EU's external relations and, on the other hand, that it reflects truly European, not simply national strategic objectives dressed up as European interests. Those truly European interests are based on relative or even similar perceptions of reality which, if they exist, facilitate the political will to act which we so often complain is lacking today.

A strategic dialogue involving the Council, the Commission and Parliament, as well as the request, formulated in the report, that the High Representative / Vice-President should present her foreign policy objectives for 2014 and 2015 in the next annual report, are conducive to that aim. To that effect, the report indicates specific strategies such as strengthening cooperation, particularly with regard to policies having transnational implications, and strategic policy coordination in international bodies.

Naturally, the CFSP and CSDP get proper attention in the report. In that respect, proposals advanced by Parliament in previous reports, such as common funding and more transparency in the way money is spent on operations; more effort on the part of the Member States in developing and implementing the CSDP; strengthening the European industrial and technological base; and more democratic scrutiny involvement of Parliament, are reiterated in the report. Another contribution, which is also a step forward, is the report's recommendation that European defence should be firmly based on the revised European Security Strategy and a White Book which should serve as a common template for concurrent national security and defence reviews – this being, after all, the case in all Member States.

In conclusion – apart from congratulating the rapporteur – I would point to the very good communication and cooperation of the author with the shadow rapporteurs and his willingness to accommodate as many views as possible and find common ground between them.

3-192-000

Andrew Duff, *on behalf of the ALDE Group* . – Mr President, four years after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon, the credibility of the EU in world affairs is at stake. I fear that, despite the great efforts of Cathy Ashton and her team, neither the European External Action Service nor the European Defence Agency are properly trusted, certainly by the larger Member States. European-NATO relations remain impaired, and the single most successful tool of the CFSP – an enlargement policy – is sadly depleted.

These things are, of course, connected. Of all the obstacles, the greatest is Cyprus, whose assimilation as a full Member State is only partial, where the *acquis* is suspended and which remains not recognised by our largest and most strategic candidate state, Turkey. Turkey faces a big decision. It either follows a path of European pluralist liberal democracy and becomes a normal NATO partner and a serious accession candidate, or it chooses an authoritarian Islamist democracy and an oriental foreign policy.

So I think that, if there is a single big issue which must be tackled by the European Council in December, it is Cyprus. A solution to its partition is clearly beyond the capacity of Cypriots by themselves. The entire European Union and the UN must establish and assert that the present situation can no longer be tolerated as an obstacle to our global stance.

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

3-193-000

Charles Tannock (ECR), *blue-card question* . – Andrew, you are a well-known friend of Turkey and you mentioned the problems with Turkey. Would you not agree that the very best thing it could do in terms of confidence-building measures would be to allow the return of Famagusta-Varosha to its rightful inhabitants, who are mainly from the Greek Cypriot community? Not only would it actually create huge numbers of jobs in a Member State – against the backdrop of the problems that it is now facing with the banking crisis – it would also allow the Kasoulides Plan – a plan formulated by our former colleague who is now Foreign Minister of Cyprus – to deliver some sweeteners, i.e. lifting the veto by Cyprus on certain Turkish chapters for negotiation. This would be win-win situation all the way round. Could you try to convince your Turkish friends to agree to that?

3-194-000

Andrew Duff (ALDE), *blue-card answer* . – I think there are several things that could and should be achieved on each side. Perhaps the most dramatic and important thing that Turkey could do is to remove some of its occupying forces in the North. But the real problem is, I think, the occupation of the minds of Cypriots, Greeks and Turks. I think that is a graver and more complex and profound issue that will require intensive diplomacy and a considerable amount of time.

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

3-195-000

Takis Hadjigeorgiou (GUE/NGL), *blue-card question* . – First of all, I would like to thank Mr Duff and Mr Tannock for their contribution to Cyprus. I would like to add that Mr Duff signed the written declaration asking Turkey to return Famagusta, so I thank him once again. My question is whether Mr Tannock, Mr Duff, myself and others can work to persuade the European Council during the next meeting to do something about Turkey.

3-196-000

Andrew Duff (ALDE), *blue-card answer* . – I trust that we can, and indeed I proposed that Prime Minister Erdoğan be invited to the meeting of the European Council. Unfortunately, the aggressive response he has displayed to the Gezi Park protests has scuppered that plan, but there is still time, and I would like this Parliament, the Commission and Catherine Ashton to concert strongly upon a solution to the Cypriot problem.

3-197-000

Ulrike Lunacek, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group* . – Mr President, first of all I would like to thank Lady Ashton and her team for the really excellent work she has been doing over these past years, and since we last talked about the CFSP report. I know it is not an easy task all the time, especially when we know that Member States are not always very happy to give power away to the European level. Many, or at least some of them, always try at

different stages to prevent more power going to the European level and being taken away from them. That is one of my concerns with our Common Foreign and Security Policy because, as Mr Brok rightly said, it is the one thing that citizens like about the European Union and of which they would like to have more.

It is a fact that the European Union is a global player. We spend more on development cooperation than any other country or group in the world, but we are not seen as much as we should be as a global player. This very often has to do – and I would like to come back to this point – with the lack of unity among Member States, and also the lack of will to give more power to the European level. Quite often it has to do with economic interests, to be very frank. If we look at trade and business lobbyists and interests on that ground, very often – I am afraid to say – these interests come before our common values. These common values of human rights, defence of democracy and the rule of law are things that are not just European values: they are universal values. It is something that makes our common foreign policy weak.

I would like to take one example: that of Russia. We all know that the situation in Russia is worsening every day. It is not just the law by which all kinds of NGOs that get money from abroad are so-called ‘foreign agents’; it is the LGBT laws that incite not just hatred but violence against people who are considered to be LGBT. They do not even have to be lesbian or gay. There have been incidents of late. And there is also the issue with Greenpeace, whose activists are now facing the threat of being tried in court as pirates, which they certainly are not. On all of these issues, I think that the European Union would be a lot stronger if we were more independent of fossil fuels and not afraid of Russia turning off the gas now when the winter is coming.

Another issue that we should tackle is that of the United States of America. I am glad that we have in the report the words ‘diverging views’. I am very glad that the European Parliament has just voted to demand the suspension of the SWIFT agreement because of the NSA scandal, and I am glad that the Parliament delegation that is going to visit Washington next week will have to take that with it.

3-198-000

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group*. – Mr President, I am a staunch defender of national sovereignty and the right of Member States to hold the reins over their own foreign policy and defence, acting in their own national interests. But this does not mean that the United Kingdom – my country – cannot support a common foreign security policy of the EU where it adds clear value.

The European Union is a powerful bloc of liberal democracies. Although our domestic politics may differ substantially, in our dealings with the outside world our similarities are usually more evident and outweigh our differences. Lady Ashton, your recent achievement in bringing together the Kosovo and Serbian leaders in their landmark agreement demonstrates the potential for a CFSP at its best, particularly given the fact that the EULEX mission in Kosovo was very helpful in re-establishing the rule of law. The EU training missions in Uganda and Mali are also particular successes, as is the EU-NAVFOR Atalanta mission, which has done so much in the Indian Ocean to reduce piracy off the coast of Somalia.

As rapporteur both for the Horn of Africa and for the human rights report on the Sahel, which went through this week in the House, I hear first hand from regional actors how

valued the EU contribution is and how effective we can be when we coordinate our soft and hard power strategies. This applies to sticks as well as carrots, as evidenced by the EU-led sanctions now forcing President Rouhani of Iran to the negotiating table, and to the blacklisting of Hezbollah, which sends the right message about terrorism internationally.

Nevertheless, one real problem that my group has with the Brok CFSP report is its continued insistence on a permanent EU seat at the UN Security Council, which the United Kingdom cannot accept. In a sense, this is the key issue. Foreign, security and defence policy can be coordinated, where appropriate, but ultimately, control must be intergovernmental. Where collective decisions are being taken, they must be taken unanimously. We can support them in that case, but we cannot allow a situation to develop whereby small – or, for that matter, large – countries, such as my own, are forced to submit to policies and interests that they do not share with the others.

We have more reservations as a group over the CSDP, given that the EU has only two major military powers – France and the UK. But, where CSDP missions can coexist effectively with NATO without duplication, we are also happy to endorse a collective and constructive approach.

3-199-000

Willy Meyer, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL* . – Señor Presidente, saben ustedes, sobre todo la señora Ashton y el señor Brok, que mi Grupo parlamentario ha presentado una opinión minoritaria porque no compartimos —y lo hacemos año tras año— este actual sistema de seguridad, que, desde nuestro punto de vista, hace un mundo más inseguro. Ya nos gustaría a nosotros reconocer que estamos en un error y que, por lo tanto, año tras año, el mundo es más seguro, hay menos conflictos y el Derecho internacional y la Carta de las Naciones Unidas prevalecen en las relaciones internacionales. Desgraciadamente, no es así.

Y por eso hemos presentado esta opinión minoritaria. Nosotros creemos que es un error que la Unión Europea base su seguridad en el vínculo atlántico, a saber, en la OTAN y las bases norteamericanas desplegadas en la Unión Europea; un error porque la OTAN ha aprobado, desde el año 1999 y de forma reiterada, un concepto estratégico que le permite intervenir al margen de la Carta de las Naciones Unidas, del mandato expreso de que el Consejo de Seguridad tiene que autorizar el uso de la fuerza.

Desde nuestro punto de vista esto es un salto atrás de la civilización. Creo que después de la Primera y la Segunda Guerra Mundial teníamos que haber aprendido, para que el uso de la fuerza se haga siempre conforme a esta Carta de las Naciones Unidas. Y, por lo tanto, los valores de la Administración estadounidense no son los nuestros. La Administración estadounidense hace ejecuciones extrajudiciales.

Señor Presidente, creía que tenía un minuto y medio. ¿No? Pues lo siento, lo lamento.

3-200-000

Bastiaan Belder, *namens de EFD-Fractie* . – Hoge vertegenwoordiger, ik zou u graag twee urgente kwesties willen voorleggen.

Ten eerste: de aanhoudende stroom van jihadisten uit Europa – een rechtszaak vindt nog plaats in mijn eigen land, Nederland – en uit Turkije naar het Syrische slagveld. Welke tegenmaatregelen nemen de EU en haar toetredingskandidaat Turkije daartegen?

Ten tweede, de ontduiking van het westerse sanctiebeleid door Iran op het grondgebied van de EU en ook Turkije. Opnieuw mijn vraag: welke tegenmaatregelen treffen Brussel en Ankara daartegen?

Over deze twee aangeduide kwesties en vragen aan uw adres wil ik nog enige details ter illustratie toevoegen. Turkse media meldden dat in het afgelopen jaar honderden jonge Turken zich bij de extremisten in buurland Syrië hebben aangesloten. Alleen al tweehonderd in de zuidoostelijke Turkse stad Adi Jaman. Voeg daaraan toe de verdubbeling van het aantal franse jihadisten in Syrië sinds deze lente! Typerend is de recente uitspraak van een prominent lid van de Franse inlichtingendienst. Citaat: "Zoiets hebben wij niet eerder gezien, zelfs niet met Afghanistan!"

Voor wat betreft de Iraanse ontduiking van het westerse sanctiebeleid op Europees grondgebied, daarover overhandig ik u straks graag de analyse van de expert Emanuele Ottolenghi die hij begin september publiceerde onder de titel: *Iran is really good at evading sanctions*. Graag verneem ik zo spoedig mogelijk een schriftelijke reactie op de belastende feiten die Ottolenghi in zijn gedetailleerde onderzoeksverslag aanbracht. Want ik mag aannemen, mevrouw de hoge vertegenwoordiger, dat u door de glimlach van de nieuwe Iraanse president Rohani heen kijkt.

3-201-000

Adrian Severin (NI). - Mr President, beside all the good things that I could mention, let me say that the European Union foreign and security policy is held hostage by the dilemma of choosing between values and geostrategy. This is a false dilemma, since values are a dimension of power and part of the geopolitical endeavour.

EU interests are best protected in areas and with partners sharing the same values. However, the promotion of EU values must not be done at the expense of geopolitical interests, and vice versa. Both are about the security of European citizens. The real problem lies in our failure to understand that our values cannot prevail until we prevail in the geostrategic race. This does not mean that we should abandon our values for the sake of a geostrategic rationale. It means that first we have to create a security framework for those values to grow. The prevalence we currently give to our values does not reflect our attachment to them but our ineffectiveness in defining our geostrategic identity and therefore our long-term interest and geopolitical goals.

We are fighting an elusive crusade that gives us a false impression that we are imposing our model around the world while disguising the real reactive character of our external action. You must overcome this Messiah complex and stop behaving as a global secular priesthood. Likewise, we must admit that the more-for-more approach does not function when the countries concerned have geopolitical or geo-economic alternatives.

A foreign policy without strategic goals is a vehicle going nowhere. Like Alice in Wonderland, we fool ourselves that if we do not know the destination, all roads will lead us there. If we do not change that, we will condemn ourselves to irrelevance. A soft power, yes; but a soft power with vision and teeth. This is what we need to be.

3-202-000

Michael Gahler (PPE). - Herr Präsident! Unser Auswärtiger Dienst bietet einen Mehrwert in allen Bereichen des auswärtigen Handelns, wenn wir mit einer Stimme sprechen und nationale Alleingänge vermeiden, die meist nicht einmal mehr die Heimatbasis dauerhaft

beeindrucken, geschweige denn diejenigen, denen unsere Außenpolitik eigentlich gilt. Wenn wir gemeinsam auftreten, beeindrucken wir Janukowitsch in der Ukraine und Rohani im Iran und hoffentlich auch die im Hintergrund, die dort tatsächlich das Sagen haben.

Wir zeigen Serbien und Kosovo, was wir erwarten und im Gegenzug auch anbieten können. Zu unserer Toolbox gehören Instrumente wie Demokratieförderung in Form von Wahlbeobachtung, wie auch Handelsförderung in Form von GSP+. Wir sollten einem Land wie Pakistan beides gewähren. Stabilisierung sowohl durch Stärkung demokratischer Institutionen als auch durch mehr Marktzugang. Wer *Soft Power* sein will, muss auch *Hard Power* bieten können. Zur Toolbox der EU gehört auch die GSVP. Hier haben wir noch nicht das volle Potenzial des Vertrags von Lissabon ausgeschöpft, obwohl die Gefährdungen und Krisen näherkommen, obwohl die USA deutlich sagen, wir sollten uns selbst insbesondere um unsere Nachbarschaft kümmern, und obwohl alle Mitgliedstaaten unkoordiniert im Verteidigungsbereich kürzen. Ich brauche nicht zu wiederholen, was bereits von den Kollegen Brok und Paşcu zur GSVP gesagt wurde, ich unterstütze das.

Danke, Frau Hohe Beauftragte, für Ihren Beitrag zum Dezember-Gipfel. Sorgen Sie mit Herrn Van Rompuy bitte dafür, dass dort alle drei *envelopes* gut gefüllt sind. Der strategische Teil, der Teil, wo es um Kapazitäten und Fähigkeiten geht, und auch der Teil, wo es um den Binnenmarkt und die industrielle Basis geht. Ich denke, wir sollten den Mitgliedstaaten klarmachen, dass sie ihr knappes Geld bisher sehr verschwenden, wenn sie in der GSVP so weitermachen wie bisher. Deswegen ist dieser Gipfel ein Muss. Er darf nicht scheitern, und er darf auch nicht nur mit Lippenbekenntnissen daherkommen, sondern dort müssen wirklich Aufträge erteilt werden.

Ich hoffe, dass wir das dann vielleicht auch in der Form tun können, dass wir für das nächste Jahr einen formellen Verteidigungsministerrat einrichten, der dann sozusagen hauptamtlich die Beschlüsse in der Umsetzung begleitet.

3-203-000

PRESIDE: MIGUEL ÁNGEL MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ

Vicepresidente

3-204-000

Ana Gomes (S&D). - Senhor presidente, Senhora Alta Representante, o relatório do Senhor Brok é importante, mas não pode ser tão positivo como os cidadãos europeus mereceriam.

A União Europeia continua fechada sobre si mesma a braços com uma crise política, económica e financeira que nos tem deixado cegos para as mudanças tectónicas na geoestratégia mundial.

Temos permanecido quase impávidos e muito ineficazes perante as convulsões e comoções que se fazem sentir na nossa vizinhança e além dela. Espero que o Conselho ouça o debate que hoje houve aqui sobre a inação cínica face à recente tragédia de Lampedusa. (Presidente interrompe).

A União Europeia não tem conseguido escapar ao pernicioso esquema de cada um por si, em que vários Estados-Membros servem e se servem da União para as suas próprias prioridades, minando o desenvolvimento de uma robusta política externa europeia.

Falta liderança para confrontar os governos da União com o que estamos a perder e com o que podemos ganhar com uma política externa que assente os interesses estratégicos que são comuns e que atue, coordenada e eficazmente, contra os perigos e riscos para a nossa segurança e para a influência da União no mundo.

Olhemos para a nossa vizinhança: a Europa já está a sentir as consequências do desastre na Síria, a Europa já sente os perigos que emanam de uma Líbia instável e que se torna uma real ameaça para o povo líbio, em primeiro lugar, mas também para a Europa e para a estabilidade na região e além dela.

Estes são dois casos onde reina a ação autista de alguns Estados-Membros, por vezes em detrimento dos valores da Europa e dos interesses da paz e da democracia no plano global e regional.

Na Líbia, podíamos e devíamos ter feito mais pela estabilização do país, para encorajar a transição democrática e corresponder aos apelos do povo líbio e das autoridades líbias mas, pelo contrário, deixamos tudo nas mãos de outros, nomeadamente aquilo de que mais precisa a Líbia e que nos sairá muito caro com a demora: a reforma do setor da segurança, que tem de ir de par com a desmobilização e o desarmamento e a reintegração das milícias revolucionárias. Este não acontecerá sem o primeiro.

E o que se vê hoje é, por isso, uma Líbia de fraca governação, quase sem nenhuma, mais insegura, mais instável com os arsenais de Kadafi às mãos das redes terroristas que atuam, por exemplo, também em toda a região, e na Síria até, da criminalidade organizada, incluindo os traficantes de seres humanos que fabricam as tragédias como Lampedusa.

A Síria é o espelho das contradições da ação externa europeia. Deixamos as capitais conduzir o processo reduzindo a União a uma papel humanitário que, apesar de muito importante, não vai ajudar a pôr fim à guerra. A União tem de investir na solução político-diplomática da crise síria, tem de trabalhar muito mais para a mediação e agrupamento da oposição ao regime de Bashar al-Assad e trazer à mesa, a Genebra, essa oposição.

Também tem de chegar a Genebra com uma só voz, porque os desafios afetam-nos a todos na Europa, os desafios na Síria. E a Síria não pode ser apenas uma preocupação francesa ou inglesa, é vital também que nós procuremos trazer Teerão à mesa de Genebra para a resolução da guerra na Síria.

O próprio envolvimento do Irão e do Hezbollah no conflito implica que Teerão tenha de estar à mesa e eu espero que a Senhora Alta Representante, com o peso diplomático que ganhou nas negociações sobre o programa nuclear, que obviamente tem de ser uma prioridade de acordo com o NPT, com as obrigações e os direitos previstos no NPT, possa também envolver a liderança da República Islâmica do Irão na resolução do conflito da Síria.

(o Presidente interrompe)

3-205-000

Norica Nicolai (ALDE). - Doamnă Înalt Reprezentant, fără îndoială că și declarația dumneavoastră, și raportul domnului Brok sunt două documente care abundă de idei pozitive, care încearcă o viziune strategică și lucrul acesta este pozitiv pentru politica noastră de apărare și securitate comună. Toți acceptăm să vorbim – și chiar ne place lucrul ăsta – despre mai multă Europă, dar nivelul la care, în momentul de față, am ajuns în a avea o politică externă și de securitate comună dovedește că suntem departe de a avea mai multă

Europă. Avem, însă, din păcate, dacă privim strict la sistemul de securitate și la ceea ce se întâmplă în abordările statelor membre în materie de politică comună, mai puțină Europă, pentru că, dincolo de strategii, dincolo de valoarea ideilor pe care le promovăm, avem o realitate care nu ne susține în realizarea unei politici de apărare și securitate comune.

Avem o provocare majoră în summitul de la Vilnius și, cum spuneam ieri, îmi doresc ca domnul Putin să nu mai aibă un alt succes de talia celui de la Sankt Petersburg ci, dimpotrivă, noi să dovedim că suntem motivați să susținem proiectele Uniunii. Avem un nord al Africii turbulent, în care am încercat să ne implicăm – rezultatele se văd însă, avem o Uniune pentru Mediterana ratată, avem o Asie Centrală care ne ignoră, avem o Africă dominată de alte puteri. Ca atare, cred că este momentul să trecem de la ceea ce minunat există pe hârtie la o strategie care să ne facă să lucrăm împreună într-o politică comună de apărare și securitate.

Cred că trebuie să înțeleagă statele membre că nu este momentul individualismului, nu este momentul deciziilor individuale, pentru că numai împreună putem fi relevanți într-un joc de securitate și apărare global. Ceea ce s-a întâmplat, de pildă, în Libia, depozitul comun de material este un mic proiect care va avea succes și, în opinia mea, de la acest tip de proiecte trebuie să pornim, pentru că este vital pentru Uniune să lărgască ceea ce se cheamă conceptul de „soft power”.

3-206-000

Tarja Cronberg (Verts/ALE). - Mr President, the report is correct in regretting that the EU does not have a clear strategy for its relations with the world. It also makes a valid point by calling the EU a reactive, rather than a proactive, international actor. Obviously the EU needs to become more proactive. However, at this juncture the best we can do may be at least to make sure that the EU reacts at the right time, with efficient instruments to hand and with a long-term vision.

In order to become more proactive, I think there is a need to review the EU delegations' work in the world, in order to ensure that the Union's policies, ambitions and strategic priorities are efficiently carried out. We need to look at the role played by the EU's Special Representatives to critical regions and on thematic issues. Several mandates expire already next summer, and we need to overview their work. They are also changes in the global situation – Iran is an example – and of course it will be necessary to consider whether there is a need for EU representation at this time.

In terms of defence and security policy, I quite agree with the High Representative when she takes up the question that Europe actually has a lot of resources: EUR 200 million. We have the second-largest army in the world, and there are capacities that, when we are on missions, we cannot carry out without depending on the US. Therefore, I hope that the Vilnius Summit will take the question of pooling and sharing seriously, that the Member States will make their preparations and that we can create some of the trust that is needed for this important task. This applies also to the defence industry. This is equally fragmented, and priorities are needed. How this can be carried out will, I hope, also be discussed at the Vilnius meeting.

Finally, I want to deplore the fact that, with the ATT now being signed and the EU's common position on the terms of arms exports being implemented, Member States have actually decided to deliver weapons to Syria.

3-207-000

Ryszard Antoni Legutko (ECR). - Mr President, I would like to make a few comments on Mr Brok's report. Firstly, 'to establish a new and credible foreign policy' is an indirect admission that we do not have such a policy. Indeed, we do not – and we never will, unless it is imposed by those in the EU who are more equal upon those who are less equal. Such a danger is not a figment of my imagination: the report states that the Common Foreign Policy should be used 'to overcome the inappropriate use of the veto within the Council'. I do not know what an inappropriate use of the veto is – nobody does – but the statement is unabashed encouragement to intimidate those who dare to disagree.

Secondly, the report calls for the development of European media 'to raise awareness of the Common Foreign Policy'. This looks like an official blessing for political propaganda. For two-thirds of my life I lived in a communist system that tried to raise my awareness. It failed. Please, Baroness and dear colleagues, do not raise awareness – either mine or anyone else's.

Thirdly, the report calls for a permanent seat for the EU on the Security Council. Giving the EU a seat on the Security Council would make the EU a state, which it is not, and – God willing – never will be. Such a statement is, in fact, an explicit affirmation of the federalist project, which is another reason why we should look at the Common Foreign Policy with suspicion.

Fourthly, given the fact that the EU is notoriously undemocratic, a common foreign policy must mean another area of political unaccountability. Do we not have enough of that already?

3-208-000

Τάκης Χατζηγεωργίου (GUE/NGL). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, λυπούμαι που θα είμαι λίγο τραχύς, αλλά νομίζω ότι η Κοινή Εξωτερική Πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης είναι ίσως το πιο σύντομο ανέκδοτο σήμερα στην Ευρώπη. Κατά την άποψή μου, ούτε μπορεί να επιδιωχθεί, ούτε επιδιώκεται κοινή εξωτερική πολιτική. Αυτό που συμβαίνει στην πραγματικότητα είναι μία συνεχής εξισορρόπηση μεταξύ διαφορετικών συμφερόντων των κρατών μελών. Για να υπάρξει κοινή εξωτερική πολιτική χρειάζονται ηγέτες με 'κότσια' και 'τσαγανό' που θα υπερασπιστούν τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα πρώτα από όλα και πάνω από όλα. Δεν μπορεί να υπάρξει κοινή εξωτερική πολιτική χωρίς πλήρη σεβασμό των θέσεων όλων των κρατών μελών, ανεξάρτητα από το μέγεθος και τη δύναμή τους. Για την Τουρκία, ούτε λέξη για την κατοχή του ενός τρίτου της Κύπρου! Αποφεύγετε να πείτε ή να κάνετε κάτι. Ή δεν σας ενδιαφέρει, ή φοβάσθε το θέμα ή αγνοείτε ότι μπορείτε και οφείλετε να εργασθείτε για την πλήρη ελευθερία και ανεξαρτησία ενός κράτους μέλους, για το καλό όλων των κατοίκων της Κύπρου, Ελληνοκυπρίων και Τουρκοκυπρίων.

3-209-000

Fiorello Provera (EFD). - Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, Baronessa Ashton, so che Lei stava lavorando duramente – e mi congratulo per questa sua attività – anche in Iran.

Le elezioni del nuovo presidente Rohani hanno aperto molte speranze e molte illusioni forse, perché questa moderazione pare essere smentita da numeri precisi: dalle elezioni di Rohani in agosto ad oggi sono state eseguite 150 sentenze capitali e nell'ultimo anno 560 esecuzioni, più che nello stesso periodo del 2012.

Ma questa nuova atmosfera ha causato una grande euforia in molti colleghi, tant'è che è già stato chiesto da più parti di ridurre o abolire le sanzioni, dimenticando che forse sono proprio le sanzioni che hanno agito da deterrente e portato a un cambiamento nella politica iraniana.

Vorrei venisse evitato quanto successo nel Maghreb, dove purtroppo le nostre speranze sono state in parte disilluse e che venisse invece mantenuto quell'atteggiamento prudente nei confronti della nuova politica iraniana, da Lei riassunto in maniera magistrale con l'espressione "*more for more and less for less*", questo non soltanto sotto il profilo economico e finanziario, ma anche sotto il profilo politico.

3-210-000

Andreas Mölzer (NI). - Herr Präsident! In unserer global vernetzten Welt – das ist eine Binsenweisheit – ist kaum eine außenpolitische Aufgabe im Alleingang für ein Land lösbar. Dennoch ist die Europäische Union leider bei den meisten außenpolitischen Problemen eher ein Leichtgewicht. Selbst in eher unwichtigen außenpolitischen Fragen fällt eine Einigung der 27 Mitgliedstaaten zumeist sehr schwer. Ganz zu schweigen davon, dass es fast unmöglich ist, die großen EU-Mitgliedstaaten – Frankreich, Großbritannien oder Deutschland – auf einen Nenner zu bringen. Frankreichs Vorpreschen bei der Anerkennung der neuen Nationalen Koalition in Syrien als legitime Vertreter des syrischen Volkes zeigt einmal mehr die Hilflosigkeit der EU gegenüber dem deschiefgelaufenen arabischen Demokratisierungsprozess.

Solange sich die EU-Staaten ein Wettrennen im Erfüllen US-amerikanischer Wünsche liefern, wird die EU zum zahllosen Zahlmeister für US-amerikanische Interessen degradiert. Brüssel sollte zu wichtigen außenpolitischen Fragen also nicht zu schweigen. Wir Europäer brauchen dringend eine eigenständige, von Washington unabhängige Außenpolitik, in der die Erfahrungen und guten Beziehungen der Mitgliedstaaten zu bestimmten Regionen optimal genutzt werden.

3-211-000

Arnaud Danjean (PPE). - Monsieur le Président, Madame la Haute représentante, vous êtes la dépositaire d'une politique extérieure européenne qui est confrontée à un impossible défi.

D'un côté, une demande toujours plus forte de nos concitoyens et de nos partenaires pour une réponse collective face aux défis diplomatiques et de sécurité. Où est l'Europe? Que fait l'Europe? Voilà ce que nous entendons dans nos capitales, dans nos opinions publiques, ainsi que de Lampedusa à Nairobi, d'Alep à Bamako. De l'autre côté, des prérogatives et des capacités d'initiative prisonnières de volontés politiques nationales de plus en plus frileuses et de capacités nationales de plus en plus réduites.

Réduire cet écart, mortifère pour l'Europe, sur la scène internationale est le fil conducteur du rapport Brok que nous vous proposons aujourd'hui. Le principal danger est la dispersion, l'incapacité à nous donner collectivement des priorités réalistes, particulièrement dans un contexte de réduction budgétaire, que vous avez bien souligné.

Le but n'est pas de planter le drapeau européen partout en même temps, partout pour le principe, partout là où nous devrions aller. L'objectif est d'être là où nous avons des intérêts et des valeurs à défendre. L'objectif est d'être là où on nous attend, où on nous espère, mais surtout où nous pouvons être efficaces.

C'est incontestablement dans notre voisinage, oriental et méridional, que se joue la crédibilité de l'Europe: dans les Balkans, au Proche-Orient, en Afrique et dans le Caucase. Si nous ne jouons pas un rôle majeur dans ces régions-là, ce n'est pas la peine d'exercer la moindre influence sur la scène internationale ni, surtout, d'espérer convaincre nos concitoyens de la pertinence du projet européen.

C'est pour cela que je salue les actions que vous avez menées dans les Balkans, dans la Corne de l'Afrique, ailleurs en Afrique du Nord, notamment en Égypte, mais ces actions doivent s'amplifier et doivent surtout recueillir l'assentiment volontaire de nos États membres.

3-212-000

Véronique De Keyser (S&D). - Monsieur le Président, nous avons plus que jamais besoin d'une politique étrangère et de sécurité commune. En effet, le monde d'aujourd'hui est dans une espèce de transition entre un monde bipolaire et un monde que nous voudrions multipolaire, mais la transition n'est pas achevée. Cela explique que des pays que nous considérons comme des alliés dans un monde bipolaire partent parfois en vrille. Je pense notamment au rôle que l'Arabie saoudite et le Qatar ont joué dans la déstabilisation du printemps arabe et certainement de la Syrie, allant jusqu'à financer des groupes terroristes. Et c'est parce que nous avons besoin d'un monde bipolaire qu'aujourd'hui nous avons besoin d'une politique étrangère commune et d'une Europe qui soit forte dans ce domaine.

Nous devons peser d'une seule voix, autonome, sur l'équilibre international, sinon il s'en trouvera fragilisé. Je partage tout à fait ce que M. Danjean vient de dire. Pour bien peser, il nous faut une stratégie visible et lisible. Il nous faut des priorités. Nous ne pouvons pas tout faire, mais nous devons agir là où c'est le plus efficace.

À ce titre, je suis pleinement d'accord avec la ligne qu'a suivie M. Brok dans son rapport. Et bien entendu, Madame Ashton, pourquoi vous rendre responsable des échecs que nous essuyons parfois dans un monde qui traverse de telles turbulences et de tels cataclysmes, dans un monde qui vit de telles révolutions? Si nous n'avons pas réussi partout, ce n'est certainement pas de votre faute. Il y a néanmoins une seule phrase dans votre rapport, Monsieur Brok, que je n'accepte pas: c'est quand vous dites que Mme Ashton doit être l'"animatrice" de la politique étrangère: j'ai plus d'ambition pour le poste de haute représentante! Je voudrais en tout cas vous féliciter pour ce que vous avez fait dans la Corne de l'Afrique, pour ce que vous avez fait en Somalie, pour votre action en Serbie et au Kosovo, pour ce que nous avons pu éviter là-bas. Je pense qu'on ne mesure pas assez à quel point, là, l'Europe a pesé.

Je voudrais revenir à ce qui ne sont pas des échecs de notre part, mais bien des espèces de catastrophes, des espèces de génocides humanitaires. Je veux parler de la Syrie et du Moyen-Orient. En Syrie, nous n'avons pas réussi jusqu'à présent à arrêter les massacres. Vous avez dit: "il nous faut trouver de l'intérieur et de l'extérieur de quoi alimenter Genève 2". Je crois que vous avez tout à fait raison. Et pour embrayer sur ce que M. Provera a dit, je crois qu'il ne faut pas hésiter à avoir de l'audace dans la recherche mesurée et prudente de collaboration à un autre niveau. Je pense à l'Iran. Oui, Monsieur Provera, nous connaissons la situation des droits de l'homme en Iran et vous avez raison. Mais si nous réussissons les négociations sur le dossier nucléaire, si nous réussissons à avoir un Moyen-Orient dénucléarisé, l'Iran peut être un partenaire pour la stabilité régionale, pour l'Afghanistan, pour la question de la Syrie et contre le terrorisme qui, aujourd'hui, a pénétré dans ces régions.

(Le président retire la parole à l'oratrice)

3-213-000

Kristiina Ojuland (ALDE). - Mr President, I listened very carefully to the speech by the High Representative, and I think the European Union does a lot in the field of Common Foreign and Security Policy – but we definitely need to do even more. I do not want to go into small details in my short statement; rather, I would like to concentrate on some general remarks on what I see in the current Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union.

I believe that the economic recession has left its mark on several areas in the EU, including the CFSP. Therefore, I fully welcome this report by Mr Brok, and I believe it offers a clear and decisive strategy that will improve the Union's effectiveness as a cohesive global player. There is an absolute necessity for the European Union to formulate a clear, coherent, priority-based and progressive international strategy which aims to anticipate, prevent and shape the unfolding situations around the world. Furthermore, the European Union is one of the few international actors whose foreign policy is not only informed by its economic and political interests but also anchored in fundamental values and principles that define its very normative identity. Together with the parliamentary scrutiny of the foreign policy, such a norms-based international strategy will not only increase our credibility but will also help to mobilise support from other international parties, including from NGOs.

Last but not least, it will be virtually impossible to implement any new strategy that we come up with without a coherent coordination of international actions amongst the European capitals and without a stronger role of the High Representative on Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. This has enormous importance in ensuring the unity, consistency and effectiveness of our actions, and it is vital if the EU is to make a significant difference in the international arena.

3-214-000

Reinhard Bütikofer (Verts/ALE). - Mr President, I would like to welcome Mr Brok's report because, even though there is some relevant disagreement, there is much more that we have in common.

In a world in flux, Europe's broad security environment is in flux too. The reluctance of the United States to continue directing as much effort towards unruly regions in our neighbourhood as they did in the past is an obvious fact. Therefore I believe there is just one European answer: coordinate, cooperate, pool, share. Merely by continuing with the Member States' half-baked level of ambition to cooperate, CSDP and CFSP will not be delivering what they should.

I am afraid that the need to change the perception has not yet resonated enough in most Member States, most notably in the one that I represent here. So I would like to underline what Mr Brok wrote: 'Member States have an interest to develop a common vision that goes beyond individual Member States' perceptions and historical experience'. That is exactly the point. Interestingly, citizens seem to be more advanced in understanding that than some leaders because, if we listen to what Eurobarometer tells us time and time again, a huge majority of European citizens support exactly that perspective.

There is, however, one mistake we should refrain from making, and I think there is a point that we should criticise. Funding the Defence Agency via the EU budget is not going to overcome the lack of ambition and engagement by the Member States. These spend roughly EUR 200 billion on defence each year. If they cannot come up with the financing for the Defence Agency, we should not step in and say that we will squander European funds for that purpose. The problem is not a lack of funding. The problem is a lack of making the right decisions. So let us refrain from making that mistake.

3-215-000

Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR). - Mr President, I would like to address Baroness Ashton. In your introduction to your final progress report on CSDP a week ago, you were very clear about the primary reason for CSDP, and I quote: 'it is political and it concerns fulfilling Europe's ambitions on the world stage'. In other words, it is all about European integration. There are, of course, others, who cherished the naive hope that support for CSDP will encourage reluctant states to contribute more, militarily, and use it. I fear that they will be disappointed.

You spoke earlier of the EU's operational expertise; this is truly smoke and mirrors. Any military assets and expertise that you draw on come from our nations; the EU adds nothing. It does not matter how you dress it up: no CSDP activities bear critical scrutiny. Two thirds of the 7 000 personnel deployed on so-called EU CSDP missions are civilians, and 23 of the 30 missions are civilian. It is not even true to say that the EU's maritime operation has drastically reduced the scourge of piracy off the coast of Somalia, as you said. For the most part, Atalanta merely drew on the same small pool of national naval forces already providing ships for NATO's ocean shield.

In reality, of course, the main factor in reducing pirate attacks in the Red Sea/Indian Ocean area was the introduction of on-board private armed security teams. If I thought for a moment that CSDP was designed to help the European nations become more effective and capable defence contributors and alliance partners, then there might be some merit. But the EU has no military requirements different to those of NATO. It may make sense for less-capable countries to get together to improve capabilities, provided they have the will to use them, but there is absolutely no need for the EU to be involved in any of this.

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

3-216-000

Arnaud Danjean (PPE), question "carton bleu". – Monsieur le Président, mon cher collègue, nous allons faire profiter la plénière de nos débats habituels.

En vous entendant critiquer ce que vous appelez les *so-called EU missions and operations*, en particulier la mission Atalante, mais aussi les missions de formation EUTM, EUTM Somalia – que vous avez pu voir sur le terrain avec moi en Ouganda, dont vous avez pu mesurer l'efficacité, le professionnalisme, les mérites – mais aussi EUTM Mali, je m'interroge quand même sur le degré de mauvaise foi – pardon de vous le dire – que vous mettez dans ce jugement un peu rapide et qui contredit complètement le jugement que je viens d'entendre de notre excellent collègue, Charles Tannock, qui louait, lui, les mérites de ces missions européennes. Alors, pouvez-vous me dire où est la cohérence de votre ligne politique?

3-217-000

Geoffrey Van Orden (ECR), *blue-card answer*. – I am always delighted to discuss these matters with my good friend and colleague Arnaud Danjean. Yes, I did indeed visit the training mission in Somalia. What was particularly interesting about it was that all those recruits that were being trained had been recruited by the United States and were paid for by the United States, and indeed moved there by the United States. The European Commission delegation in Entebbe had not even visited the EU training mission at the time we went there – so much for joined-up EU activity and a so-called comprehensive approach.

My point is that there is no need for the European Union to be involved in this. All those personnel that we saw doing training – and doing some excellent training – were provided by nations which for the most part are NATO allies.

3-218-000

Χαράλαμπος Αγγουράκης (GUE/NGL). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, τόσο η έκθεση που συζητούμε όσο και η Σύνοδος Κορυφής του Δεκεμβρίου 2013 αποσκοπούν στο να γίνει η Κοινή Εξωτερική Πολιτική και Πολιτική Ασφάλειας ακόμη πιο επιθετική, ακόμη πιο ιμπεριαλιστική. Οι στρατιωτικές και άλλες αποστολές της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης αυξάνονται και επεκτείνονται, γεωγραφικά και χρονικά. Σε τούτο κυνίγι το των φυσικών πόρων και των αγορών, ολόκληρες χώρες έχουν μετατραπεί σε πραγματικά προτεκτοράτα και διοικούνται από εγκάθιτες κυβερνήσεις. Εκατομμύρια άνθρωποι στις χώρες αυτές έχουν χάσει κάθε ελπίδα και αναζητούν διαφυγή στη μετανάστευση για να καταλήγουν, κατά χιλιάδες, είτε στον βυθό της Μεσογείου, είτε σε στρατόπεδα συγκέντρωσης. Αυτή η πολιτική έχει οπλίσει τους μισθοφόρους της Συρίας και τους θεωρεί συνομιλητές της, αυτή η πολιτική ευθύνεται για την αποσταθεροποίηση στην Αίγυπτο και για την κατάσταση που προέκυψε στη Λιβύη μετά τον ιμπεριαλιστικό πόλεμο. Αυτή η πολιτική καταστρέφει την αμυντική βιομηχανία και τα ναυπηγεία της Ελλάδας για χάρη των πολυεθνικών, ρίχνοντας στην ανεργία χιλιάδες εργαζόμενους.

Για αυτούς τους λόγους, οι λαοί δεν αποδέχονται να καθορίζεται από τις γεωπολιτικές επιλογές των ΗΠΑ, της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των μονοπωλίων και από τους ανταγωνισμούς με τις ανερχόμενες καπιταλιστικές δυνάμεις η διεθνής νομιμότητα. Δεν δέχονται οι λαοί να νομιμοποιούν τα συμφέροντα και τις αξίες της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των πολυεθνικών εταιρειών.

3-219-000

Νικόλαος Σαλαβράκος (EFD). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση Brok επισημαίνει ότι οι δράσεις ΚΕΠΠΑ για το 2012 εξακολουθούν να υπολείπονται των προσδοκιών που δημιούργησε η Συνθήκη της Λισαβόνας και προτείνει, μεταξύ άλλων, τον καθορισμό σαφών προτεραιοτήτων και στρατηγικών κατευθυντήριων γραμμών για τη σύσταση πλαισίου αξιολόγησης των σχέσεων με τους στρατηγικούς εταίρους της Ένωσης και δη με τους κυριότερους εξ αυτών, τις ΗΠΑ, την Ρωσία, τη Κίνα, την Ινδία, την Ιαπωνία, την Βραζιλία, κα.. Πρέπει εντούτοις να τονίσουμε ότι η χρήση της δυνατότητας σύμπτυξης ενισχυμένων συνεργασιών ώστε να παρακαμφθεί το σοβαρό πρόβλημα της αρχής της ομοφωνίας, του βέτο, είναι θέμα εξαιρετικά ευαίσθητο και πρέπει συνεπώς να είμαστε ιδιαίτερα προσεκτικοί.

Η όλη εισήγηση της Βαρώνης Ashton καταγράφει σημαντικές δράσεις διαχείρισης εξωτερικών γεγονότων αλλά δεν αναφέρεται σε καμία πρωτοβουλία η οποία να προέρχεται από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση. Θεωρώ ότι η Ένωσή μας πρέπει να παίζει ισχυρό πρωταγωνιστικό ρόλο στα παγκόσμια πράγματα, πρέπει να προηγείται των γεγονότων και όχι να τα ακολουθεί. Σε μια τέτοια προοπτική, θα πρότεινα στην κυρία Ashton να αναλάβει πρωτοβουλία για σχέδιο ειρήνευσης στη Μέση

Ανατολή, ιδίως τώρα που η εκλογή Rouhani ως Προέδρου στο Ιράν έχει δημιουργήσει ελπίδες σε πολλούς.

3-220-000

Cristian Dan Preda (PPE). - Raportul privind politica externă și de securitate comună e în fiecare an foarte important pentru parlamentul nostru, dar aș spune că anul acesta el are o semnificație specială. Am în vedere aici, sigur, perspectiva alegerilor europene de la anul și, de asemenea, contextul politic în care consensul față de proiectul european pare să fie fragilizat. De aceea, cred, e nevoie de o viziune clară asupra rolului pe care trebuie să îl joace Uniunea în lume. Aș vrea să îl felicit pe colegul meu, Elmar Brok, pentru raportul redactat în Comisia AFET. E un raport care reușește să propună, dincolo de recomandări concrete, o asemenea viziune, pentru o acțiune externă mai coerentă.

Pentru cetățenii europeni e, într-adevăr, cum au spus-o și alți colegi, important ca Uniunea să le apere interesele într-un mod hotărât, într-un mod unitar, bazându-și politicile pe promovarea valorilor pe care ni le-am asumat. Pentru ca lucrul acesta să fie o realitate, sigur, e nevoie de mai multe resurse decât în prezent și nu pot decât să îmi exprim regretul față de reducerea cadrului financiar multianual în acest context.

Ideea cercurilor concentrice ale păcii, securității și dezvoltării, concretizată prin încheierea parteneriatelor strategice ale Uniunii, e o componentă esențială a acestei viziuni asupra rolului Europei în lume. Dar aici e nevoie, cred, de mai multă coerență și de implicarea Parlamentului în luarea deciziilor privind viitoarele parteneriate.

Pe lângă obiectivul extinderii, care rămâne mereu actual, subscriu ideii că Uniunea trebuie să se angajeze mai mult în direcția politicii europene de vecinătate. Determinarea noastră de a susține țările din vecinătate e pusă la încercare de evoluțiile politice din unele dintre țările acestea. Tocmai de aceea trebuie să recompensăm țările care înregistrează evoluții pozitive, cum e, de pildă, cazul Moldovei, în vecinătatea estică, iar succesul tranziției către o democrație durabilă trebuie să constituie prioritatea pentru vecinătatea sudică.

3-221-000

Richard Howitt (S&D). - Mr President, in this, the last annual CFSP report in the lifetime of this parliamentary term, I congratulate Mr Brok, but apologise that I have to use my own contribution to warn how the global influence of my own country – the United Kingdom – would suffer, as has been demonstrated by the previous contribution, if Conservative Eurosceptics get their way and take Britain out of the European Union.

International partners, including Britain's historic allies and friends in the world, have been clear. Japan called on the UK to maintain a strong voice and continue to play a major role in the EU. Australia told the UK that EU membership allows Britain greater leverage in our global influence, and the Obama Administration warned Britain that referendums, such as the one wanted by Prime Minister Cameron, turn countries inward. That is the real alternative. Remember, when Putin's adviser wanted to criticise British intelligence, he called us a small island that no one listens to. In Norway, a country Eurosceptics often cite, the Head of their Institute of International Affairs said that his country's relationship with the EU is not an alternative for Britain as it is 'complex and costly, as well as problematic in terms of democracy and the national interest'. Even the UK Government's own so-called Balance of Competences Review shows that foreign policy competences remain squarely with the Member States and that most of the evidence argues strongly that it is in the UK's interest to work through the EU. Yet it is their ideology that leads them to ignore their own

evidence. This year's European foreign policy scorecard has already shown the British Government prepared to give up leadership in six out of 19 areas of European foreign policy, despite the overall finding that in only one, during the last year, has there even been minor divergence between EU and UK goals.

In this debate it is the individual merits of our High Representative, not her nationality, that allow us to celebrate what I consider to be foreign policy successes: the mediation between Serbia and Kosovo, encouraging reforms in Burma, leading the enormously important diplomacy on Iran's nuclear programme and combating piracy off the Horn of Africa. But I am proud that the High Representative is British too, and that her personal success demonstrates how British foreign policy can sit comfortably at the heart of today's European Union.

The British Labour Party offers a different vision. We understand that each of our countries stands taller and is able to build better alliances, win more trade deals and tackle global challenges, including climate change, by taking part in EU foreign policy and that this enhances, rather than threatens, our sovereignty. Today we punch above our weight. Tomorrow we might not even get in the ring. Labour's shadow foreign secretary argues that the EU amplifies British power and promotes our values, not just our interests.

3-222-000

Marietje Schaake (ALDE). - Mr President, Madam High Representative, this is the last time we will debate the annual CFSP in the current configuration of Parliament and with yourself as our High Representative. As we take stock, we need no reminders of the urgent need for strong, strategic, European foreign and security policy. With a confident Russia bullying not only its own citizens but also Member States of the EU and vital neighbours through politicising trade, we must stand firmly and take care not to be played apart.

The US is choosing to no longer be the world superpower as it seeks to take a step back, and perhaps this is understandable – but who takes the place of leadership in defending and promoting free societies, free markets and, most of all, free people? Especially with regard to human rights and fundamental freedoms, the US has lost credibility, and this should be Europe's moment. We can use the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership to strengthen our alliance, but not without cementing our values.

The Middle East is more fragile than ever. With an average age of 26, the young generation needs opportunities for self-determination yet are lured by hopelessness and also extremism.

Syria, of course, represents the most horrific of examples. The horror and the suffering should not be forgotten, and while there are no easy solutions, certainly the US-Russia initiative to deal with the chemical weapons is not a solution to all problems, nor was the breaking of the European weapons embargo, under the leadership of France and the UK. I am happy with European leadership when it comes to humanitarian aid – we take our responsibility. But we must do more, because I am afraid we have not seen the worst yet.

A divided Europe is a weak Europe that is played apart, and with our basis not in order, opportunities are difficult to reap. I believe we must test the words of opening from Iran, and the EU needs its own strategy. We should not merely be a facilitator for talks between the US and Iran, as the US Congress is pushing for more sanctions. This is the moment for Europe to act independently and forcefully.

We must take our responsibility militarily. Soft power and hard power go hand in hand, and I am afraid we should push harder to put the silver thread of human rights back on top of the agenda.

3-223-000

Mirosław Piotrowski (ECR). - Dyskutujemy dzisiaj na temat wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa Unii Europejskiej. W punkcie 12 rezolucji Parlamentu Europejskiego czytamy, że nasza izba wyraża ubolewanie w związku z faktem, że UE nie opracowała jeszcze jasnej strategii dotyczącej stosunków z resztą świata oraz że jej działania są określone bardziej jako reakcja niż akcja. Parlament Europejski przyznaje więc, że 4 lata od wejścia w życie traktatu lizbońskiego, który miał przecież nadać nowy impuls tzw. wspólnej polityce zagranicznej Unii, projekt ten okazał się, łagodnie rzecz ujmując, ułomny. Niektórzy na tej sali wspólną politykę zagraniczną i bezpieczeństwa określają jako żart, kosztowny dla podatników dowcip. W związku z powyższym chciałbym zapytać panią wysoką przedstawiciel Ashton, czy jej zdaniem wypracowanie takiej jednolitej i jasnej strategii przez 28 krajów członkowskich uważa w ogóle za możliwe, a jeśli tak, to w jakim horyzoncie czasowym.

3-224-000

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD). - Mr President, Libya was the most recent conflict directly concerning Member States, and just 11 of the Member States supported the UN resolution. From this and other examples, it is clear that, in fact and reality, there is no – and I repeat no – common foreign and security policy between Member States. What there is, is an EU Foreign Service – the External Action Service – apparently with 30 missions, and what that is, is a gigantic gravy train for EU insiders and their hangers-on.

My amendment in June proposed that External Action Service personnel be restricted to ten weeks' paid holiday a year. Just 84 MEPs voted in favour. This is shameful, and I hope it will be very different in the next Parliament. By the way, on a previous occasion, I have made it very clear how I regard the office and office-holder of the post of High Representative.

(The speaker was then given the floor for a point of order)

3-225-000

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD). - Mr President, I have a point of order. Is it in order for Mr Brok – whose report this is – to ostentatiously engage in irrelevant chat between himself and his acolyte while Members of the European Parliament are speaking in the Chamber? Mr President, in your view, is this in order?

3-226-000

President. – Yes, my good friend, I think it is in order.

(Applause)

3-227-000

Francisco José Millán Mon (PPE). - Señor Presidente, quisiera felicitar en primer lugar a Elmar Brok por su informe, un excelente análisis sobre la política exterior de la Unión Europea. Creo —como el señor Brok— que es necesaria una política exterior y de seguridad

europaea activa, eficaz y coherente. En este mundo multipolar, cambiante y global, juntos somos más fuertes que por separado. Pero esta política europea requiere la voluntad política de actuar juntos, así como medios y liderazgo por parte de los organismos creados por el Tratado de Lisboa, cuestiones estas en las que se detiene el informe del señor Brok.

Quisiera destacar la importancia de unas relaciones estrechas con los Estados Unidos. Siento que no se haya celebrado todavía la Cumbre anual Unión Europea-Estados Unidos y también que el clima de la relación esté algo afectado por las revelaciones del llamado «caso Snowden», pero la relación estratégica más importante que tiene la Unión Europea es con los Estados Unidos. Las negociaciones del Acuerdo Transatlántico sobre Comercio e Inversión abren además una importante oportunidad para reforzar esta relación.

Me gustaría además que, en el futuro, compartiéramos una perspectiva de cooperación transatlántica más amplia, que incluyera, en determinadas áreas, a los países latinoamericanos e incluso a la orilla atlántica africana.

Señorías, en este mundo no desprovisto de riesgos y en el que el ascenso de la región Asia-Pacífico es un importante factor de cambio en la geopolítica internacional —y me estoy refiriendo, por ejemplo, al giro de los Estados Unidos hacia Asia—, también es necesario profundizar en la política europea de seguridad y defensa. Acontecimientos en zonas tan cercanas a Europa como Libia o Mali demuestran que la política exterior sigue necesitando instrumentos de defensa.

La necesaria consolidación fiscal no debe ocultar esta verdad y celebro por ello que la política de defensa sea objeto del próximo Consejo Europeo de diciembre.

3-228-000

Μαρία-Ελένη Κοππά (S&D). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Βαρώνη Ashton, όπως είπατε και εσείς, ζούμε σε μία περίοδο μεγάλων αλλαγών στο διεθνές σκηνικό ενώ την ίδια στιγμή η Ένωση αντιμετωπίζει τη μεγαλύτερη κρίση στην ιστορία της. Σε αυτό το σταυροδρόμι πρέπει να αποσαφηνίσουμε αν η Ένωση θα διαδραματίσει τον ρόλο που της αντιστοιχεί στη διεθνή σκηνή ή αν θα παραμείνει παρατηρητής. Σήμερα, χρειαζόμαστε μία εξωτερική πολιτική-εργαλείο αντιμετώπισης των μεγάλων προκλήσεων ενός κόσμου που αλλάζει με ιλιγγιώδεις ρυθμούς. Οφείλουμε όμως να καταλάβουμε ότι μόνο με κοινή, συντονισμένη, συλλογική δράση μπορούμε να πετύχουμε το μέγιστο αποτέλεσμα. Σε αυτή τη προσπάθεια, η Υπηρεσία Εξωτερικής Δράσης έχει κεντρικό ρόλο. Ξέρουμε πλέον τις αδυναμίες και τις αγκυλώσεις της και πρέπει να την κάνουμε ακόμη πιο αποτελεσματική, ώστε να μπορέσει, με διαφάνεια και λογοδοσία, να εκπληρώσει την αποστολή της, προκειμένου να υπάρξει μια πραγματική ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική που θα εκπροσωπεί συνολικά την Ένωση και θα εμποδίσει την επανεθνικοποίηση της εξωτερικής πολιτικής.

Η κρίση στον Νότο της Μεσογείου, η συριακή καταστροφή, η αλλαγή του κέντρου ενδιαφέροντος των Ηνωμένων Πολιτειών προς τον Νότιο Ειρηνικό, όλα αυτά τα γεγονότα ασκούν πίεση στην Ένωση για να αναλάβει τον ρόλο που της αντιστοιχεί. Οφείλει συνεπώς η Ένωση να ορίσει με σαφήνεια τους εξωτερικούς της στόχους. Οι αλλαγές που έχει φέρει η Συνθήκη της Λισαβόνας δεν έχουν αξιοποιηθεί επαρκώς και δεν έχει αποσαφηνισθεί πλήρως ο ρόλος των θεσμικών οργάνων. Κατ' επανάληψη είχαμε την ευκαιρία να το διαπιστώσουμε αυτό, ειδικά σε περιόδους κρίσης. Η Συνθήκη δίνει στο Κοινοβούλιο σημαντικές δυνατότητες ως προς τον έλεγχο και την αξιολόγηση της εξωτερικής δράσης. Εξάλλου, το Κοινοβούλιο έχει έναν ουσιαστικό ρόλο να διαδραματίσει στη διάχυση της πληροφορίας και στην ευαισθητοποίηση των πολιτών σε σχέση με τα θέματα εξωτερικής πολιτικής.

Σήμερα, περισσότερο από ποτέ άλλοτε, μια μεγάλη μερίδα πολιτών πλήττεται από την φτώχεια και την ανεργία σε πολλές χώρες της Ένωσης και πιστεύει ότι τα ζητήματα εξωτερικής πολιτικής δεν την αφορούν. Σε δύσκολες περιόδους σαν την σημερινή χρειαζόμαστε σαφείς και αυστηρές προτεραιότητες. Δεν μπορούμε να βρισκόμαστε με την ίδια παρουσία παντού. Η γειτονιά μας, Ανατολική και Νότια, τα Βαλκάνια, η Τουρκία - αυτές οι περιοχές πρέπει να είναι η προτεραιότητά μας. Με λιγότερους πόρους καλούμαστε να κάνουμε περισσότερα και κυρίως να στείλουμε ένα σαφές και καθαρό μήνυμα προς όλες τις κατευθύνσεις που να εκφράζει τις αρχές και τις αξίες μας, κρατώντας πάντα σαν άξονα της κάθε δράσης μας στον εξωτερικό τομέα τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα - χωρίς διπλά μέτρα και σταθμά και χωρίς εκπτώσεις. Σε κάθε περίπτωση, χρειαζόμαστε και εδώ περισσότερη Ευρώπη και όχι λιγότερη.

3-229-000

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, dobro sam upoznata s nedosljednošću vanjske i sigurnosne politike Unije jer se po ovom pitanju nismo maknuli s mjesta još od vremena srpske agresije na Hrvatsku i Bosnu i Hercegovinu. I tada je Europa bila troma i neodlučna u političkoj i vanjskoj reakciji, i vojnoj reakciji, a takva je i danas. Izvjestitelj s pravom ističe kako moramo zaštititi svoje državljane i njihove interese diljem svijeta. A kad je u pitanju Bosna i Hercegovina učinili smo malo ili ništa kako bismo zaštitili politička prava Hrvata Bosne i Hercegovine, koji su ujedno i državljani Republike Hrvatske, a time i građani Europske unije. Opstruiranje povratka hrvatskih izbjeglica u Republiku Srpsku i protuhrvatski izborni inženjering u Federaciji Bosne i Hercegovine dobar su pokazatelj onoga što Hrvati proživljavaju u vlastitoj državi. Ako želimo položiti ispit vjerodostojnosti i biti globalni politički akter, vrijeme je da počnemo čistiti u svom europskom dvorištu. Stoga tražim od institucija i političkih tijela Europske unije da konačno poduzmu konkretne korake za osiguravanje ravnopravnosti Hrvata u Bosni i Hercegovini.

3-230-000

Krzysztof Lisek (PPE). - Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Wysoka Przedstawiciel! Zaczę, tak jak inni, od komplementów i – przepraszam panią Wysoką Przedstawiciel – zaczę od sprawozdawcy. Chciałem tylko powiedzieć, że jak pan poseł Brok pisze sprawozdanie, to zawsze jest to ważne i poważne sprawozdanie, i tym razem jest tak samo, więc przyłączam się do gratulacji, które złożyli koledzy. Gratulacje należą się także pani Wysokiej Przedstawiciel i – przy okazji tego kompleksowego sprawozdania – pani zespołowi, bo w tych trudnych warunkach – i to nie tylko trudnych warunkach związanych z różnymi konfliktami, które toczą się na świecie, ale również tych trudnych warunkach w łonie Unii Europejskiej, bo nie mamy jeszcze kompleksowej i spójnej polityki zagranicznej – udało się, myślę, bardzo wiele. Wizytując w ramach delegacji Parlamentu Europejskiego różne miejsca na świecie, widzę, że np. przedstawicielstwa Unii Europejskiej już bardzo dobrze odgrywają rolę koordynacyjną pomiędzy placówkami państw Unii Europejskiej. Czyli ta współpraca między przedstawicielstwem Unii a ambasadami państw członkowskich Unii jest w większości wypadków bardzo dobra. Jedna rzecz, na którą chciałem zwrócić uwagę, korzystając z okazji, bo mamy jeszcze kilka nierozwiązanych konfliktów również w Europie: chciałem prosić panią Wysoką Przedstawiciel, aby w najbliższym czasie zdwoiła wysiłki dotyczące sytuacji w Gruzji, a dokładnie dotyczące tego dziwnego poszerzania granic, budowania infrastruktury granicznej przez Rosjan na granicy pomiędzy okupowaną Osetią Południową a resztą Gruzji. To jest coś, co uniemożliwia ludziom przemieszczanie się, kontakty rodzin, i musimy starać się temu zaradzić.

3-231-000

Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D). - Arvoisa puhemies, kiitokset Elmar Brokille hyvästä mietinnöstä ja korkealle edustajalle Ashtonille mielenkiintoisesta avauspuheenvuorosta. Ihmettelin, kuuntelivatko monet Euroopan unionin ulko- ja turvallisuuspolitiikan arvostelijat eilistä hyvin henkilökohtaista ja puhuttelevaa Saharov-palkinnon voittajan Aung San Suu Kyin puheenvuoroa. Hänhän muistutti meitä juuri siitä, kuinka tärkeää on pehmeä valta ja kuinka tärkeä on Euroopan unioni, ja hän sanoi moneen kertaan, että ilman Euroopan unionia ja ilman kansainvälistä yhteisöä hän ei olisi täällä vastaanottamassa Saharov-palkintoa. Ja tämä pehmeä valta, joka perustuu ajattelun vapauteen, demokratiaan, solidaarisuuteen ja oikeusvaltion periaatteisiin, on se ydin Euroopan unionissa.

Aung San Suu Kyi muistutti myös siitä, että kuinka tärkeää on se, että Euroopan unioni on johdonmukainen puolustaessaan näitä arvoja. Näin valitettavasti ei ole, ja se ei johdu ulkosuhdehallinnosta eikä korkeasta edustajasta vaan jäsenvaltioista, jotka esimerkiksi Keski-Aasiassa tekevät sitä politiikkaa mitä haluavat. Ja näiden kaikkien kolmen instituution pitää tehdä todella... *(Puhemies keskeytti puhujan.)*

3-232-000

Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR). - Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Komisarz! Skuteczność i spójność polityki zagranicznej Unii Europejskiej sprawdzi się na Wschodzie. Jeśli Pani i my wszyscy będziemy skuteczni w tym, co nazywamy wymiarem wschodnim Unii Europejskiej, jeśli to wszystko zakończy się sukcesem – Pani przejdzie do historii, a my nie będziemy musieli się wstydić przed naszymi wnukami. Jeśli Pani i my będziemy skuteczni w przeciąganiu Ukrainy na Zachód, jeśli Pani i my będziemy skuteczni w wyciąganiu więźniów politycznych z więzień na Białorusi, z więzień, które znajdują się 50 km od unijnej granicy, jeśli będzie Pani skuteczna, i my wraz z Panią, w pomocy dla Mołdawii i Gruzji, jeśli będziemy, Pani i my, skuteczni w walce o europejskie interesy i wartości, z krajem, który dzisiaj więzi działaczy Greenpeace'u tylko dlatego, że mieli trochę odwagi upomnieć się o sprawy dla nich ważne, jeśli w tym wszystkim Pani będzie skuteczna, to będzie oznaczać sukces Unii Europejskiej i sukces tych państw. Bardzo Panią proszę o to, żeby uznała Pani, że nie Azja, nie Afryka, nie Ameryka Południowa są tym testem na spójność i skuteczność europejskiej polityki, tylko wymiar wschodni. Bardzo proszę zwrócić na to uwagę, a będzie Pani miała poparcie Parlamentu Europejskiego.

3-233-000

Othmar Karas (PPE). - Herr Präsident, Frau Hohe Beauftragte, meine Damen und Herren! Der Bericht ist großartig, weil er nicht nur lobt, was geschehen ist, sondern vor allem das Ziel genau definiert: Außen-, Verteidigungs- und Sicherheitsunion. Wer das Ziel nicht kennt, kann den Weg dorthin nicht planen. Und nur, wenn die Europäische Union zum Sprecher des Kontinents in der Welt werden darf, nur wenn die Europäische Union mit einer Stimme in der Welt auftritt und ihre Kräfte bündelt, können wir unser Gewicht angemessen zur Geltung bringen.

Es geht um eine Richtungsentscheidung. Nicht nur, aber auch in dieser Frage wollen wir ein globaler Akteur werden oder sind wir zum Zuschauen verdammt. Diese Richtungsentscheidung können wir selbst entscheiden, mit den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern. Ägypten, Syrien, Lampedusa zeigen, dass wir die Gemeinsame Außen-, Verteidigungs-, Sicherheits-, Außenhandels- und Entwicklungspolitik stärken müssen, um auch gegenüber

unseren eigenen Bürgerinnen und Bürgern glaubwürdig zu sein und Vertrauen in unser politisches Handeln und in die Institution zurückzugewinnen.

Zusammenarbeit heißt auch Kosten senken und Effizienz erhöhen. Dazu muss die Einstimmigkeit fallen. An der Gemeinsamen Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik führt kein Weg vorbei, wollen wir unsere Verantwortung gegenüber den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern Europas wirklich erfüllen können.

3-234-000

Pier Antonio Panzeri (S&D). - Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, se guardiamo il quadro geopolitico mondiale e la sua recente evoluzione, vediamo dinanzi a noi tre scenari.

Il primo è rappresentato dal venir meno di quello che può essere definito il "missionarismo democratico americano". E questo avviene per due motivi principali: costi economici insopportabili e un'opinione pubblica stanca di guerre e di seguire modelli superati di esportazione di democrazia.

Il secondo scenario è rappresentato dal proporsi invece sulla scena mondiale di paesi che si autocertificano democratici – Cina, Russia – e che usano la loro forza economica, finanziaria ed energetica per condizionare il nuovo quadro geopolitico e per riempire gli spazi che si stanno liberando.

Il terzo scenario è rappresentato dall'Europa e caratterizzato dalla sua crisi democratica e dalla sua difficoltà attuale di proporsi come punto di riferimento per la comunità internazionale.

Dovremo essere consapevoli, quindi, che occorre giocare un ruolo importante adesso da parte della politica estera europea per diventare protagonista, perché qui ed ora c'è uno spazio da cogliere per rilanciare una nuova politica estera e costruire un nuovo approccio globale, come del resto suggerisce la relazione dell'onorevole Brok.

3-235-000

Eduard Kukan (PPE). - Mr President, congratulations to the rapporteur for a very good report. As his report acknowledges, the Union's external actions need to be understood and supported by EU citizens. The European Parliament plays an important role in this process. A few issues I want to mention: in order to be a global player, the EU must keep up with the rest of the world, hence it must continue to develop and cultivate a modern, professional and competent External Action Service. Congratulations to Madam Ashton on her achievements so far. I want to encourage her to continue active personal engagement in her future activities.

The only way to achieve a strong and credible foreign security policy is with clear strategic goals; we need coherence and consistency. These must be the key principles of our external policy and must mirror the EU's political and economic weight in the world. We can achieve this only by coordinated action among the Member States.

The other challenge for us lies just beyond our borders. Our near neighbourhood and countries with the prospects of EU membership are the real test for our external action. Developments in these countries directly affect our citizens and their interests. Therefore, we need to invest more in these relations politically, economically and physically.

3-236-000

Σοφοκλής Σοφοκλέους (S&D). - Βαρώνη Ashton, πρέπει να παραδεχτούμε ότι ως προς τη Κοινή Εξωτερική Πολιτική και Πολιτική Ασφάλειας έχουμε έλλειμμα, αδυναμία, αναποτελεσματικότητα. Η Συνθήκη της Λισαβόνας δεν έχει εφαρμοστεί στην πράξη. Η κοινή πολιτική ασφάλειας και άμυνας εξακολουθεί δυστυχώς να παραμένει ζητούμενο. Ο πόλεμος της Συρίας συνεχίζεται, η Αίγυπτος δεν βρήκε την ηρεμία της, η 'αραβική άνοιξη' μετατρέπεται σε 'αραβικό χειμώνα', οι διώξεις των χριστιανών συνεχίζονται, οι κινητοποιήσεις του τουρκικού λαού καταστέλλονται βίαια και ανάλογα προβλήματα υπάρχουν σε όλες τις ηπείρους. Η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση πρέπει να μετεξελιχθεί σε μία ενιαία ισχυρή ομόσπονδη δύναμη που να επιβάλει τη σταθερότητα και την ειρήνη.

Έχω δύο παρατηρήσεις αναφορικά με την έκθεση του κυρίου Brok: καταρχάς, προϋπόθεση για να ανοίξουν τα καίρια κεφάλαια είναι να μετατραπεί η Τουρκία από δύναμη αποσταθεροποίησης σε δύναμη ειρήνης και σταθερότητας. Δεν είναι δυνατόν μια χώρα που είναι υποψήφια για ένταξη να φυλακίζει δημοσιογράφους και καλλιτέχνες, να φιμώνει τον Τύπο, να απειλεί την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση, να συνεχίζει να καταπατά τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα και να περιφρονεί τον Οργανισμό των Ηνωμένων Εθνών και, βεβαίως, να μην αναγνωρίζει την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία. Δεύτερον, επιθυμώ να χαιρετίσω τη θέση του εισηγητή που επιδοκιμάζει και ενθαρρύνει πρωτοβουλίες όπως το αίτημα χωρών της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης να γίνουν μέλη της «Συνεργασίας για την Ειρήνη», θέση που εξέφρασε η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία μέσω του αρμόδιου υπουργού, ευελπιστώντας σε στήριξη από την Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση.

3-237-000

Andrej Plenković (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedniče, hvala puno na razumijevanju i na onoj mogućnosti da govorim malo ranije nego što je bilo predviđeno. Ja se ubrajam u one koji su svjesni da je zajednička vanjska i sigurnosna politika Europske unije politika koja je doživjela najkvalitetniju i najsnažniju evoluciju u proteklih 20 i nešto godina. Toga smo posebno svjesni mi koji dolazimo iz Hrvatske i koji smo bili svjedoci ograničenja i institucionalnih, i financijskih, i pravnih, europske vanjske politike s početka '90-ih. Na temelju naučenih lekcija toga vremena danas imamo i mehanizme, i proračun, i politike, a gđa Ashton je u svom govoru jako dobro elaborirala koliko je danas bitna i Europska služba za vanjsko djelovanje, Europska obrambena agencija. Zato mi se čini da je izvješće našega kolege i predsjednika odbora g. Broka jako dobro u smislu identificiranja ključnih strateških postavki europske vanjske politike, a to je koherentnost, to je učinkovitost, to je učinkoviti multilateralizam, to je prije svega globalno pozicioniranje Europske unije u vezi ključnih kriznih žarišta u svijetu gdje moramo imati svoju ulogu koja je uvijek jasna i konzekventna. Isto tako smatram da moramo dotaknuti pitanje određenih paralelizama između aktivnosti Europske unije i nekih naših velikih članica, osobito u okviru G20, u okviru kvinte, u okviru Kontaktne skupine. To su oni elementi koji moraju biti komplementarni ukupnim naporima Europske unije u jačanju vanjske politike.

3-238-000

Маруся Любчева (S&D). - Въпросите, които засягаме в дебата за общата външна политика се отнасят едновременно към Източното партньорство и към политиката за добросъседство. По тези приоритети се върши изключително важна работа и то в сложна геополитическа обстановка – политически и финансови кризи, усложнени отношения с наши партньори и трети страни.

Трябва да бъдем по-динамични, решителни и отговорни. По-отношение на държавите от Източното партньорство сме постигнали положително развитие – законодателни реформи, диалог с гражданското общество, укрепване на демократичните процеси. В навечерието на Вилнюс, докладът дава добри перспективи за европейската интеграция на Украйна, Молдова, Грузия. Важно е да имаме развитие по визовата либерализация с Молдова. При увеличаващ се натиск върху тези страни трябва да бъдем отговорни и да не ги оставяме сами. В случая с Армения, независимо от нейната преориентация, трябва да продължим и затвърдим своята подкрепа. Не бива да поставяме под съмнение необходимостта от диалог с Русия, която остава наш стратегически партньор. Бих желала да споделя и надеждата си за европейска подкрепа на демократичните процеси в Турция и разрешаването на някои все още нерешени въпроси с нейните съседи, включително България.

3-239-000

Tunne Kelam (PPE). - Mr President, our main practical task is to try to enhance cooperation and the efficiency of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) – it is a process of global transformation. The EU is poised to be a global actor. However, to perform this role, the CFSP has yet to obtain common determination and genuine credibility. That means applying conditionality and reciprocity as fundamental criteria, especially in dealing with authoritarian regimes. Iran continues to be a test case of such conditionality and reciprocity: while reacting to the so-called liberal president, one should also face the real situation there.

One credible signal is there: finally, international sanctions have started to bite. This seems to be the real cause of change in Tehran's rhetoric. Iran's main concern is still to get rid of sanctions first, not to open up first or stop their secret programmes. Reciprocity is crucial now, when every gain of time by Tehran could mean successful completion of their weapons of mass destruction. Tehran will not change without a strict conditionality, which means that, for every real loosening of sanctions, our partner has to answer immediately in the same hard currency, not through hints of change.

3-240-000

Boris Zala (S&D). - Mr President, the EU could achieve so much on the global stage. Consider the example of the so-called 'Strategic Partnership', a new concept introduced in 2010 to organise our bilateral relationships with the established and emerging powers. It is a very sensible idea. It has great potential to make our engagement with key players more coherent and more effective; however, so far the potential remains unfulfilled.

What are the criteria for selecting our strategic partners? Today we have ten strategic partners: the USA, Canada, Brazil, Russia, China, India, Japan, South Korea, South Africa and Mexico. But the list seems arbitrary – why South Korea and not Australia? – and so on. Does the designation as 'strategic partner' have any budgetary implications?

In summary, we need more clarity on what the instrument is designed to achieve, and the European Parliament should be fully involved in this debate.

3-241-000

Μαριέττα Γιαννάκου (PPE). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η έκθεση του κυρίου Brok πραγματικά είναι πολύ σημαντική και πάρα πολύ καλά συγκροτημένη, με μόνη εξαίρεση το σημείο, στο οποίο προτείνει το άνοιγμα νέων κεφαλαίων για την Τουρκία, μια χώρα που δεν αναγνωρίζει όλα τα κράτη μέλη της Ένωσης. Θέλω επίσης να ευχαριστήσω την κυρία Ashton διότι δημιούργησε μια

Υπηρεσία, η οποία μπορεί να μην είναι τέλεια αλλά ξεκίνησε από το μηδέν και έχει κάνει τρομερές προσπάθειες. Συμφωνώ με ό,τι σημειώνει στην έκθεσή της, ότι, δηλαδή, μας χρειάζεται το πολιτικό, το επιχειρησιακό και το οικονομικό. Στην ουσία βεβαίως, όλα εξαρτώνται από το πολιτικό. Αυτή τη στιγμή, η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στηρίζει την ανάπτυξη όπου μπορεί στις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες και οι Ηνωμένες Πολιτείες ασχολούνται μόνο με τα θέματα ασφάλειας. Θεωρώ ότι πρέπει να κατανεμηθούν εξίσου οι δράσεις και στο ένα πεδίο και στο άλλο, εάν θέλουμε να παίξει η Ευρώπη το ρόλο που όλος ο κόσμος επιθυμεί από αυτήν. Ας μην ξεχνούμε ότι η Ευρώπη εξακολουθεί να είναι ακόμη ελκυστική για τις αναπτυσσόμενες χώρες. Κατά συνέπεια, χρειάζεται πολιτική βούληση κατ' αρχήν, πολιτική βούληση για μία νέα Ευρώπη, για μία διαφορετική Ευρώπη, και, συγκεκριμένα στα θέματα άμυνας και εξωτερικής πολιτικής, για μια Ευρώπη που θα λάβει υπόψη της τα συμφέροντα όλων των χωρών, μεγάλων και μικρών, και θα προβεί στην αναγκαία σύνθεση που θα της δώσει την δυνατότητα να αποκτήσει μια ολοκληρωμένη πολιτική πραγματικής άμυνας και ασφάλειας και, φυσικά, μία ενιαία εξωτερική πολιτική.

3-242-000

Filip Kaczmarek (PPE). - Panie Przewodniczący! Pani Wysoka Przedstawiciel! Sprawozdanie w sprawie wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa zajmuje się między innymi niepewnością sytuacji na świecie. Chciałbym podkreślić, że nie uda się tej niepewności trwale zmniejszyć, dopóki ponad 840 milionów ludzi na świecie cierpi z powodu głodu. Dlatego to, co nazywamy całościowym podejściem do polityki zagranicznej Unii Europejskiej, jest jak najbardziej uzasadnione. Tak samo z resztą jak lepsza koordynacja. Dzięki lepszej koordynacji moglibyśmy znacznie lepiej wykorzystać nasze zasoby, a jest to ważne, ponieważ jesteśmy największym dawcą pomocy na świecie. Istotna jest także spójność naszych polityk z celami rozwojowymi, tym bardziej, że jest ona umocowana traktatowo. Jeżeli brakuje spójności, to doprowadzamy do takiej sytuacji, w której jedną ręką coś dajemy, a drugą zabieramy. Nie da się w taki sposób budować stabilizacji. Spójna, całościowa, dobrze skoordynowana polityka rozwojowa pomoże nam uniknąć wielu problemów na świecie. Nie walczmy jedynie z objawami, walczmy z przyczynami problemów, które w perspektywie czasu zagrażają również Europie.

3-243-000

Davor Ivo Stier (PPE). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, pozdravljam izvješće Elmara Broka koje postavlja jedan jasan okvir za promicanje i vrijednosti i interesa Europske unije na globalnoj sceni. Kada se u izvješću govori o liderstvu i koherentnosti vanjske politike Europske unije onda se na jednom istaknutom mjestu spominje uloga Europske unije u jugoistočnoj Europi. I s pravom se ističe uloga Visoke povjerenice u postizanju dogovora između Srbije i Kosova. Zato ću se fokusirati upravo na ovu regiju, naglasiti da ovdje još ima nedovršenog posla i da će se po našoj politici prema ovom kutu europskog kontinenta mjeriti uspješnost vanjske politike EU-a jer kako ćemo govoriti o Europskoj uniji kao globalnom igraču ako ne znamo pokazati vodstvo u politici prema području koje je okruženo članicama Europske unije. Stoga pozdravljam napore i Europske komisije i kolega iz Europskog parlamenta, pogotovo u odnosu na Bosnu i Hercegovinu. Posebno izdvajam BiH jer je ona u ovom trenutku najveći izazov za ostvarivanje naših ciljeva stabilnosti i prosperiteta u jugoistočnoj Europi. Napori povjerenika Füleu u postizanju dogovora u BiH i pristup koji je on izabrao ovoga puta ulijevaju nadu da se konačno prepoznalo kako su separatizam i centralizam dva jednako opasna ekstrema za stabilnost i opstojnost te višenacionalne države. Ipak apeliram da se dodatno radi na usklađenosti poteza država članica na ovom području, što će se sasvim sigurno reflektirati i na opću snagu i vjerodostojnost europske politike na globalnoj razini.

3-244-000

Моника Панайотова (PPE). - Първо бих искала да поздравя докладчика г-н Брок за опита да отчете необходимостта от баланс на интереси и ценности в една нова външна политика на Европейския съюз от изграждането на нов цялостен подход, целево и ресурсно обезпечен, така че Европейският съюз да поеме ръководна роля в постоянно променящия се свят. Обсъждайки общата външна политика с оглед и на Лисабонския договор, бих искала да насоча вниманието ви върху Общата политика за сигурност и отбрана като неразделна част от нея.

В епохата на глобализация, заплахите на географски отдалечени места могат да бъдат също толкова сериозни като тези в непосредствена близост. Характерното е, че никоя не е само военна, нито може да бъде отстранена с чисто военни средства. Новите заплахи изискват комплексно използване на различни инструменти и интегриран подход. За целта е време за стратегическо преосмисляне на средата за сигурност. Нужна ни е нова обща стратегическа визия, която освен да дефинира предизвикателствата, трябва да приоритизира целите, оптимизира и консолидира способностите съгласно принципа на обединяване и споделяне. От ключово значение за Европейския съюз е хармоничното съвместяване на политиките за сигурност с тази на развитие и да прецени силите си както икономически, технологични, така и политически и отбранителни, отчитайки дефицита на ресурс, демографското "буре", което има в Северна Африка, Близкия изток и Азия, преразпределението на силите и играчите на световната сцена. Европа трябва да реши как иска да се позиционира и да бъде възприемана оттука нататък. Повече фокус и приоритетност.

3-245-000

Mariya Gabriel (PPE). - Monsieur le Président, je remercie à mon tour le rapporteur pour son travail et le félicite pour la richesse de son texte.

Pour ma part, j'aimerais insister sur trois points. D'abord, la visibilité de l'action extérieure de l'Union est la grande priorité. À ce titre, je salue l'idée de renforcer la coordination entre les chefs de mission, les représentants spéciaux de l'Union et les chefs de délégation. C'est comme cela que l'Union pourra parler d'une voix forte et assurer ses ambitions.

Je voudrais ensuite insister sur le partenariat avec l'Afrique. Nous devons avoir le courage de porter nos ambitions, du courage pour avoir un partenariat donnant-donnant, du courage pour renforcer notre coopération avec l'Union africaine, mais aussi avec la SADC, la Cedeao et la CEEAC, du courage pour faire le bilan des accords de partenariat économique et pour voir comment nous abordons les questions économiques dans la politique étrangère. Nous ne devons pas oublier non plus le potentiel que recèlent la région des Grands Lacs, le Sahel, la Corne de l'Afrique et le centre du continent africain.

Troisième point, je veux insister sur le rôle de médiateur de l'Union européenne. La médiation fait partie intégrante de la diplomatie préventive de l'Union. C'est l'une des composantes de l'approche globale. C'est notre valeur ajoutée. À ce titre, je voudrais vous féliciter, Madame Ashton, pour le travail que vous menez avec l'équipe de soutien à la médiation.

Enfin, je vous félicite également pour tous les efforts que vous déployez afin de promouvoir les femmes dans la politique étrangère de l'Union. C'est très encourageant pour tous les citoyens européens.

3-246-000

Vytautas Landsbergis (PPE). - Saugumas, taip pat Europos saugumas, Europos Sąjungos narių saugumas ypatingai priklauso nuo kaimynystės. Kaimynystė, kuri būtų suprantama kaip sutarimas ir bendradarbiavimas bendram gėriui, – tai yra kas kita negu kai kieno suprantama tiksliai geografinė kaimynystė, buvimas greta, o iš tikrųjų – varžybos, kas kam darys įtaką ir kas ką valdys. Mes turim Vidurio Rytų Europoje tokį kaimyną iš senų laikų, kuris visada buvo ir tebėra linkęs į dominavimą. Centrinės Europos nepriklausomybė, o tuo labiau draugiški ryšiai su Rytų Europos šalimis, norinčiomis suartėjimo su Europos Sąjunga, erzina ir pykdo tą kaimyną, kuris vis dar mano, kad jisai turi valdyti ir dominuoti. Todėl Europos Sąjungos politika, kalbant ir apie Rytų kaimynystę, ir visus kitus energetinius ryšius ir santykius, turėtų būti ramiai tvirta, nes tai yra mūsų saugumo pagrindas. Su viltimi, kad tas didysis geografinis kaimynas, kuris iš tikrųjų jaučiasi varžovas ir Europos Sąjungą traktuoja kaip sau nemalonų ir pavojingą varžovą, kad tas geografinis kaimynas pradės suprasti kitokios kaimynystės naudą ir bendradarbiavimo naudą. Tam reikia kantrybės, reikia ramios ir tvirtos politikos, jokiū būdu ne pataikavimo ir bandymo nuraminti neprotingai pykstantį geografinį kaimyną.

3-247-000

Alojz Peterle (PPE). - Moje iskrene čestitke poročevalcu Elmarju Broku za dobro opravljeno delo.

S tem poročilom ne izraža Evropski parlament samo odnosa do kriznih žarišč, ampak jasneje precizira temeljna izhodišča skupne zunanje in varnostne politike. V tem smislu sem še posebej vesel, da vključuje poročilo prvič tudi strateško usmeritev glede zdravja.

Zdravje, ki je omenjeno skupaj z energijo, klimatskimi spremembami in oskrbo z vodo, kot eden od sodobnih izzivov, je treba v našem sporazumevanju in sodelovanju z različnimi partnerji obravnavati kot strateški element varnostne in zunanje politike.

Soglašam s pozivom k zunanjepolitični fleksibilnosti, ko gre za nove grožnje, hkrati pa poudarjam, da zdravje ni čisto nov izziv. Že dalj časa smo priča slabšanju zdravstvenih kazalcev v Evropski zvezi in globalno – to je tudi posledica napačnih politik in napačne razvojne paradigme.

Sedaj, ko Evropska zveza pripravlja strateške partnerske sporazume z vodilnimi državami sveta, je prilika, da vključi vanje zdravje kot enega od bistvenih elementov bilateralnega sodelovanja in deljene skrbi za globalni razvoj.

3-248-000

Intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»)

3-249-000

Ingeborg Gräßle (PPE). - Herr Präsident! Frau Außenministerin, ich möchte Ihnen meine ausdrückliche Anerkennung aussprechen für die Veränderungen im Annex X im Statut. Sie haben dafür gesorgt, dass die Zahl der Urlaubstage im Auswärtigen Dienst heruntergeschraubt wird, und zwar auf zwei Tage pro Monat von jetzt dreieinhalb. Ich halte das für eine beachtliche Leistung. Ich habe Sie für diese unverändert hohen freien Tage kritisiert. Deswegen wollte ich Sie ausdrücklich loben dafür, dass Sie sich dafür eingesetzt haben. Ich weiß, das waren Sie persönlich. Es war sicherlich keine ganz leichte

Entscheidung. Es gibt Ihnen mehr Flexibilität in Sachen *rest and recreation*, dort freie Tage zu geben, wo sie auch wirklich dringend notwendig sind. Es wäre schön, wenn diese Entscheidung, wo es künftig freie Tage gibt in Drittstaaten, in voller Transparenz erfolgen würde, weil ich Sie hier wirklich gerne deutlich mehr loben und nicht kritisieren würde.

3-250-000

Janusz Władysław Zemke (S&D). - Panie Przewodniczący! Chciałbym zwrócić uwagę na fakt, że jednym z elementów polityki zagranicznej jest także polityka bezpieczeństwa. Jeśli chodzi o wdrażanie tej polityki, to czeka nas jeszcze długa droga do osiągnięcia postępu i sukcesu. Chciałbym tutaj zwrócić uwagę na jeden aspekt – na sferę polityczną. Widać bowiem, że operacje wojskowe Unii – których było kilkanaście w ostatnich latach – powodują szereg problemów, obnażają także niestety sporo słabych punktów. Proponuję, żebyśmy kładli silny nacisk na rozwiązania pragmatyczne, żeby było mniej debat, natomiast trzeba konsekwentnie tworzyć wspólny transport strategiczny, zdolności do tankowania, a także dążyć do poprawy, jeśli chodzi o jakość sprzętu teleinformatycznego. Jeżeli postępy osiągniemy w tych dziedzinach, to będzie łatwiej mówić o wspólnej polityce.

3-251-000

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE). - Herr Präsident! Eine gemeinsame europäische Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik impliziert die Bündelung von Kräften und Ressourcen. Das könnte man angesichts der budgetären Situation in der Europäischen Union allseits befürworten. Doch am Montag wurde uns die drohende Zahlungsunfähigkeit avisiert, und vor diesem Hintergrund gedenkt man nun die Beitrittsverhandlungen mit der Türkei weiterzuführen? Abgesehen davon, dass die EU einen solchen Beitritt budgetär nicht bewältigen kann, frage ich mich, warum in diesem Bericht die Eröffnung weiterer Kapitel gefordert wird, wenn gerade die Türkei ein Mitglied der EU – nämlich Zypern – nicht anerkennt. Und *last but by no means least*, vielen Dank an den Berichterstatter und auch an Sie, Frau Hohe Vertreterin.

3-252-000

Andrew Henry William Brons (NI). - Mr President, I am sure that the High Representative will be believed when she says she wants to promote democracy and the rule of law throughout the world. I am not an enthusiast for her position, but she rightly challenges and criticises countries that imprison opposition leaders on spurious or doubtful pretexts. Of course, this does not just take place in former Soviet Republics or unstable regimes of the Middle East or Africa; it can also happen in Member States.

Only a few weeks ago we saw several MP's of Greece's third-strongest party arrested and detained on a 'sovietesque' charge of founding a criminal organisation. They are not, apparently, charged with complicity in the despicable murder of a left-wing activist, but their party has been transformed into a criminal organisation over night. I know nothing directly about Golden Dawn, and I certainly do not look at them through rose-tinted spectacles. But the rule of law cannot be observed selectively. We cannot pre-judge governments and opposition (...)

(the speaker was cut off by the President)

3-253-000

Ivo Vajgl (ALDE). - Na poti do tega, kar danes je, je Evropa v več trenutkih znala odgovoriti na svoje zgodovinske izzive.

Tako je po drugi svetovni vojni nastal začetek združevanja Evrope, tako je po padcu berlinskega zidu se odprl proces širitve Evrope in deset držav je hkrati vstopilo leta 2004 v Evropsko unijo.

Zdi se mi, da bi bilo vmesno razmišljati o tem, da bi Evropska unija zmogla hrabrost in, če hočemo, tudi inovativnost in ponovila manever s tem, da bi tudi države jugovzhodne Evrope sprejeli skupaj, v paketu, da bi ponovili big bang.

Razlike med njimi izgledajo včasih velike, v resnici pa niso velike, in mislim, da bi takšen pristop sprožil sinergijo in novo energijo v vseh teh državah, ki čakajo na vstop v Evropsko unijo.

3-254-000

(Fin de las intervenciones con arreglo al procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye»))

3-255-000

Catherine Ashton, *Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative*. – Mr President, it has certainly been an interesting debate. I am not quite sure when it began, but I was expecting some of the contributions.

I think some of you see what you feel is a growing ability of the EU to act. You pointed to a number of examples – for which I thank you – of areas where you have seen the European Union develop its capacity, on behalf of all its citizens, to be able to respond to some of the crises and challenges that we face, particularly those that focus on our neighbourhood – but not only those. A number of colleagues have talked about our relationships right across the world.

For some of you, I sense a frustration that there is much more to be done. You would like to see Europe act in a more coherent way. You would like to see Europe act in a different way than that which is allowed under the Lisbon Treaty – which is, if you like, the rule book under which I operate. But not all of you: some of you are very glad that the rule book of Lisbon exists. Some of you might even want to undo it and make the relationship between all of us very different. So I am very conscious, as I listen to this debate, that it reflects the wide range of views and ideas that I see reflected on a day-to-day basis when I am in contact with many of our colleagues across the European Union.

But I am very straightforward in my view. I believe – and my colleagues in the Foreign Affairs Council, of which I am President, know – that when we decide to work together and act together, we can achieve more than we can do individually. This does not take away from the capacity of individual nations to have important and strong relationships with others. What it does is enable us to get across the messages on which we all agree, and the values which we all hold, more consistently and better when we stand together. It is the oldest thing in the book. It is the thing we have known in the European Union from the beginning, but it is the thing that we have learnt from the playground onwards: that if you stand together for what you believe, you are much more likely to be successful in achieving it. That is what this is about.

I accept that we are very often reactive, but actually it is not surprising, considering the speed of events with which we have been confronted, especially in our southern neighbourhood. Few, if any, predicted what would happen. Some, with hindsight, 'predicted' what would happen but few, if any, really did predict it. The journey is by no means over.

So, yes, we do react to events from time to time, but we also do so by creating the momentum to demonstrate our commitment to help those nations get through difficult times so that the kind of societies that people in many cases have fought for – and in some cases have died for – can become a reality.

We are engaged all the time in conflict prevention and resolution. There are examples of it, sometimes more obvious than others, all across the world. In many cases people work tirelessly to achieve that in a deliberately very quiet way.

As well as our neighbourhood, I also pointed to the strategic relationships that we need. We need them with NATO as much as we need them with the United Nations. If the Secretary-General of NATO was standing here today, he would say the same thing. It is not 'either/or', it is 'both/and'. It is about projecting what we do in collaboration with our partners across the world to achieve more than we can achieve on our own. It is about the values of human rights. It is about economics meeting politics. It is about the comprehensive approach – not words just to be thrown around, but actually representing what we uniquely do when we bring together all that we do and aim our work, very deliberately, at some of the big problems and issues that we face.

It is also the case that our missions matter, whether they are civilian or military. Of course they are made up of people from Member States: that is what Europe is. And of course they are done in partnership with others. But they really do matter. If you talk with those who are engaged in the missions, they will tell you that the collaboration they get from working with other Member States adds a new richness to the capacity they have to act as individual nations.

When it comes to how we spend EUR 200 billion, nobody can tell me that we could not spend it better. The point about collaboration between defence ministers, when I chair their meetings, is to be able to use our resources to greater effect for all our citizens. It is not about giving something up, but about gaining something by being able to use resources better, whether it is the research we have done into improvised explosive devices, the ability to do mid-air refuelling – so important for future missions – or the work we do on a regular basis with NATO to complement each other on the way in which resources are used. These are positive developments and are nothing to be frightened of.

But I would say to the honourable Members that we are not onlookers in the world. This service is three years old and this role is four years old. It will grow and develop. I hope that I have given my successors the foundations upon which they can build to make the service everything that the parliamentarians in this Parliament would wish it to be and the Member States will allow it to be.

I would like to thank Mrs Koppa and Mr Brok for their reports, and I would like to thank the honourable Members for the opportunity to respond to this debate.

3-256-000

Elmar Brok, *Berichterstatter* . – Herr Präsident! Ich danke Ihnen für die souveräne Verhandlungsführung. Ihnen, Hohe Beauftragte und Vizepräsidentin, danke ich für Ihre Arbeit und das, was Sie zum Schluss gesagt haben. Ich danke den Kolleginnen und Kollegen, die an der Vorbereitung dieses Berichts in einem langen Prozess mitgewirkt haben, wie auch den Mitarbeitern.

Ich glaube, wir hatten heute einmal eine außenpolitische Generaldebatte, was man auch braucht. Dass es nicht bei jedem Redner immer kohärent geht, ist klar, da sind die unterschiedlichen Schwerpunkte, aber wir brauchen solche außenpolitischen Generaldebatten.

Zweitens muss ich feststellen – Frau Baroness Ashton, Sie haben Recht –, dass man oft reagieren muss, weil die Dinge in einer so hohen Geschwindigkeit kommen, aber das eine sollte das andere nicht ausschließen. Aber ich meine, das war wohl zu merken, dass wir einer Meinung sind.

Was wir unserem Bericht auch deutlich machen wollten, ist, dass es dem klassischen Auseinandergang von Werten und Interessen zu begegnen und diese wieder miteinander zu verbinden gilt. Das ist in vielen Reden zum Ausdruck gekommen.

Außenpolitik heißt, unsere Interessen wahrzunehmen, aber dieses unter Nutzung und Durchsetzung unserer Werte. Und ich glaube, dass dieses Haus heute etwa im Bericht Panzeri/Saryusz-Wolski in der Frage der Ukraine darauf bestanden hat, dass die *requirements* erfüllt werden. *Selective justice* mit Frau Timoschenko und die Fragen von Justiz- und Wahlrechtsreform zeigen, dass man, wo wir das sowohl aus strategischen als auch aus vielen anderen Gründen wollen, den Weg findet, dass dieser Vertrag in Vilnius unterzeichnet und mit den beiden anderen Ländern paraphiert wird. Ich glaube, auch dies wird hier deutlich.

Zum Schluss möchte ich zum Ausdruck bringen, was Sie in Ihrer Rede in der Schlussbemerkung gesagt haben, Baroness Ashton. Ich glaube, wir alle miteinander, unsere Nationalstaaten müssen begreifen, dass in unserer globalen Ordnung keines unserer Länder, auch nicht die sogenannten Großen dieser Welt, noch irgendetwas durchsetzen können.

Souveränität für unsere Völker zurückzugewinnen, bedeutet nicht, zu dem alten Spiel des Nationalstaates, zu den alten Modellen des vorigen Jahrhunderts zurückzukehren, sondern es heißt, dass wir unsere Kräfte poolen müssen, um auf dieser Welt ausgehend von der ökonomischen und sozialen Situation etwas zur Sicherung von Menschenrechten und Lebensperspektiven in Afrika und anderen Regionen und im Interesse unserer eigenen Sicherheitspolitik zu unternehmen.

Nur gemeinsam ist das möglich, und Sie, Frau Ashton, haben gesagt, zusammen schaffen wir mehr als allein. Ich glaube, das ist genau der Punkt, um den es geht, um europäische Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik zu betreiben. Herzlichen Dank!

3-257-000

El Presidente. – Se cierra el debate.

La votación tendrá lugar mañana a las 12.00 horas.

Declaraciones por escrito (artículo 149 del Reglamento)

3-258-000

Corina Crețu (S&D), *in scris.* – Conceptul „abordării cuprinzătoare”, enunțat de Înalțul Reprezentat, trebuie să capete conținut cât mai bine definit. Sunt de acord că acest lucru se poate face printr-o dezbatere extinsă cu Parlamentul European. UE are un important potențial în materie de gestionare a problematicii globale într-o lume în schimbare. Trebuie să găsim cele mai bune instrumente pentru a putea influența lucrurile care țin de interesele

noastre comune. Dimensiunea militară și de securitate trebuie adaptată noilor sfidări și trebuie extinsă. Avem nevoie de o reacție mai fermă față de acțiuni precum ascultările și culegerile ilegale de informații care privesc Uniunea și țările membre. Sunt de acord cu autorii Raportului, care reclamă o politică externă activă, nu reactivă, o mai mare implicare în rezolvarea unor probleme importante. Cazuri precum facilitarea relațiilor între Serbia și Kosovo demonstrează virtuțile acțiunii. Dimensiunea estică a politicii externe comune trebuie să rămână o prioritate, alături de politica ușilor deschise. Vecinătatea imediată a Uniunii este critică din multe puncte de vedere. O altă problemă care poate trebuie ținută sub control este imigrația ilegală. Tragediile cu repetiție din zona insulei Lampedusa ne amintesc datoria pe care o avem față de acești oameni, care își riscă viața pentru un trai mai bun.

3-259-000

Joanna Senyszyn (S&D), *na piśmie.* – Jednym z pięciu celów wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa Unii Europejskiej (WPBiO) jest poszanowanie praw człowieka i jego wolności. Wymaga to opracowania i stosowania jednolitych kryteriów w stosunku do wszystkich państw trzecich. Nie można ulgowo traktować łamania praw człowieka przez naszych strategicznych partnerów. Potrzebujemy przestrzegania jasnego minimum w odniesieniu do praw człowieka, aby prowadzić jakiegokolwiek rozmowy z państwami trzecimi. Prawa człowieka i demokracja powinny być uwzględniane na każdym etapie procesu decyzyjnego polityki zagranicznej. Działania zewnętrzne Unii muszą być zgodne z prawami zawartymi w Karcie praw podstawowych Unii Europejskiej oraz z prawami ustanowionymi w Europejskiej Konwencji Praw Człowieka. Oczekuję również jasnego wsparcia Unii i państw członkowskich dla instytucji międzynarodowych, które promują prawa człowieka i bronią ich. W związku z planowanymi cięciami budżetowymi pojawia się ryzyko braku wystarczającego wsparcia finansowego dla realizacji unijnych celów i zobowiązań w zakresie WPBiO.

Wiarygodność Unii na arenie międzynarodowej wymaga wykorzystywania środków w sposób skoordynowany, ukierunkowany i efektywny. Dlatego popieram m.in. przygotowanie osobnych linii budżetowych dla każdej misji i operacji WPBiO.

3-260-000

Valdemar Tomaševski (ECR), *raštu .* – Pone Pirmininke, bendra Europos Sąjungos užsienio ir saugumo politika – tai didelės iššūkis, turint omenyje audringus politinius pokyčius visame pasaulyje. Kaip pavyzdį galima pateikti Afriką arba Artimuosius Rytus. Dėl šių priežasčių Europos Sąjunga turi taikyti naują ir patikimesnę užsienio politiką siekiant užtikrinti valstybių narių interesus ir pozicijas tarptautiniuose mastuose. Todėl bendra tarptautinė politika neturėtų pakeisti valstybių narių politikos, o turėtų ją koordinuoti ir teikti diplomatinę paramą. Tik taikant šią taisyklę nuosekliai ir bendrai būtume pajėgūs įgyvendinti savo strateginius tikslus ir padidinsime Europos Sąjungos svarbą tarptautinėje politikoje. Dėl šių priežasčių su nerimu stebime nuolatinį aiškios strategijos dėl santykių su likusiu pasauliu trūkumą. Dėl to iki šiol šioje srityje nėra pasiekti tikslai, įrašyti Lisabonos sutartyje. Peržvelgiant Tarybos ataskaitą, verta atkreipti dėmesį į "strateginės partnerystės" plėtrą kaip Europos Sąjungos ir esančių bei jais tampančių pasaulinių lyderių bendradarbiavimo formą. Visgi derėtų nepamiršti, jog ši idėja reikalauja aiškių kriterijų dėl Europos Sąjungos pozicijos tarptautinėje politikoje. Yra dar vienas svarbus Europos Sąjungos tarptautinės politikos aspektas, į kurį derėtų atkreipti dėmesį. Tai yra Europos Sąjungos kaimynystės politika, kuri šiuo metu yra keblioje padėtyje. Jai reikėtų suteikti žymesnę prioritetą bei

sustiprinti jos reikšmę, kadangi tai leis užtikrinti politinį stabilumą artimiausioje Europos Sąjungos kaimynystėje.

16. Situación en Maldivas (debate)

3-262-000

El Presidente. – El punto siguiente en el orden del día es el debate a partir de la declaración de la Vicepresidenta de la Comisión y Alta Representante de la Unión para Asuntos Exteriores y Política de Seguridad sobre la situación en Maldivas (2013/2895(RSP)).

Me señalan que la señora Ashton está obligada a dejarnos y que ha delegado en el señor Leškevičius, que será, por lo tanto, quien presente el tema y cierre el debate.

Además, quiero informarles a todos de que no aplicaremos el procedimiento de solicitud incidental de uso de la palabra («catch the eye») en este debate y tampoco el de la «tarjeta azul» por razones de tiempo.

3-263-000

Vytautas Leškevičius, *President-in-Office of the Council, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.* – Mr President, the EU has followed the developing constitutional crisis in the Maldives with concern. The Maldives may not be largest of our partners, but the future of democracy there, as elsewhere in South Asia, is important to us. We actively assisted the country when it returned to democracy in 2008. Since ex-President Nasheed's resignation in February last year, Vice-President / High Representative Ashton has issued a number of statements and declarations, most recently last Sunday, encouraging the political parties to end the stand-off which followed and allow the crisis to be resolved by democratic and constitutional means. We strongly supported efforts by the Commonwealth and the UN to forge a consensus on the way forward, but it became apparent that the elections offered not only the best but possibly the last opportunity to ensure that the Maldives can benefit from a government with a genuine popular mandate which has the credibility to address the many challenges the country faces. These range from environmental problems stemming from climate change – the main target for our assistance in recent years – to the spread of drug trafficking and addiction, especially among young people.

We are also concerned about the growth of radical Islamist sentiment in the country. This, together with a judiciary strongly influenced by Sharia law, has led to gross injustices such as the recent sentence of flogging – now fortunately rescinded – on a minor for alleged immoral relations, after she had in fact been assaulted by a family member.

That case led to an international outcry, in which we joined. But it is symptomatic of a wider problem. Weak democratic institutions and bickering among the political parties have helped to open the door to extremism. Hence the importance of these elections.

You will recall that, with our strong encouragement and that of other partners of the Maldives, including India, the US, and many Commonwealth countries, presidential elections were held on 7 September. Although ex-President Nasheed obtained 45 % of the vote, no candidate polled more than 50 %, so necessitating a second round. All the observers, including the Commonwealth Observation Mission, our own electoral experts, and the 'Diplomatic Watch' composed of representatives of Member States' embassies in Colombo and New Delhi and of our Colombo Delegation, agreed that the outcome had been credible

and transparent. The Election Commission was congratulated for its efficiency and impartiality.

This was not, however, the view of those candidates opposed to ex-President Nasheed. They launched two legal cases alleging that the voter registry was flawed and accusing the Election Commission of malfeasance. The result was that the seven-man Supreme Court first stopped the process and then ordered a complete re-run of the elections on 19 October. In the event the election was cancelled once again, after the political parties refused to sign the voter register and the Maldives Police Services entered the Election Commission premises to halt the preparations.

We have continued to insist that elections be held as soon as possible. On 22 October the Election Commission announced a new date – 9 November – for the new first round, but the procedure is still vulnerable to legal challenges on technical grounds and if there is a second round, the constitutional deadline will not be met. I would remind you that the EU and international observers have expressed their confidence in the Election Commission, and we have pointed out that elections cannot successfully be held if the candidates can repeatedly bring them to a halt through legal injunctions. The forces of law and order must facilitate the democratic process and not impede it.

We should continue, together with like-minded partners, to assist the country to further develop its democratic institutions. We are important to the Maldives, which depends on tourism – taken together, Europeans are still the single largest group of tourists – and on exports of fish, again mainly to the EU. What we say and do is of importance there.

We should be open to working with any new government, providing that it has been democratically elected: that is, the elections must be manifestly credible, transparent and inclusive. Only in that way can the Maldives put their recent history of political conflict and personality clashes behind them.

3-264-000

Thomas Mann, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion* . – Herr Präsident, Herr Leškevičius, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Lage auf den Malediven ist außerordentlich kritisch. Die Außenministerien vieler Staaten warnen davor, Reisen in das Urlaubsparadies anzutreten, und wer bereits im Land ist, sollte auf Touren in die Hauptstadt Malé verzichten.

Wir stehen an der Schwelle zu ernststen Auseinandersetzungen – eine bittere Konsequenz der verhinderten Wiederholung der Präsidentschaftswahl. Am 19. Oktober hatten Polizeikräfte Wahllokale gestürmt und die Ausgabe von Stimmzetteln untersagt. Am letzten Wochenende haben Tausende von Anhängern des Kandidaten und Menschenrechtlers Mohamed Nasheed den Auto-, Bus- und Fährverkehr blockiert. Ihre Forderungen, die auch von großen Teilen Indiens unterstützt werden, heißen: erstens Neuwahlen und zweitens sofortiger Rücktritt des Amtsinhabers Waheed Hassan.

Als EVP-Fraktion sind wir bestürzt darüber, dass der noch junge demokratische Prozess so massiv behindert wurde. Wir fordern Aufklärung. Wieso haben Polizeikräfte die mit großer Sorgfalt vorbereitete Wahl verhindert? Ist Präsident Hassan eine der treibenden Kräfte, um möglicherweise den Sieg eines anderen Kandidaten zu verhindern?

Notwendig ist eine unabhängige Untersuchung der Rechtmäßigkeit der Wahlen, und zwar sowohl der Wahl von 2012 als auch der Neuwahl vom 7. September dieses Jahres. Der Oberste Gerichtshof hat im Übrigen beide Wahlen für ungültig erklärt. Der

Menschenrechtler Nasheed erhielt vor einem Monat 45 % aller Stimmen. Das ist zwar nicht die Mehrheit, aber mit deutlichem Abstand war er die Nummer 1. Dieses Votum darf nicht einfach übergangen werden!

Die Malediven müssen zurückkehren zu Demokratie und Rechtsstaatlichkeit. Eine dauerhafte wirtschaftliche Bedrohung gefährdet die Existenzgrundlage der Bevölkerung. Immerhin gab es gestern einen ersten positiven Schritt: Der Wahlleiter kündigte die Wiederholung der Wahlen für November an. Möge wenigstens das stattfinden!

3-265-000

Alexander Mirsky, *S&D grupas vārdā*. – Priekšsēdētāja kungs! Šai problēmai ir trīs aspekti. Pirmais aspekts ir mūsu darbs ar Maldīvu valdību. Vai tas ir jaunums, ka spēka struktūras neatrodas prezidenta kontrolē? Kā varēja notikt, ka policijas šefs pēc būtības ir diktators? Mums jāizvērtē šīs darbības. Eiropas Savienībai nav jāpalīdz Maldīvu salu valdībai, ja tur nav kārtības.

Otrs aspekts: kas tas par prezidentu, kurš nevar nomainīt policijas šefu? Kādi viņam ir valsts vadības instrumenti, un kāpēc mēs to uzzinājam vēlēšanu laikā, nevis tad, kad notiek Maldīvu prezidenta oficiālās vizītes Briselē?

Trešais aspekts: ja reāli Maldīvu salās valsti vada spēka struktūras, tad sakiet, lūdzu, kāpēc mums ir jāsniedz viņām finansiāla palīdzība? Varbūt mēs īsti nezinām, kas notiek Maldīvu salās. Ja nezinām, tad tas ir mūsu komandas neprofesionāls darbs. Ja zinām, tad kāpēc mēs reaģējam tikai pēc tam, kad tur notiek politiski izkropļojumi? Ir jānācās saukt lietas īstajos vārdos, tad nebūs tik daudz nepatīkamu ziņu no Maldīvu salām. Paldies jums par uzmanību!

3-266-000

VORSITZ: ALEXANDER ALVARO

Vizepräsident

3-267-000

Phil Bennion, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, firstly I would just point out that one of the great political advantages for the Member States of European Union membership is the influence that we have through the European Union on these types of international issues. This is the reason why the Liberals and Democrats are the party of 'in Europe' and not 'out of Europe'.

I think in Europe we can influence the world; in Europe we can defend our core liberal and democratic values – such as the clear separation of powers between the executive and the judicial institutions which we see in this case, and the fundamental right of people to democratic and fair elections.

I saw this in practice when I was an EU electoral observer in Pakistan earlier this year. This is why a European reaction to what is happening in the Maldives is important, and I welcome the fact that the Vice-President / High Representative has been vocal and has raised concerns over the halting of the work of the election commission following police intervention. The role and the credibility of the election commission is crucial in order to give confidence to citizens. In addition, the organisation of elections cannot be either the job of political parties or indeed of the police. We have to ask ourselves what the police are doing as far as stopping these elections is concerned. What on earth are they doing there?

The situation whereby lack of confidence in the Supreme Court and its judgments undermines the credibility of an election is deeply worrying. We need confidence in the separation of powers. Given that the failure to hold credible elections would be to deny Maldivian people their democratic rights – and I think we need to see these elections held as soon as possible – I would like to know what the EU is doing in terms of diplomatic dialogue. Why was there not an EU election observation mission? Are there plans for the EU to provide capacity-building with respect to judicial powers in the Maldives? Finally, is the Commission considering, as a last resort, the possibility of pressure through international trade tools?

3-268-000

Barbara Lochbihler, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion* . – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrter Minister Leškevičius! Ich danke der Hohen Vertreterin für die klare Aufforderung, dass die Wahlen auf den Malediven bis zum 11. November abgehalten werden müssen, wie es die Verfassung vorsieht. Alle Kandidaten, die sich bereits in der ersten Runde im September zur Wahl gestellt haben, sollten dies jetzt auch wieder tun können.

Die Bürgerinnen und Bürger der Malediven brauchen Gewissheit, dass die Regeln der Wahlkommission von allen Kandidaten, von allen Institutionen akzeptiert und eingehalten werden. Wir haben die Begeisterung gesehen, mit der die Menschen zur Wahl gegangen sind, und es ist die Aufgabe von Parteiführungen, dies zu respektieren und die Durchführung von Wahlen jetzt mit aller Kraft zu unterstützen.

Auch andere Akteure, wie z. B. der Oberste Gerichtshof, sind aufgefordert, sich klar im Sinne der Verfassung für das Abhalten von Wahlen einzusetzen. Die Wahlkommission muss nun unter großem Zeitdruck Vorbereitungen treffen, damit faire und freie Wahlen stattfinden können. Die EU sollte deren Arbeit unterstützen.

Wir beobachten den zunehmenden Einfluss religiöser Fundamentalisten und deren Auseinandersetzungen mit den moderaten Kräften. Auch dies wirkt sich auf die Wahlen aus. Die Grenzen zwischen Gesetzen und Interpretationen der Scharia werden zunehmend verschwommen. So hat das Parlament im März ein Gesetz entworfen, das auch Hudud-Strafen vorsieht, wie z. B. Zwangsamputationen bei Diebstahl oder Auspeitschungen bei Unzucht. Ich bitte den EAD dringend, sich gegen diese menschenrechtsverletzenden Strafen einzusetzen.

3-269-000

Charles Tannock, *on behalf of the ECR Group* . – Mr President, 2008 saw the Maldives' first democratic election, in which Mohamed Nasheed became President, representing a turning point for the country. We all hoped, as friends of the Maldives, for a future of multiparty politics and peaceful democratic rule in that small South Asian island paradise. It is therefore with a mixture of alarm and profound regret that we have looked on the deteriorating situation over the past 18 months, with an effective coup ousting MDP President Nasheed, followed by a political campaign waged against him for having dared to challenge sharia law in his country.

The free and fair election last month therefore represented a fresh opportunity, which was comprehensively endorsed by the international community and observers. The Supreme Court's decision, which was highly controversial, to now annul the result of the election which would have put Mr Nasheed comfortably on the path to being re-elected as President,

and the forcible prevention by the police of a further poll, to me smacks of judicial and political interference in a clear, democratic process and is unacceptable.

The people of the Maldives deserve better than this. They must have their voices heard and their decisions respected. The constitutional crisis which looms in Malé if a new president is not elected before the current president's mandate expires could spell disaster for this small but dignified Commonwealth nation. I therefore join colleagues in the House in calling for Maldivian politicians to put the interests of their country before their own political futures and to help create a truly democratic society where it is the people, and not a small band of disfavoured elites allied to ex- President Gayoom and the Islamist parties, who determine the country's future. We in the EU should apply maximum pressure to reverse the judicial coup.

3-270-000

Vytautas Leškevičius, *President-in-Office of the Council, on behalf of the Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy*. – Mr President, the problem that we have is to ensure that those who participate in this young democracy put the needs of the country ahead of their own interests. The Maldives is not, of course, the only country with a tradition of 'winner takes all'. But any parliamentary democracy includes not just a governing party but a 'loyal opposition' as well. We stand ready to help. And I can say, in response to what Mr Bennion was asking: if the election can at last be held, we can also consider other support, for example training for bodies like the judiciary and an effective audit organisation.

Regarding election observation, let me remind you that the EU funded the Election Expert Mission, which is still in place. The Maldives is an important beneficiary of our assistance in the field of climate change as well. We shall certainly continue scrutiny of developments affecting human rights.

In conclusion, I am grateful to Parliament for offering us the possibility to discuss the Maldives. We need to follow developments carefully. These elections have a relevance which goes beyond the borders of this small country. We should do whatever we can to stop it sliding into administrative chaos or back into dictatorship, as was the case before 2008.

3-271-000

Der Präsident. – Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

17. Festnahme von Greenpeace-Aktivisten in Russland (Aussprache)

3-273-000

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über die Erklärungen des Rates und der Kommission zu der Festnahme von Greenpeace-Aktivisten in Russland (2013/2888(RSP)).

3-274-000

Vytautas Leškevičius, *President-in-Office of the Council*. – Mr President, Commissioner, honourable Members, thank you for your interest in this matter. Let me start off by saying that the Council has not yet discussed the issue, whereas the High Representative and the European External Action Service have been in close contact with our Member States and

Greenpeace to follow developments and to bring support in terms of coordination and consular support ever since 19 September, when the Greenpeace ship Arctic Sunrise was seized by Russian authorities.

As we are all aware, the whole crew, including two journalists – 30 in all, of 18 different nationalities – were arrested and subsequently charged with piracy and put under two months' pre-trial arrest. The arrest followed attempts by Greenpeace activists to scale an oil rig off Russia's coast to protest against oil production in the fragile Arctic environment.

The EU delegation in Moscow hosts regular coordination meetings with all countries concerned, both Member and non-Member States of the EU. In Murmansk, where the crew and journalists are detained, consular assistance is being coordinated by Finland. It is at least positive to note that there has been no problem so far with consular staff seeing and assisting the detainees.

It is important to note that all the Member States which have nationals among the detainees wish to deal with the incident, for the time being, as only a consular matter. The EU respects this and has abstained from public statements on the wider issues involved. You will, however, recall that Commissioner Malmström addressed the issue here in Parliament earlier this month.

Having said this, we would agree that the piracy charges against the 28 crew members and even against two journalists covering Greenpeace's action seem disproportionate. In addition, they would seem to be a clear violation of freedom of the press.

We hope the ongoing investigation will allow swift clarification of the facts for which the crew could be held accountable, and we look forward to seeing Russia release the 30 detainees. In the meantime, we expect that they will all continue to have access to all the legal and consular assistance to which they are entitled.

3-275-000

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission* . – Chairman, Mr Leškevičius, honourable Members of the European Parliament, the arrest of the Greenpeace crew and the two journalists followed attempts by activists to scale an oil rig off Russia's Arctic coast in an attempt to attract attention to the potential impact of economic activities on the fragile Arctic environment.

While our immediate preoccupation is the continuing detention and the manifestly disproportionate charges brought against those detained, we should certainly not lose sight of the issue that they were attracting attention to. It is one that we should all take very seriously – how to ensure that economic activities in the Arctic do not endanger the region's fragile environment. Climate change is already having a significant impact on the Arctic environment, and the exploitation of the region's natural resources poses an additional threat if it is not carried out in a sustainable way, with all necessary precautions in place and in consultation with the people who live there. We cannot even begin to imagine the impact that a major oil spill would have on the Arctic environment or the difficulties and cost of trying to clean it up.

The EU is keen to step up its engagement with its Arctic partners, including Russia, to help meet the challenge of safeguarding the environment while ensuring the sustainable development of the Arctic region. We have funded projects and programmes to that end and will continue to do so in the future.

The events also raise questions relating to interpretation of the UN Law of the Sea Convention. The Netherlands, as flag state of the Arctic Sunrise, has initiated arbitration procedures under the Law of the Sea Convention. We welcome this step, which might clarify the underlying issue of the legality of the ship's seizure. Perhaps more importantly, the Netherlands has asked for the release of the ship's crew and journalists as a provisional measure pending clarification of the main legal issues. This would be a positive early outcome not only for those detained but also for their families.

But as we have just learned, Russia will, unfortunately, not accept the arbitration procedure in this case. Russia claims not to be obliged to recognise the authority of the Law of the Sea tribunal in disputes concerning sovereign rights and jurisdiction. While, of course, regretting this decision, we also note that Russia has declared itself open to settlement of the case. This gives hope for a positive outcome.

3-276-000

Wim van de Camp, *namens de PPE-Fractie*. – De verhoudingen tussen Nederland en Rusland zijn de afgelopen eeuwen uitstekend geweest, maar worden op dit moment zwaar overschaduwd door de problematiek van de *Greenpeace*-activisten.

Nederland heeft de afgelopen weken geprobeerd via arbitrage en via een spoedprocedure bij het Zeerechttribunaal om deze mensen uit de voorlopige hechtenis te krijgen. Ik vind het onaanvaardbaar dat activisten twee maanden in voorarrest zitten en het centrale punt van mijn bijdrage is dan ook: wat kan de Europese Unie doen, zowel de Raad als de Europese Commissie, om deze mensen op korte termijn vrij te krijgen? Dat er juridisch procedures komen vanuit de Russische regering begrijp ik, maar om deze mensen daarvoor in voorarrest te houden, vinden wij disproportioneel. Twee maanden!

De voorzitter van de Raad zei het al, het gaat om 18 nationaliteiten, waaronder twee journalisten. Dit Parlement komt altijd op voor de persvrijheid van journalisten en dit is eigenlijk in de verhoudingen tussen de Europese Unie en de Russische Republiek onaanvaardbaar. Mijn vraag is dan ook aan de voorzitter van de Raad: wordt het onderwerp op de komende top in Brussel besproken en op welke manier? Mijn tweede vraag is aan de Commissie: Wat kan de Commissie doen om ervoor te zorgen dat Rusland wél het Zeerechttribunaal erkent?

En uiteindelijk, Voorzitter, mijn vraag: het kan toch niet zo zijn dat Nederland en de Nederlandse bevolking alleen staan in dit dossier? Ik doe dan ook een dringend beroep op hulp, zowel bij de Raad als de Commissie.

[De spreker gaat in op een "blauwe kaart"-vraag (artikel 149, lid 8, van het Reglement).]

3-277-000

Marek Henryk Migalski (ECR), *pytanie zadane przez podniesienie niebieskiej kartki*. – Z radością przywitałem pana przemówienie. Podziwiam decyzję rządu holenderskiego, który tak silnie i mocno upomina się o swoich obywateli. Niestety polski minister spraw zagranicznych powiedział (cytuje): „Panowie z *Greenpeace* powinni byli wiedzieć, na co się ważyć”. Moje pytanie do pana jest następujące: czy ma pan jakiś sposób na to, aby przekonać polski rząd, ale też Radę i Komisję, żeby przyjęły tak twardą i stanowczą postawę, jak rząd holenderski?

3-278-000

Wim van de Camp (PPE), *"blauwe kaart"-antwoord*. – Het zal in belangrijke mate afhangen van de antwoorden die wij zo meteen van de Raad en van de Commissie krijgen. Vergis u niet, vrijheid van meningsuiting, vrijheid van actie, óók ter bescherming van het milieu, is een van de grondrechten van de Europese Unie. Dat sommige derde landen dat niet prettig vinden weet ik, maar als zij goede contacten met de EU willen, dan moeten zij ook onze spelregels accepteren.

3-279-000

Ivo Vajgl, *v imenu skupine ALDE*. – Gazprom enako kot velike multinacionalne družbe zahoda, ki želijo na hitro osvojiti nove prostore in si po možnosti nekontrolirano zagotoviti eksploatacijo naravnih bogastev našega planeta, nima absolutnega mandata.

Jemljejo si več svobode, kot jim pripada, in nas je samo strah tega, kar bodo prizadejali naravi in okolju.

Zato v skupini ALDE ne moremo sprejeti avtoritarnega ravnanja ruskih oblasti z okoljevarstveniki Greenpeacea pod absurdno obtožbo piratstva.

Takšna obtožba se je, tako so vsaj poročali, zdela problematična celo ruskemu voditelju Putinu. Ob tem je seveda dovoljen dvom o tem, da bi v današnji Rusiji predstavniki katere koli veje oblasti nasprotovali predsednikovi volji.

Prav je, da Evropski parlament okrepi izraze zaskrbljenosti, obsodbe in solidarnosti, ki jo je ravnanje ruskih oblasti z aktivisti Greenpeacea sprožilo v vsem demokratičnem svetu.

Potem ko je ta organizacija idealistov v preteklih letih razkrila nešteto grobih in nevarnih posegov v naravo v drugih delih sveta, je z drzno akcijo v vodah Arktike opozorila na to, da se groba eksploatacija z vsemi možnimi posledicami širi na ta del skorajda nedotaknjene zemlje.

Ruska vlada noče razumeti tega demokratičnega sporočila, podobno kot v primeru deklet skupine Pussy Riot, primera Magnitsky, Navalny in drugih, najprej poseže po represiji.

To ni Rusija, ki bi jo lahko razumeli, sprejeli ali zagovarjali. Rusija naj enostavno najprej čim prej osvobodi zaprte greenpeaceovce in si prihrani še večjo mednarodno blamažo.

3-280-000

Rebecca Harms, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, sehr geehrter Vertreter der Ratspräsidentschaft! Diese unvergleichliche Schönheit der Arktis haben wir in vielen Debatten in diesem Haus, auch in Ausstellungen, immer wieder beschrieben. Wir wissen inzwischen alle, wie empfindlich dieses letzte große Paradies auf der nördlichen Halbkugel ist. Wir wissen aber auch, dass dieses letzte kalte Paradies in großer Gefahr ist, seit Russland vor einigen Jahren seine Flagge auf dem Territorium gehisst hat. Denn das Hissen der Flagge hat eigentlich die Auseinandersetzung um die Frage eröffnet, wem die Rohstoffe gehören, die in dieser Region liegen, und wer wann damit beginnt, diese Rohstoffe zu fördern.

In Vorbereitung auf die Debatte habe ich mich noch einmal allgemein mit der Ölförderung in Russland beschäftigt und habe eine erschreckende Zahl gefunden: 5 Millionen Tonnen Öl werden bei Ölbohrungen in Russland Jahr für Jahr unkontrolliert in die Umwelt freigesetzt. Das ist der Zustand heute. Das ist sechsmal mehr als bei diesem großen Unglück

der *Deep Water Horizon* im Golf von Mexiko freigesetzt wurde. Es gibt also ganz guten Grund dafür, dass sich die Greenpeace-Aktivisten mit der *Arctic Sunrise* auf die Reise in die Arktis begeben haben, um ein Banner aufzuhängen an einer bisher einzigartigen Ölplattform dort in der Arktis. Diese gewaltfreie Aktion sollte ein Signal sein, nicht nur an Russland, sondern auch an den Rest der Welt, insbesondere an die Europäer, für unsere Verantwortung für das, was dort passiert. Die Reaktion darauf mit Piraterieanklagen nicht nur gegen die 28 Greenpeace-Aktivisten, sondern auch gegen die zwei Journalisten, die dabei waren, ist völlig unverhältnismäßig.

Der Europäische Rat sollte morgen und übermorgen der niederländischen Regierung beispringen. Es geht um den Schutz der Arktis, es geht aber auch darum, dass die Europäer Russland gegenüber erklären, was dort geht und was wir nicht tolerieren werden, und zwar umweltpolitisch, aber auch, was Demokratie und Freiheitsrechte angeht.

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

3-281-000

Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D), *sinisen kortin kysymys* . – Olen täsmälleen samaa mieltä, että merirosvosyyte on kohtuuton ja on väärin, että näitä nuoria ja innostuneita ihmisiä pidetään siellä vangittuna. Mutta edustaja Harms, tiedättekö Te oikeasti, mitä arktisella alueella tapahtuu? Tiedättekö Te sitä, että Venäjä, Norja ja koko kansainvälinen yhteisö on pystynyt kansainvälisillä sopimuksilla saamaan erittäin paljon aikaa öljyntorjunnan ja muun suhteen? Voi olla, että tämä vain ärsyttää Venäjää, koska Venäjä on arktinen valtio ja heillä on oikeus tiettyihin toimenpiteisiin. Tiedättekö Te, mitä siellä tapahtuu?

3-282-000

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“* . – Herr Präsident! Ich weiß, was da ist, ich weiß aber auch, wie es weitergehen soll, denn der ganze Fall spielt nicht nur in Murmansk, sondern demnächst auch in New York, weil dort bei der UNO über weitere Gebietsansprüche, die Russland angemeldet hat und die sehr gigantisch sind, entschieden werden muss. Unser Problem ist also eine dauernde Expansion des Territoriums dort.

Zweitens: Kontrollieren von Ölplattformen, von Ölförderung in diesen Gewässern. Da können Sie zwar sagen, dass das möglich ist, aber ich glaube, dass es bisher überhaupt keine Technologien gibt, die in der Lage wären, große Leckagen in der Arktis tatsächlich wieder unter Kontrolle zu bringen.

3-283-000

Marek Henryk Migalski, *w imieniu grupy ECR* . – Panie Przewodniczący! Nie dajmy się zwariować! Przecież wszyscy, którzy znają współczesną Rosję, Rosję putinowską, wiedzą, że ci działacze nie zostali tam aresztowani za to, że przedsięwzięli jakąś akcję, tylko za akcję polityczną. Każdy, kto zna współczesną putinowską Rosję, wie, że nie działa tam niezależny wymiar sprawiedliwości, że jest to decyzja polityczna. A jeśli jest to decyzja polityczna, to znaczy, że jest to testowanie reakcji Unii Europejskiej na fakt bezprawnego zatrzymania pod kuriozalnym, śmiesznym, gdyby nie tragicznym, zarzutem piractwa obywateli państw Unii Europejskiej. A to oznacza wobec tego, że Rosja testuje dzisiaj naszą reakcję. Widzimy dziś przedstawicieli ambasady rosyjskiej, których należy tutaj przywitać, którzy oglądają dzisiejszą debatę, ale którzy będą również bardzo uważnie patrzeć na to,

jak Unia Europejska potrafi obronić przed kuriozalnymi i śmiesznymi zarzutami obywateli państw Unii Europejskiej. To jest w dużej mierze test, który zaproponował Władimir Putin, czy potrafimy tak bronić naszych obywateli jak robi to rząd holenderski, czy też uznamy, że w tej sprawie będziemy się bawili w pseudoprawnicze argumenty, czy oni mieli prawo, czy nie mieli prawa testować poszczególnych wieży wiertniczych.

3-284-000

Mikael Gustafsson, för GUE/NGL-gruppen . – Herr talman! Politik börjar och slutar på gatorna eller, som i det här fallet, på internationellt vatten. Att Ryssland tillfångatagit fredliga ickevåldsaktivister från en internationell miljöorganisation på internationellt vatten är ett hot mot demokratin, ett hot mot yttrandefriheten och ett hot mot demonstrationsrättigheten.

I måndags diskuterade vi i den här kammaren det kommande COP-mötet i Polen, och förväntningarna på det mötet verkar nästan obefintliga, kanske därför att vi inte har levt upp till de krav man kan förvänta sig i internationella miljöförhandlingar.

Det är därför vi behöver organisationer som Greenpeace som fortsätter att agera, belysa och kämpa för vår natur och framtida generationers rättigheter.

Det olagliga fängslandet av Greenpeaceaktivisterna har väckt massor med internationell uppståndelse, och Holland är ett gott exempel på hur man agerar. Jag tycker att vi måste stämma in i den här kritiken mycket tydligare. Det är vår demokratiska skyldighet att kräva att dessa Greenpeaceaktivister frigges.

3-285-000

Daniël van der Stoep (NI). - Voorzitter, in het geval Rusland en Greenpeace zijn beide partijen volledig verkeerd bezig. Rusland heeft veel te hard opgetreden en houdt de activisten nu op een onacceptabele manier vast. Aan de andere kant wisten de Greenpeace-activisten precies waar zij aan begonnen met de acties.

Doordat Nederland het vlaggenschip is van het Greenpeace-schip, is er nog een actor bij betrokken: de Nederlandse staat. Strafrechtelijk en civielrechtelijk is het Rusland versus activisten, waarbij nogmaals moet worden aangegeven dat Rusland de activisten onacceptabel behandelt. Maar aan de andere kant speelt de relatie Nederland-Rusland internationaalrechtelijk mee. Het Zeerechttribunaal gaat nu naar de legitimiteit van het enteren kijken en eigenlijk zou ik ze willen aanraden om anders naar het Internationaal Hof van Arbitrage in Den Haag te gaan.

In Nederland hebben wij al genoeg te maken met de arrogantie van de Russische staat. Russische diplomaten weigeren hun parkeerboetes te betalen en zodra zij hun kinderen mishandelen beroepen zij zich op hun internationale immuniteit. Ondertussen wordt een Nederlandse diplomaat thuis in Moskou overvallen en mishandeld in een situatie die in alles lijkt op een *hate crime*! Dankzij de compleet falende Nederlandse minister van Buitenlandse Zaken, die liever op Facebook dan op zijn eigen ministerie zit, loopt dit alles uit op een diplomatieke ruzie.

Het centrale punt in deze ruzie is dat de Europese Unie zich hier op geen enkele wijze hiermee dient te bemoeien, en vooral niet nu nog onderhandelingen lopen tussen de Nederlandse en Russische autoriteiten! Dit debat in het Europees Parlement berokkent de Nederlandse diplomatie alleen maar schade en brengt de activisten in gevaar.

3-286-000

Krzysztof Lisek (PPE). - Panie Przewodniczący! Jest kilka aspektów tej sprawy, podnoszonych już tutaj przez wielu kolegów. Muszę powiedzieć, że nie zawsze jestem zwolennikiem metod używanych przez Greenpeace, choć jestem pełen uznania dla tego, że organizacja i jej członkowie wskazują pewne problemy, miejsca na świecie, gdzie dochodzi do zagrożenia dla środowiska naturalnego, i skupiają uwagę opinii publicznej i mediów, a przez to powodują, że my – politycy też się zaczynamy tym interesować. Tak więc mając pewne zastrzeżenia do metod, jednocześnie uważam oczywiście, że jest to działalność niezwykle pożyteczna, i powinniśmy ją wspierać. Z drugiej strony, chciałem powiedzieć, że znając trochę Rosjan, Federację Rosyjską i politykę rosyjską, i to, jak traktuje takie sprawy, jak platformy wiertnicze czy inne instalacje i urządzenia, to można by powiedzieć, że dobrze, iż skończyło się to tylko na tym. Chociaż oczywiście mamy problem – 30 aresztowanych. Aresztowanych oczywiście niesłusznie. – Zgodzę się tutaj całkowicie z kolegą Migalskim, że te zarzuty są kuriozalne. Prawo międzynarodowe, prawo morskie, prawo dotyczące piractwa zupełnie inaczej definiują piractwo, a działalność Greenpeace nie była nastawiona na zysk. Ci ludzie nie chcieli tej platformy obrabować, więc o piractwie nie możemy tutaj mówić.

Z czym mamy w takim razie do czynienia? Mamy do czynienia, tu się również zgodzę z kolegą Migalskim, z pewną demonstracją i próbą naszej siły i jedności państw członkowskich, których obywatele są tam zatrzymani, czy też siły Europejskiej Służby Działań Zewnętrznych. Dlatego działania wszystkich ambasad państw zaangażowanych w działania Europejskiej Służby Działań Zewnętrznych powinny być spójne i koherentne.

3-287-000

Knut Fleckenstein (S&D). - Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen. Sie kennen sicherlich alle den Kassenschlager an den internationalen Kinokassen: *Pirates of the Caribbean*. Ich muss gestehen, in den letzten Wochen hatte ich das Gefühl, im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes im falschen Film zu sein, denn plötzlich reden wir von Piraten in der Arktis.

Greenpeace ist berühmt und zugegebenermaßen auch berüchtigt für seine aufsehenerregenden Aktionen, bei denen sie auf Umweltbedenken aufmerksam machen. Es ist auch richtig, dass auch für *Greenpeace*-Aktivisten die Gesetze der jeweiligen Länder gelten, und das nehmen diese Aktivisten auch in Kauf. Aber eines ist auch klar, diese Art von Protesten sind weit entfernt von Piraterie. Und wenn ich mich nicht täusche, dann sieht das auch die russische Strafgesetzgebung so.

Wie Herr Migalski und andere und Herr Putin selbst auch gesagt haben, liegt hier ganz offensichtlich kein Fall von Piraterie vor. Und der Vorsitzende der Menschenrechtskommission beim russischen Staatspräsidenten, also nicht irgendein wilder Oppositioneller, hat am 11. Oktober in einem Interview erklärt, dass diese Anschuldigungen geradezu lächerlich seien, und er forderte die Staatsanwaltschaft auf, diese Anschuldigungen fallen zu lassen. Er erklärte völlig richtig, der Fall schade dem Ansehen Russlands.

Ich hoffe daher, dass die russischen Gerichte in Murmansk möglichst schnell zu der notwendigen Einsicht in dem vorliegenden Fall kommen, und ich hoffe, dass diese Einsicht es dann auch erlaubt, diese 30 internationalen Aktivisten sehr schnell vom Vorwurf der Piraterie freizusprechen.

Herr Kommissar, ich hätte mir gewünscht, dass Sie ein bisschen deutlicher sagen, dass Sie nicht nur, wie Sie den Anschein erweckt haben, im Sessel sitzen und zugucken. Ich weiß

doch von Ihnen, dass unsere Vertretung in Moskau sehr aktiv in dieser Sache ist. Gemeinsam mit den Botschaften der Niederlande und Großbritanniens – die eine gewisse Koordinierung übernommen haben – tun wir eine Menge, um die Männer und Frauen aus dem Gefängnissen herauszubekommen. Insofern danke ich Ihnen für diese Aktivität, ich hätte mich gefreut, wenn Sie sie auch genannt hätten.

Ich möchte unsere heutige Plenardebatte auch dazu nutzen, alle Seiten zu ein bisschen Umsicht aufzufordern. Die niederländischen Behörden, das haben wir gehört, haben als Flaggenstaat ja ein Schiedsgerichtsverfahren vor dem Seegerichtshof in meiner Heimatstadt Hamburg einberufen, und wir werden sehr genau darauf achten, wie Russland sich in diesem internationalen Zusammenhang verhalten wird.

Allerdings ist diese Angelegenheit für mich kein Grund, geplante Gespräche mit russischen Partnern abzusagen, wie einige von mir erbeten haben. Nein, im Gegenteil, sie sind ein Anlass dafür, eine maßvolle Reaktion auf diese Protestaktion anzumahnen, und deshalb werde ich mich in der kommenden Woche in Moskau, gemeinsam mit meine Kolleginnen und Kollegen von der Russland-Delegation, darum bemühen. Wir werden auch mit den Anwälten von *Greenpeace* sprechen.

3-288-000

Yannick Jadot (Verts/ALE). - Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Représentant de la présidence, Monsieur le Commissaire, depuis trente ans l'Arctique a perdu 15 % de sa superficie et 40 % de son épaisseur à cause de nos émissions de gaz à effet de serre. Et, cynisme absolu, finalement le crime paie! Le crime paie parce que ceux qui produisent le CO₂, ceux qui vont le chercher, vont pouvoir aller le chercher un peu plus en Arctique, parce que l'Arctique est victime de nos émissions de gaz à effet de serre.

Les militants de Greenpeace nous rappellent à nos responsabilités. L'Arctique ne peut pas être un terrain de jeu pour les grands groupes énergétiques, l'Arctique ne peut pas être une zone de non-droit. Monsieur le Représentant de la présidence, excusez-moi, mais GAZPROM n'est pas encore le 29e État de l'Union européenne! J'entends que vous coordonnez, que vous suivez l'évolution de la situation, mais on attend une parole beaucoup plus forte de l'Union européenne en l'espèce.

Il faut sauver l'Arctique, il faut sauver le climat. C'est un enjeu de démocratie, moi j'attends que les institutions européennes soient beaucoup plus fortes et que les États européens disent enfin à M. Poutine et à GAZPROM qu'ils ne peuvent pas faire n'importe quoi.

3-289-000

Peter van Dalen (ECR). - De aanklacht tegen de Greenpeace-bemanning van de Arctic Sunrise luidt piraterij. Dat is volkomen absurd! En ook bespottelijk als je kijkt naar de ernst en het geweld van de piraterij in de Indische Oceaan. Hopelijk maakt het Zeerecht-Hof in Hamburg vlug een einde aan deze poppenkast. Want van de Russische rechters hoeven wij dat niet te verwachten, die liggen aan de ketting van het Kremlin.

De vraag is, hoe democratisch en rechtsstatelijk is het regime Poetin? De heer Poetin duldt namelijk geen tegenspraak, noch tegenwerking. Is die er wel, dan komen er wat lieden langs om je kantoor leeg te halen. Zoals bij Greenpeace in Moermansk gebeurde.

Kortom, het wordt hoog tijd dat wij onze betrekkingen met Rusland opnieuw overdenken. Laten wij allereerst meer zelfvoorzienend worden op het gebied van energie. Zo lang wij met olie en gas té afhankelijk zijn van Rusland zijn wij onverstandig bezig!

[De spreker gaat in op een "blauwe kaart"-vraag (artikel 149, lid 8, van het Reglement).]

3-290-000

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD), *blue-card question*. – Mr van Dalen, thank you very much for taking the question. You rightly describe the charges brought against the Greenpeace activists by Russia as ridiculous. Do you see it as desirable that Russia sends a judge to the European Court of Human Rights?

3-291-000

Peter van Dalen (ECR), *"blauwe kaart"-antwoord*. – Ik vind het allerbelangrijkste dat er nu een gezamenlijke actie komt van de Raad en de Commissie om snel die bemanning vrij te krijgen. Daar gaat het mij nu in de eerste plaats om. En dat daarna nog andere stappen kunnen worden ondernomen op het diplomatieke vlak ...

3-292-000

Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL). - Hr. formand! Jeg vil sådan set godt starte med at kondolere den russiske befolkning med terrorangrebet mod en passagerbus i Volgograd forleden, hvor op mod 20 blev dræbt eller såret. Ingen sag - retfærdig eller ej - kan undskylde angreb på uskyldige civile.

Til gengæld må enhver demokratisk stat jo også være klar til at acceptere fredelige protester mod sin politik. Og derfor vil jeg selvfølgelig også godt opfordre de russiske myndigheder til øjeblikket at løslade de fængslede Greenpeace-aktivister og droppe anklagerne om pirateri. Anklager, som jo kan give op til 15 års fængsel. Greenpeace-aktivisterne er hverken pirater eller terrorister. Greenpeace-aktivisterne er engagerede borgere, som med fredelige midler ønsker at gøre opmærksom på de katastrofale konsekvenser, som olieboringer i Arktis kan få. Ikke bare for naturen, ikke bare for dyrene, men også for den indfødte befolkning. Derfor skal disse aktivister løslades. Og det krav, det må alle gode kræfter bakke op om.

(Taleren var indforstået med at besvare et blåt kort-spørgsmål (forretningsordenens artikel 149, stk. 8)).

3-293-000

Peter van Dalen (ECR), *"blauwe kaart"-vraag*. – Ik heb goed geluisterd naar de heer Søndergaard en hij doet een oproep aan de Russen om de bemanning vrij te laten. Op zich steun ik dat, liever nog vandaag dan morgen, maar ik denk dat een oproep op zich niet genoeg is, want een oproep is een papiertje, een *statement*, daar wordt de heer Poetin niet koud of warm van. Wat wilt u nu concreet dat deze heren hier vooraan van Raad en Commissie doen? Dat er écht iets wordt gedaan om een drukmiddel te zetten, want een oproep, daar lachen ze in het Kremlin om.

3-294-000

Søren Bo Søndergaard (GUE/NGL), *Blåt-kort-svar*. – Hr. formand! Tak for spørgsmålet. Nu hørte hr. Peter van Dalen formentlig ikke den sidste del, hvor jeg netop opfordrede alle kræfter til at gå sammen og lægge pres på Rusland.

Det er klart, at når man skal lægge pres på Rusland, så skal man selvfølgelig finde nogle konkrete måder at gøre det på. Det starter selvfølgelig med, at alle formulerer det krav, at de skal løslades. Og når det er formuleret klart - vi hørte jo før, at Rådet ikke havde diskuteret sagen - når det krav er formuleret klart, og hvis det ikke fører til en reaktion, så må man selvfølgelig diskutere, hvad der er det næste skridt. Men det vil nok være klogt, at man stiller kravet fra Rådets side, før man begynder at diskutere de næste skridt, efter kravet er stillet. Men jeg støtter, at Rådet selvfølgelig stiller kravet over for Rusland, når det nu forhåbentlig meget snart diskuterer sagen.

3-295-000

Martin Ehrenhauser (NI). - Herr Präsident, meine Damen und Herren! Ein friedlicher Protest im Namen der Umwelt ist kein Verbrechen und sicherlich auch keine Piraterie. Greenpeace hat zu keinem Zeitpunkt versucht, die Bohrinsel zu kapern in dem Sinne, dass versucht wurde, sich fremdes Eigentum anzueignen. Greenpeace hat lediglich versucht, ein Banner auf der Bohrinsel zu installieren. Greenpeace hat auch nie Gewalt angewendet. Es wurde nicht einmal Gewalt angedroht. Die Inhaftierung dieser 28 Aktivisten und dieser zwei Journalisten hat im Endeffekt keine juristische Grundlage, kein juristisches Fundament.

Ich kann an dieser Stelle die russischen Behörden nur bitten, diese Aktivisten und diese zwei Journalisten unverzüglich freizulassen. An dieser Stelle möchte ich auch meine Abgeordnetenkollegen bitten, dass sie das *Solidarity Statement* von Greenpeace unterzeichnen.

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

3-296-000

Thijs Berman (S&D), *blue-card question*. – Mr President, I have difficulty expressing my joy and emotion at seeing you back in our midst. I am so happy that you are in your seat, where you belong, as Peter van Dalen has also said.

The second thing is that news has just come through that the Russian authorities have dropped the charge of piracy and changed it to hooliganism, which carries a seven-year sentence.

3-297-000

Martin Ehrenhauser (NI), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Ja, ich kann mich natürlich nur anschließen. Auch ich freue mich natürlich sehr, den Kollegen Alvaro wieder hier auf dem Platz des Präsidenten zu sehen.

Das Zweite wusste ich noch nicht, dass hier die Rechtsgrundlage geändert wurde. Herzlichen Dank für den Hinweis.

3-298-000

Bogusław Sonik (PPE). - Panie Przewodniczący! Działacze Greenpeace protestują przeciwko wydobyciu ropy na morzu Barentsa ze względu na ekstremalne warunki klimatyczne w tym regionie, przez które prawdopodobieństwo wypadku i wycieku jest bardzo wysokie. Akcja działaczy Greenpeace powinna skłonić Unię Europejską do intensyfikacji prac nad wspólnym międzynarodowym podejściem do Arktyki i kontrolowania eksploatacji złóż tam się znajdujących.

Oczywiście dzisiaj najważniejsze jest skłonienie Rosji do zwolnienia z aresztu działaczy Greenpeace i odstąpienia od oskarżeń o piractwo, co stawiałoby ich w jednym szeregu z somalijskimi terrorystami morskimi. Uważam, że Unia Europejska powinna na drodze dyplomatycznej wynegocjować z Moskwą uznanie, że Greenpeace działał na rzecz dobra wspólnego, i spowodować, by międzynarodowy protokół z 1988 roku w sprawie przeciwdziałania bezprawnym czynom przeciwko bezpieczeństwu stałych platform umieszczonych na szelfie kontynentalnym nie znalazł zastosowania w tym przypadku.

Szanuję odwagę członków załogi zatrzymanego statku, nie jest też moim celem usprawiedliwienie działań władz rosyjskich, ale z naciskiem powtarzam, iż w tym przypadku więcej Unia Europejska osiągnie w miękkim dialogu z Rosją niż w eskalacji napięcia.

Przy okazji uderzmy się też w nasze demokratyczne piersi. Chciałbym przypomnieć tutaj, że w latach dziewięćdziesiątych francuski wywiad wojskowy wysadził w powietrze statek Greenpeace „Tęczowy wojownik” w Nowej Zelandii, zabijając fotografa tej organizacji. Greenpeace protestował wówczas przeciwko francuskim próbom atomowym w Nowej Zelandii.

3-299-000

Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D). - Arvoisa puhemies, arvostan nuorten Greenpeace-aktivistien rohkeutta ja paheksun sitä, että Venäjä on keksinyt mielikuvituksen merirosvoussyytteen, josta se on onneksi luopumassa, ja vetoan siihen, että Venäjä vapauttaisi nämä nuoret aktivistit.

Mutta kollegat, älkäämme tähän asiaan sekoittako sitä ihan selvää tiettyä venäläisvastenmielisyyttä, jota on ilmennyt. Nimittäin Venäjä on ollut Arktisessa neuvostossa erittäin rakentava voima. Hyvin paljon sellaisia asioita, joita pelättiin, on kansainvälisin sopimuksin ja diplomatian keinoin saatu jo estetyksi. Esimerkiksi Arktisen neuvoston öljyntorjuntaa koskeva sopimus ja keskustelut poraukseen liittyvistä periaatteista ovat erittäin hyviä esimerkkejä siitä, mitä kansainvälisillä sopimuksilla ja diplomatialla on jo aikaansaatava. Ja ei ole tapahtunut sitä arktista konfliktia, jota odotettiin ja ennustettiin, kun eri tahot lähtevät juoksemaan mineraalien, öljyn ja kaasun perään.

Eli itse asiassa arktinen politiikka voidaan jo osoittaa esimerkiksi siitä, että millä tavalla kansainvälisillä sopimuksilla saadaan jotain aikaan. Esimerkiksi Norja ja Venäjä ovat tehneet jo merkittäviä sopimuksia. Sen sijaan voimme arvostella Euroopan unionia, joka ei ole vielä saanut kunnon arktista strategiaa aikaiseksi.

(Puhuja lupasi vastata työjärjestyksen 149 artiklan 8 kohdan mukaiseen sinisen kortin kysymykseen).

3-300-000

Bernd Posselt (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Frau Jaakonsaari, wie kommen Sie auf die Idee, hier könnte irgendjemand russlandfeindlich sein? Wer gegen ein tyrannisches, Menschenrechte verletzendes Regime arbeitet oder kämpft wie das russische oder gegen die Gleichschaltung eines Staates durch einen Staatskonzern wie Gazprom, der ist doch nicht russlandfeindlich, sondern der ist russlandfreundlich, weil er das russische Volk und die Menschenrechte dort unterstützt. Sie können doch nicht das Regime und das Volk gleichsetzen!

3-301-000

Liisa Jaakonsaari (S&D), *vastaus sinisen kortin kysymykseen*. – Niin teen, mutta eikö ole aivan niin kuin lasten kasvatuksessa tai monissa vaikeissa olosuhteissa, eli silloin kun joku osapuoli käyttäytyy hyvin, niin kuin Venäjä on käyttäytynyt Arktisessa neuvostossa ja hakee kansainvälisiä ratkaisuja, niin ei kai kannata myös tätä positiivista puolta ikään kuin vetää siihen suureen saaviin, joka synnyttää ihan oikeutettua Venäjä-kritiikkiä? Nähdään tämä positiivinen puoli Venäjän käyttäytymisessä suhteessa arktiseen politiikkaan.

3-302-000

Nick Griffin (NI). - Mr President, there is all this fuss over the activities of an unelected pressure group which was warned in advance not to invade the waters of a sovereign nation and break legitimate laws. No Russian citizen has ever voted for Greenpeace. They have no democratic mandate whatsoever.

So imagine how much bigger the fuss would be if Russia launched a totally illegal assault on a legitimately-elected political party. Imagine if the Russian Government were to use the excuse of waves of lies from a controlled mass media to arrest the leaders of the opposition. Imagine if President Putin were to tear up the constitutional rights of democratically-elected parliamentarians and spit in the face of a growing body of opinion of up to 20 % of voters. We would never hear the end of it, and rightly so.

But when these things happen in Greece, you hypocrites either say nothing or actively applaud the repression. No one ever voted for Greenpeace, but half a million Greek voters have been disenfranchised by the attempted murder of Golden Dawn at the behest of EU bureaucrats, German bankers and Zionist gangsters. This looters' coup against the Greek people by the puppets of the privatisation criminals is a thousand times more important than this artificial hysteria on behalf of an unelected, unrepresentative group of watermelon-green cranks.

(Murmurs of dissent)

You do not like the truth, do you? You really should stop lecturing Russia about a speck of dust in her eye when you have a large, splintered beam in your own.

3-303-000

Thijs Berman (S&D). - Mr President, I will refrain from asking him this question after I heard him speaking about Zionist gangsters. I do not talk to anti-Semites.

3-304-000

Bogusław Liberadzki (S&D). - Panie Przewodniczący! Pierwsze wrażenie, jakie mamy, to takie, że każdy zrobił swoje. Państwo rosyjskie i Gazprom prowadziły poszukiwania

nowych złóż, prowadząc wiercenia na obszarze Arktyki. Greenpeace też robił swoje. Jak zwykle zresztą protestował, przyjmując formę wejścia na platformę wiertniczą, jak zawsze bez pytania, zezwolenia, bez wnikania w zawikłości prawne. Aktywiści Greenpeace oskarżeni byli najpierw o piractwo, potem o gwałcenie prawa międzynarodowego i chuligaństwo. Są osadzeni w więzieniu i sądzeni. Greenpeace postuluje, aby Gazprom opracował dobry plan likwidacji skutków ewentualnego wycieku. Doświadczenia, nawet niedawne, wskazują, że ten postulat jest uzasadniony. Jeżeli takiego planu nie ma, to oni mają rację, że postulują, żeby taki plan był. Jednocześnie aktywiści Greenpeace zderzyli się ze stanowczą reakcją. Nie ulega wątpliwości, że nie są oni przestępcami zagrażającymi bezpieczeństwu Rosji, zatem powinniśmy apelować do Rosji o rozsądne i szybkie rozwiązanie problemu.

3-305-000

Boris Zala (S&D). - Mr President, one may disagree with Greenpeace's methods of campaigning and even understand why Gazprom's drilling in the Arctic is a sensitive issue for Moscow, but the actions of the Russian authorities are unacceptable and must be denounced.

Legally speaking, the charge of piracy is clearly harsh and ridiculous. It is absurd to imagine that Greenpeace activists intended to violently seize Gazprom's property. The EU should stand firmly behind The Netherlands. It does not matter if the legal base changed from piracy to hooliganism, The Hague is right to ask the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea to arbitrate the case. This is a matter for international law, especially if the incident took place in international waters.

Russia must fully participate in the Tribunal's proceedings. It is the only way of resolving the dispute. But we must make it clear to Russia that, if they sentence the activists, it will have repercussions on EU-Russia relations.

3-306-000

Dan Jørgensen (S&D). – Hr. formand! Anne Mie Roer Jensen er en af aktivisterne. Hun er 29 år gammel. Hun læser til skibsfører på Marstal Navigationsskole. Hun er ikke en forbryder. Hendes venner siger, at hun, før hun tog af sted på turen, sagde, at det egentlig mest var for at komme ud at sejle. Jeg er sikker på, at hun er en stærk, ung kvinde, men hun er med al respekt mere en pige end en pirat. Ligesådan er de 29 andre aktivister heller ikke forbrydere. De er ikke hooligans eller terrorister eller pirater. De er aktivister, der ikke voldeligt agiterer deres sag. Derfor skal vi i dag sende et ganske klart signal her fra Europa-Parlamentet, men også fra Kommissionen og fra Rådet direkte til Putin. Direkte til den russiske præsident. Sæt de her Greenpeace-aktivister fri, send Anne Mie hjem til Marstal.

3-307-000

Sandra Petrović Jakovina (S&D). – Gospodine predsjedavajući, mnogi paneli o klimatskim promjenama ukazuju na alarmantnu eskalaciju utjecaja klimatskih promjena, ali i na to da je sprečavanje klimatskog kaosa još uvijek moguće. Na Arktiku i drugdje u svijetu klimatske promjene su više nego očite. Dok vječni led kopni, naftne se kompanije sele prema sjeveru u potrazi za gorivom koje uzrokuje topljenje istog leda. „Arktičkih 30” djelovalo je iz dubokog uvjerenja da takvo poslovanje predstavlja veliki rizik jer bi izlivanje nafte imalo katastrofalne posljedice za cijelo područje. Ovdje se zapravo radi o manifestu protiv opasnog pokušaja industrijalizacije ovog osjetljivog područja.

Mi smo svjedoci žustrog zalaganja i borbe aktivista Greenpeacea i po mnogim drugim pitanjima kako se stvarna zaštita prava i dobara ne bi svela na puku formalnost i mrtvo slovo na papiru.

Ukoliko javno ne upozorimo na ovu spornu praksu Rusije i po ovom iznimno važnom pitanju legitimne osnove pritvaranja aktivista, sutra će se na dnevnom redu naći i aktivisti drugih organizacija, primjerice koji se zalažu za i štite ljudska prava.

3-308-000

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

3-309-000

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE). - Arvoisa puhemies, tässä tapauksessa sekä ihmiset että teolliset toimijat toimivat aika hatarassa lainsäädäntöpuutteessa. Kiistahan liittyy arktisten alueiden hyödyntämiseen, jossa ei ole samanlaista sopimus pohjaa kuin antarktisen hyödyntämisen osalta, niinpä tämä avoin kiista siitä, minkälaisella riskiasteella ja kuinka aggressiivisesti näitä luonnonvaroja voidaan sitten hyödyntää.

Voi siis perustellusti toki kysyä kansalaisaktivismista, kuinka pitkälle se voi mennä ilman laillisia lakiseuraamuksia. Itsestään selvästi voimme varmaan kaikki sanoa, että mielenilmaus, suullinen tai plakaatissa oleva, ei nyt kuitenkaan ole merirosvousta eikä edellytä tämän tapaisia tutkintavankeus- tai muita rankaisutoimenpiteitä, vaan kuten täällä aikaisemmin on sanottu, asia tulisi asiallisesti käsitellä kansainvälisen merioikeuden piirissä.

Euroopan unionin on tässäkin suhteessa vahvasti seisottava sekä ihmisoikeuksien että perusoikeuksien puolella, niin että järjestelmät ja prosessit ovat lainmukaisia, suhteellisia ja kohtuullisia.

3-310-000

Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE). - Arvoisa puhemies, vain alle kolmasosa tunnetuista fossiilivaroista voidaan polttaa, jos ilmastonmuutos halutaan hillitä tasolle, jonka yhteiskunnat kykenevät kestämään. Tämän sanoi Kansainvälinen energiajärjestö viime syksynä, ja äskettäin ilmestynyt IPCC:n uusien raportti vahvisti saman asian.

Protestointi arktista öljynporausta vastaan on siis yritystä puolustaa meidän kaikkien tulevaisuutta ja lastemme tulevaisuutta. Jos syyte merirosvouksesta on vaihdettu huliganismiin, Venäjä itsekin tunnustaa laittomaksi sen, että se on takavarikoinut laivan, joka oli sen aluevesien ulkopuolella. Mutta myös syyte huliganismista seitsemän vuoden vankeusrangaistuksineen on suhteeton. Kysehän oli rauhanomaisesta protestista eikä vahingonteosta.

EU-maiden hallitusten tulee tukea Alankomaiden hallituksen vaatimuksia siitä, että tämä asia käsitellään oikeudellisesti oikein ja ihmisoikeuksia puolustetaan.

3-311-000

Catherine Bearder (ALDE). - Mr President, just a few months ago I was aboard the Greenpeace ship, the Arctic Sunrise, when it came to Hastings in my region, and I met many of the crew. So it came as a shock to find that 30 activists aboard that ship had been detained by the Russian authorities, including a constituent of mine, Phillip Ball.

Thankfully, the news is that the piracy charges have been dropped, but of course this still has to be confirmed. All they had been doing is peacefully protesting and highlighting the risks and dangers inherent in oil extraction in the Arctic regions. They were speaking for all of us who, after the Gulf of Mexico oil spill, worry about extraction in even more vulnerable parts of the globe. It is now important that we do all we can to ensure that the 30 are treated according to decent standards or, better still, released with all charges dropped.

That is why I am calling on Baroness Ashton to press the Russian authorities on this issue and to use the forthcoming Foreign Affairs Council on 21 November to create a coordinated EU position. That way, at their next detention hearing in November, we can start to secure their release, get them home for Christmas and start working with Gazprom to really ensure safe exploration in the Arctic.

3-312-000

Michèle Rivasi (Verts/ALE). - Monsieur le Président, en tant qu'ancienne directrice de Greenpeace France, je voudrais vraiment remercier Greenpeace d'avoir, par son action, dénoncé les risques liés à l'exploitation du pétrole en Arctique, dans la mesure où c'est une exploitation très risquée et où, en cas d'accident, la récupération du pétrole est presque impossible dans la glace.

Mais cela pose deux problèmes. Premièrement, comment peut-on les aider à sortir de prison? Sur ce point, je lance un appel aussi bien à la présidence du Parlement qu'à la présidence de la Commission et à la diplomatie européenne, pour qu'il y ait une vraie volonté politique de faire pression au niveau du gouvernement russe.

La deuxième question est la suivante: comment faire pour sanctuariser l'Arctique? On sait bien, en effet, qu'il est impossible d'exploiter cette région sans faire courir d'énormes risques à l'ensemble de la planète. Il faut sanctuariser ce site qu'est l'Arctique.

3-313-000

Paul Murphy (GUE/NGL). - Thank you, Mr President. I want to read the start of a letter from Alexandra Harris, one of those imprisoned.

'Dear Mum, Dad and Georgie, it's very cold now. It snowed last night. The blizzard blew my very poorly-insulated window open and I had to sleep wearing my hat. I am nervous about spending winter here. I have a radiator in my cell but it's the Arctic breeze that makes the place very cold. I heard that from December, Murmansk is dark for six weeks. God, I hope I'm out by then.'

Alexandra and the others are not pirates. She should be saluted rather than jailed for her and the others' courageous act. A very strong message is needed from people all across the world to demand their immediate release and the dropping of all charges, because otherwise the green light goes on for other governments do the same and for Putin to step up the repression against protesters within Russia.

Of course, this is part of the race to the Arctic. The Russian Government is part of it, big oil is part of it, and the other governments who represent big oil are part of it. That race has to be stopped. It can only be stopped by a mass movement from below.

3-314-000

Ulrike Lunacek (Verts/ALE). - Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! Auch ich möchte mich denjenigen anschließen, die den Greenpeace-Leuten dafür danken, was sie hier gewagt haben und das zu tun, was bei Greenpeace ja schon lange Tradition hat, nämlich klarzumachen, dass diese ökologisch sensible Region der Arktis geschützt werden muss und dass jetzt, da es dort zu tauen beginnt, nicht einfach von allen Staaten – sei es Russland oder seien es andere – damit begonnen werden darf, auszubeuten, auszubeuten, auszubeuten, ohne Rücksicht auf Verluste.

Das Problem ist, dass wir auch als Europäische Union und als Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union gegen Russland, gegenüber diesem Regime Putin wenig Druckmittel haben, weil wir so abhängig von Öl und Gas sind. Die Situation, in der diese Greenpeace-Aktivisten jetzt sind, ist unhaltbar: Ihnen wird Piraterie vorgeworfen, dabei hat sogar Putin gesagt, es war nicht Piraterie. Es kann auch nicht Piraterie sein, sie haben ja schließlich kein Schiff geentert, um sich selber zu bereichern, wie nach russischem Gesetz die Definition von Piraterie lautet. Ein anderer Vorwurf lautete, sie seien Hooligans. Oder sie hätten Schmerzmittel an Bord gehabt. Jetzt wird gesagt, da war Morphium, das sind ja Drogen. Oder es wird ihnen vorgeworfen, sie hätten Waffen an Bord. Das ist alles Humbug, das ist der Versuch, Menschen zu kriminalisieren, sie einzusperren, sie für Jahre hinter Gitter zu bringen, nur weil sie darauf geachtet haben, dass auf diesem Planeten die Umwelt geschützt werden muss und nicht auf Jahrzehnte ausgebeutet werden darf.

3-315-000

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. ROBERTA ANGELILLI

Vicepresidente

(Fine degli interventi su richiesta – "catch the eye")

3-316-000

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission* . – Madam President, the Commission understands and appreciates the concerns expressed by the honourable Members. Of course, our immediate reaction and concern relates to the fate of the crew and also of the journalists. This will need an early solution.

It is also important that the legal aspects of the incident, in relation to the law of the sea, are clarified. That is why I said in my introductory speech that we welcome the decision of The Netherlands, as flag state, to seek arbitration, and we regret that our Russian partners have chosen not to cooperate in the arbitration procedure.

We hope that the openness to settlement which Russia has expressed will lead to a quick solution to the problem, and we would rather not speculate on the possible next steps. Of course, it depends on how the situation evolves, and the Commission hopes that the matter will be resolved quickly and proportionally. The general concerns expressed here about freedoms and the rule of law in Russia have been met with determination and consistency by the European Union at all levels, as already debated in this Chamber during the last session with my colleague, Mrs Malmström. From the outset, the European Union has made it clear that Russia should respect its international commitments and strive for a system based on the rule of law and respect for human rights and democracy.

With regard to our longer-term concerns – an issue which some of you rightly raised – I think we should not overlook the message which Greenpeace wanted to send – not to Russia, but to all of us. It was a message about the protection of the Arctic environment. I would like to say that in the Commission we are very much aware, and are at the forefront, of global efforts to tackle environmental pressures on the Arctic such as climate change and contaminants. We are doing so, for instance, through the implementation of the new Minamata Convention on Mercury, which I co-signed just 14 days ago with the Lithuanian Environment Minister. It has a very important and tangible benefit for the people in the Arctic region. Maybe we do not see it at first sight, but the world today is global and interconnected.

The European Union is also providing EUR 20 million a year for the funding of Arctic research. Much of that goes into environment and climate issues. DG Environment is funding a pilot project to establish an Arctic NGO forum to provide a platform for NGOs engaged on Arctic environment issues, in which Greenpeace is a participant. The EU is actively participating in several Arctic Council working groups and projects to address environmental problems and promote sustainability in the Arctic. It is also participating in the Climate and Clean Air Coalition, which is addressing the issue of black carbon and other short-lived climate forces affecting the Arctic.

Finally, I will just mention the seventh Environmental Action Programme, which we will be discussing later today. This includes a commitment that the EU will give greater emphasis to the Arctic region and recognises the need for intensified cooperation and increased Union involvement to address new and shared environmental challenges in the region.

I understand that this debate today is really important both in terms of immediate concern and of the longer-term perspective.

3-317-000

Vytautas Leškevičius, *President-in-Office of the Council* . – Madam President, I thank all the Members for this really important debate. We fully understand the concerns which they have expressed.

We take note of the latest breaking news on the dropped piracy charges. This needs to be assessed. At this stage, however, all our efforts should address the urgent issue of the crew members and journalists facing the prospect of many years in prison. Furthermore, we have to fully respect the wish of the countries directly involved to treat this as a Consular matter so far.

Let me assure you that our colleagues in the EEAS are, along with diplomats from many Member States, in constant and frequent contact with the Russian authorities on this issue. We will see how events unfold on the ground and will act accordingly.

3-318-000

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 149)

3-318-500

Alexander Mirsky (S&D), *in writing*. – There is a lot of shouting and indignation about the Greenpeace case. Indeed, they made a lot of noise as they dared to intrude another's

home. The Russians acted correctly when they reacted robustly and brought all the intruders to justice. It would be interesting to know how the USA would react if their oil or gas stations were intruded by representatives of Greenpeace.

We understand that this organisation tends to put on a show; we need only mention Israel, the US 6th fleet and other examples. Should we, as members of the European Parliament, spend time trying to find a solution for the consequences of the deeds of intruders and then rescue them? Or maybe they want to be in prison.

They were looking for glory, and they got it at the cost of judicial proceedings and deprivation of freedom. If we continue in failing to make a precise assessment of the inadequate activities of organisations, then tomorrow we could have terrorists and extremists intruding stations; they would not be content with taking photos but try to set off an explosion and destroy the station.

I think it is necessary to be cautious and sober in our assessments and not give in to pressure from open Russophobes in the European Parliament.

18. Pericoli derivanti dall'esposizione alle radiazioni ionizzanti (discussione)

3-320-000

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Thomas Ulmer, a nome della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare, sulla proposta di direttiva del Consiglio che stabilisce norme fondamentali di sicurezza relative alla protezione dai pericoli derivanti dall'esposizione alle radiazioni ionizzanti (COM(2012)0242 - C7-0151/2012 - 2011/0254(NLE)).

3-321-000

Thomas Ulmer, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin, meine Damen und Herren! Es geht hier um die Richtlinie des Rates zur Festlegung grundlegender Sicherheitsnormen für den Schutz vor den Gefahren einer Exposition gegenüber ionisierender Strahlung. Also ein sehr langer, sehr komplizierter Wortlaut.

Der vorliegende Bericht des Rates soll die bereits bestehenden und veralteten Richtlinien zusammenfassen und an neue wissenschaftliche Standards der internationalen Strahlenschutzkommission anpassen. Da es sich hierbei um gewachsene Strukturen handelt, sind in diesen Richtlinien Inkonsistenzen aufgetreten, die nun durch die Überarbeitung reguliert werden sollen.

Dies ist ein wesentlicher Schritt, da die Werte für den Gesundheitsschutz von Arbeitskräften und der Bevölkerung teilweise überaltert waren und nicht mehr neuesten wissenschaftlichen Richtlinien entsprechen. Zusammengefasst handelt es sich um die Richtlinien 89/618/Euratom von 1989, 90/641 von 1990, 96/29 vom 13. Mai 1996, 97/43 von 1997 und 2003/122 vom 22. Dezember 2003. Diese Strahlenschutzrichtlinien, die jetzt neu gefasst werden, unterliegen dem Euratom-Vertrag. Hier ist genau festgelegt, wie sie zu handhaben sind.

Wir dürfen nicht vergessen, dass ionisierende Strahlung in Europa nach wie vor eine sehr große Rolle spielt, z. B. im Bereich der Herstellung von Strom aus Kernenergie, des Weiteren aber auch im Bereich ionisierende Strahlung in der Medizin zur Diagnostik und Therapie, ionisierende Strahlung im Bereich der Technik zur Materialprüfung und dergleichen.

Es geht hier darum, dass wir in diesem hochsensiblen Bereich wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse in praktische Gesetzgebung umsetzen und uns nicht von ideologischen oder emotionalen Themen treiben lassen. Allein wissenschaftliche Daten sollen hier Grundlage unserer Entscheidung sein. Aus diesem Grund unterstütze ich auch die Stellungnahme des Juristischen Dienstes des Europäischen Parlaments und das *statement* des JURI-Ausschusses, in denen festgelegt wird, dass die vorliegende Richtlinie auch weiterhin unter dem Euratom-Vertrag behandelt wird.

Die Begründung hierzu lautet: Artikel 31 des Euratom-Vertrags umfasst den Schutz der Arbeiter und der Bevölkerung gegenüber ionisierender Strahlung. Diese Grundlage sollten wir beibehalten. Wir haben diesen Bericht auch in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Beschäftigungsausschuss erstellt, der für einige wesentliche Teile zuständig ist, und die rechtliche Basis sollte auch bei der Revision weiterer Schutzmaßnahmen erhalten bleiben. Das Argument, dass aufgrund des Kapitels 6 eine Behandlung unter dem Vertrag von Lissabon gerechtfertigt ist, teile ich nicht.

In meinem Bericht habe ich dieses Kapitel auch gestrichen mit dem Hinweis, dass es wissenschaftlich dafür noch nicht genug Daten gibt, um ein solches Kapitel in dieser Richtlinie zu verarbeiten. Hier sollten in Zukunft weitere Daten gesammelt und evaluiert werden und dann sollte letzten Endes eine eigenständige Richtlinie verfasst werden, die dann als Umweltrichtlinie unter dem Vertrag von Lissabon berücksichtigt werden kann.

Für mich war ein weiterer wichtiger Gesichtspunkt, dass wir nicht ganze Landstriche brandmarken, weil es hier von Haus aus erhöhte Radonwerte gibt. Radon kommt in vielen europäischen Gebieten in natürlicher Weise und in natürlicher Konzentration vor. Hier ist es wesentlich, Aufklärungsarbeit zu leisten. Es darf aber nicht dazu kommen, dass wir der Bevölkerung den Eindruck vermitteln, diese Gebiete wären unbewohnbar. Hier müssen wir eine neue Sprachregelung finden.

3-322-000

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, I am here on behalf of Mr Günther Oettinger, who, due to other obligations, could not attend the debate this evening.

Let me first of all thank the rapporteur, Mr Thomas Ulmer, for his positive and well-balanced report and the constructive approach taken by the committees towards this quite complex and technical proposal – as you, Mr Ulmer, rightly mentioned.

Let me also emphasise the importance of this proposal establishing basic safety standards in the area of radiation protection. There are many activities in our society which involve the use of ionising radiation, such as medical diagnosis and cancer treatment, various industrial applications, energy production and applications in security screening. These activities need to be performed whilst ensuring the highest possible protection for workers, members of the public and patients. In addition, we are all living in the presence of natural radiation sources such as cosmic radiation and radon, which also call for appropriate protection for members of the public and workers.

In order to guarantee the highest level of protection, the Commission has proposed revising the current basic safety standards: firstly, to take account of the scientific and technological progress since the last revision of the directive in 1996, and secondly, to consolidate the existing set of Euratom radiation protection legislation into one single piece of legislation.

The Ulmer report brings some constructive amendments to this proposal, which aim to increase transparency in decision-making and improve the related public information. These aspects have also been raised and discussed during the negotiations in the Council. Further to this, the Commission fully agrees that the proposal needs to clarify the relationship between the proposed Euratom directive and legislation under the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. However, several issues raised in the amendments cannot be supported by the Commission.

Firstly, we cannot accept the suggestion to change the legal basis from the Euratom Treaty to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The Commission has based its proposal on the Euratom Treaty as *lex specialis*, considering that the establishment of basic safety standards for protection against dangers arising from ionising radiation is explicitly stipulated in its chapter dealing with health and safety. Moreover, all the legal acts which will be repealed by this proposal are based on the Euratom Treaty, and therefore a change of the legal basis from the Euratom Treaty to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union is not justified.

Secondly, in the absence of proper scientific justification, the Commission cannot agree with the amendments proposed which would involve extending lower-dose limits for the eye lens from workers to the broader public, as well as lower-dose limits for extremities and skin. The Commission's proposal concerning these limits is based on the most recent scientific findings.

Finally, the proposal to extend the application of occupational exposure requirements from air crew to frequent flyers cannot be supported, considering the administrative burden which would be created by such a measure. For instance, this would necessitate identification of the relevant employers and workplaces and the enforcement of an appropriate protection regime. In our view this would be very burdensome if not almost impossible to implement.

However, it should be underlined that, while the proposal is meant to define uniform basic safety standards, it is the Commission's understanding that the proposal does not preclude a Member State from providing more stringent measures of protection.

3-323-000

Richard Seeber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte mich beim Kollegen Ulmer bedanken, der hier mit kühlem Kopf an das Ganze herangegangen ist und einen ausgewogenen Bericht vorgestellt hat. Wir haben im Ausschuss, wie bereits gesagt, die Rechtsgrundlage mehr oder weniger auf den Lissabon-Vertrag geändert. Ich halte das für falsch. Das haben auch das Gutachten des Juristischen Dienstes und auch der JURI-Ausschuss deutlich gemacht. Ich hoffe, dass wir das hier in der Abstimmung beziehungsweise dann in den späteren Verhandlungen vielleicht korrigieren können.

Bei diesem Thema ist es wirklich wichtig, dass man mit kühlem Kopf herangeht und auch nicht mit den Ängsten der Menschen spielt, denn diese ionisierenden Strahlungen haben zwar, wie wir wissen, sehr viele negative Auswirkungen auf die menschliche Gesundheit, aber sie haben eben große Anwendungsbereiche, gerade in der Medizin, in der Diagnose, in der Krebsbekämpfung, aber auch in der Technik und haben so sehr viele positive Auswirkungen auf das menschliche Leben. Hier ist es dann wichtig, eine Balance zu finden, damit wir einen Nutzen für die Gesellschaft, aber gleichzeitig auch einen sehr hohen Schutz für diejenigen erreichen können, die eine Therapie brauchen, beziehungsweise auch für das Personal, das mit diesen Strahlen zu tun hat.

Daher gehen auch die Änderungsanträge mancher Kollegen nicht in die richtige Richtung, weil sie über das Ziel hinausschießen. Basis soll die Wissenschaft sein, die uns aufzeigt, welche Dosis noch verträglich und welche bereits zu schädlich ist. Dieser Bericht ist dazu da, dass wir diese neuesten Erkenntnisse einarbeiten und vor allem Ungereimtheiten, die sich aufgrund der zeitlichen Reihenfolge der verschiedenen Richtlinien ergeben haben, ausräumen.

Ich bin auch froh, dass der Kollege Ulmer bereits angedeutet hat, dass er dafür ist, den kompletten Umweltteil in einer eigenen Richtlinie zu behandeln. Hier sollte die Kommission dann auch die Vorarbeit leisten und mit einem entsprechenden Vorschlag kommen. Hier ist sicher der Vertrag von Lissabon die richtige rechtliche Basis. Ich freue mich bereits auf den Vorschlag zu diesem Thema. Wir werden uns sicher damit ausgiebig auseinandersetzen.

3-324-000

Claudiu Ciprian Tănăsescu, *on behalf of the S&D Group*. – Madam President, this report, as voted in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, together with the additional amendments tabled for the plenary, aimed to considerably improve the protection of workers and the general public against ionising radiation.

I support the establishment of lower dose limits, both for the public and for workers. I think it is necessary to reduce as far as possible radiation-related deaths and illnesses in the nuclear industry. It is hard to find the right balance between economic benefits and public safety but, in this case, I consider that we have managed to reach a good position. In this regard, the proposed amendment aims to better protect the workers who are most affected by the radiation, not to mention the fact that in most cases they are also people with lower incomes than others in the field and that they therefore have restricted access to medical support. In my opinion, the proposed limits are acceptable, given the risk and the long-term effects ionising radiation has on health.

We had a very good result in the vote in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI) and managed to obtain a very good legislative resolution that strengthens the Commission proposal, improving the definitions and the general protection against exposure to ionising radiation. We managed to retain the chapter on environmental protection and the change in the legal basis from the Euratom Treaty to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

I consider that, in spite of the opposition to changing the legal basis, we have to take into consideration the importance of Parliament having a say when it comes to the protection of workers and the general public from ionising radiation and, therefore, the protection of human health. I really hope that, through your vote tomorrow, you will give us your support so as not to lose any of these achievements.

3-325-000

Владко Годоров Панайотов, *от илето на групата ALDE*. – Извършихме дълга и трудна работа, докато постигнем споразумение по доклада на г-н Улмер по предложението за директива на Съвета по определянето на основни норми на безопасност за защита срещу опасностите, произтичащи от излагане на йонизиращо лъчение. Сега мисля, че можем да бъдем доволни от окончателния текст. Предложението на Парламента включва важни подобрения с приоритет защитата здравето на работниците и пациентите, както и на обществеността, за аварийната готовност на държавите членки и възможността им да реагират бързо и адекватно при нужда.

Що се отнася до някои видове, излагани на йонизиращо лъчение и максималните допустими граници при тях, ние в комисията по околна среда отидохме отвъд това, което беше предложено първоначално от Европейската комисия, за да се включат по-амбициозни и строги мерки за безопасност с цел да се намалят възможно най-много рисковете за общественото здраве. Преразгледаната директива ще позволи на заинтересованите страни и на гражданите да участват по-активно в процеса на вземане на решения, свързани с тяхната безопасност и излагане на йонизиращи лъчения. С тази цел също така поискахме да има гаранции за единно минимално равнище на защита в страните членки на Европейския съюз. Това ще изпрати важно послание към държавите членки колко висока е нашата цел за безопасността и радиационната защита не само на европейско равнище, но и в световен мащаб. Целта на тази директива бе да се осигури по-ефективен инструмент за защита на общественото здраве, на работниците и на околната среда срещу опасностите, произтичащи от йонизиращи лъчения. Тази цел според мен е постигната. Поздравявам г-н Улмер за чудесно извършената работа.

3-326-000

Paul Rübiger (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte den Kollegen Panayotov fragen, wie er die hier vorliegenden Texte beurteilt in Bezug auf Fukushima. Glauben Sie, dass die Texte, die uns hier vorliegen, eine Relevanz haben in Bezug auf das, was derzeit in den Abwasserbecken und durch den Gau in Fukushima passiert? Welche Relevanz ordnen Sie dem zu?

3-327-000

Владко Тодоров Панайотов (ALDE), *отговор на въпрос, зададен чрез вдигане на синя карта*. – Аз смятам, че това изисква отделна тема и отделно разглеждане, и отделен акцент в доклада. Наистина върху това си струва да се отдели специално внимание и сигурно това ще го направим в комисията по околна среда. Благодаря ви за въпроса, много е важен.

3-328-000

Michèle Rivasi, *au nom du groupe Verts/ALE*. – Madame la Présidente, c'est une directive très importante sur laquelle nous allons voter demain, dans la mesure où elle traite des dangers des rayonnements ionisants sur la santé, on l'a déjà dit, des travailleurs, du grand public et des patients. Je me suis réjoui que la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire se soit prononcée en faveur d'un changement de base juridique, même si cela va à l'encontre de ce que souhaitent le rapporteur et la Commission.

Pourquoi faut-il modifier la base juridique? Comment peut-on, à l'heure actuelle, dire que les parlementaires n'auront pas la codécision concernant les bases de la radioprotection? Cela intéresse la santé de nos concitoyens, en cas d'accident, dans le domaine médical et dans le domaine de la radioactivité naturelle, par exemple. Il faut absolument modifier la base juridique et j'espère que jeudi, tout le monde se prononcera pour renforcer le pouvoir des parlementaires. Parce qu'il ne faut pas se leurrer: les experts d'Euratom sont des gens qui travaillent dans l'industrie nucléaire, donc ils sont à la fois juges et parties.

La deuxième chose – et là je suis d'accord avec la Commission –, c'est qu'il faut ajouter tout ce qui touche au radon, contrairement à ce que dit le rapporteur. Pourquoi? L'Organisation mondiale de la santé affirme que le radon est un problème de santé publique. À l'heure actuelle, nous n'avons que des recommandations et pas de préconisations sur les niveaux de radon, aussi bien dans les habitations que dans les lieux publics. Il est donc très important

d'intégrer ces préconisations sur le radon, ainsi que celles sur la protection de l'environnement, puisque cela concerne les rejets radioactifs.

Dernière chose, et là je m'adresse à mes collègues: le problème de cette directive, c'est qu'elle anticipe l'accident nucléaire. Je ne sais pas si vous voyez les niveaux de référence par rapport à l'intervention de notre collègue, cela peut aller jusqu'à 20 millisieverts en cas d'accident. C'est exactement ce qui se passe à Fukushima. Quand on voit les risques de pathologies thyroïdiennes ou de cancer que cela peut occasionner, ce sont des niveaux de référence inadmissibles. Il faut absolument abaisser ces niveaux en ce qui concerne les travailleurs du nucléaire par rapport au développement de la sous-traitance.

En France, je peux en parler, tous les sous-traitants demandent un seuil de 6 et non de 20 millisieverts par an, comme l'indique la directive. Il faut donc aller beaucoup plus loin dans la protection des citoyens, des patients et des travailleurs, et j'espère que notre vote demain ira dans ce sens.

3-329-000

Sabine Wils, *im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin! Die Rechtsgrundlage für die Richtlinie zur Strahlensicherheit sollte nicht der Euratom-Vertrag, sondern der Vertrag über die Arbeitsweise der Europäischen Union sein, da die Anträge des Parlaments zu den Sicherheitsnormen bei der Euratom-Gesetzgebung voraussichtlich nicht berücksichtigt werden.

Artikel 168 AEUV sieht vor, dass Grundnormen für den Gesundheitsschutz der Arbeitskräfte und der Bevölkerung zu den Gefahren ionisierender Strahlung festgelegt werden. Die Mitgliedstaaten sollen höhere Sicherheitsnormen für Mensch und Umwelt festlegen können, als in der Richtlinie vorgeschrieben sind. In der Richtlinie muss festgelegt werden, dass die Behörden sowie die Betreiber einer Anlage in einer Notfall- und Unfallsituation die Bevölkerung verbindlich über die Strahlenbelastung informieren müssen. Die Exposition von Arbeitskräften muss unter Einhaltung der Grenzwerte so niedrig wie möglich sein und kontinuierlich erfasst werden, auch an verschiedenen Arbeitsorten bei Leiharbeitskräften. Bei Schwangeren muss der berufliche Expositionswert strikt unter 0,1 Millisievert liegen. Bei der Festlegung der Grenzwerte zur Exposition der Bevölkerung soll die Öffentlichkeit mit allen betroffenen Gruppen beteiligt werden. Der Zugang zu einem gerichtlichen Überprüfungsverfahren muss gewährt werden.

3-330-000

Владимир Уручев (PPE). - Поздравявам докладчика за балансираня и разумен подход, с който се разглежда и допълва предложението на Комисията. Понастоящем въпросите за радиационната защита на населението са предмет на пет директиви и редица регламенти, приети по различно време и е напълно естествено да съществуват различия и дори противоречия в правните разпоредби. Затова приветствам обединяването на изискванията за безопасност при излагане на йонизиращо лъчение в една обща нова директива.

Безусловно директивата отразява последните научни препоръки за промени на съществуващата система за защита от йонизиращи лъчения, базирани на натрупания до момента опит и научни данни. Важно нововъведение е това, че за пръв път в приложното поле на законодателството, установяващо норми на безопасност, ще бъдат включени и естествените източници на радиация и космическото лъчение, на което са изложени хора от определени категории. Това следва да бъде приветствано.

Относно правните основания на директивата считам за правилно да се съобразим със становището на правната комисия на Парламента и да запазим Евратом като основа на законодателното предложение. Въвеждането на отделна глава в Директивата за опазване на околната среда към момента би имало само най-общо значение, доколкото все още не е възможно въздействието на лъчението върху растителните и животинските видове да бъде установено на доказана научна основа. Не са приемливи и предложенията за драстично ниски норми за някои от дозите, които не се базират на солидна научна основа. Смятам, че с приемането на доклада ще постигнем важно подобряване на защитата на населението от излагане на йонизиращо лъчение чрез установяване на съвременни норми за безопасност.

3-331-000

Phil Bennion (ALDE). - Madam President, it is clear that ionising radiation incidental to commercial, medical and other day-to-day activities must be carefully controlled. I think the utmost protection to ensure the lowest possible risk of negative health effects, particularly to workers, must be maintained.

On that basis, I think it is sensible to revisit this legislation and associated procedures periodically to ensure that they are in keeping with the best scientific evidence available and to consider the experience of implementation in the different Member States. We must also ensure that the procedures and protections are simple and easy to understand and implement. We need to cut red tape in the area, where possible, and maintain efficiency in working environments where exposure to ionising radiation could occur. I think that consolidating a number of pieces of legislation into a single piece of legislation fits the bill in this respect.

This is also why I proposed my own amendments on the licensing of those organisations that use these procedures on a regular basis, to ensure that they would not need to seek authorisation every single time they needed to use these procedures. I think that is again cutting red tape in this respect.

I would also like to say that I completely agree with the Commissioner on the issue of frequent flyers. I think this is bureaucracy going too far, and I do not think it is practicable. Overall, I think it is crucial that we achieve best practice and high standards of work and protection to minimise the dangers arising from exposure to these different forms of ionising radiation.

3-332-000

Interventi su richiesta – "catch the eye"

3-333-000

Seán Kelly (PPE). - A Uachtaráin, is dócha nach mbeidh mórán sna meáin faoin ábhar seo a bhfuil á phlé againn anocht ach ag an am céanna is ábhar tábhachtach é agus tá ag moladh ag dul don rapórtéir agus do na Feisirí eile a d'oibrigh air. Agus go háirithe na daoine a fuair ailse de bharr na radaíochta seo, tabharfaidh sé treoir dóibh conas é a sheachaint amach anseo agus go háirithe do na comhlachtaí proifisiúnta cad ba chóir dóibh a dhéanamh chun an radaíocht sin a sheachaint.

So I think it is good that we are debating this and discussing it virtually unanimously tonight. I particularly welcome the inclusion of all the different directives into one directive, because that fits in with what we are trying to do in relation to 2020 and, of course, it will

also mean that any contradictory provisions in existing legislation can be eliminated. So there are a lot of good proposals in this and I welcome it.

3-335-000

(Fine degli interventi su richiesta – "catch the eye")

3-336-000

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission* . – Madam President, first of all I would like to thank you for your views and for the concerns which you expressed. My judgement is that they were more or less addressed in my opening statement.

Without any doubt, the proposal which is on the table – this report that we are talking about – is truly an important one. It is complex and very technical, but that does not mean that we should not give it our proper attention.

Our proposal in practically all cases was based on proper scientific justification, and what I would like to say is that we also very much appreciate the proposals which you are including in your report to strengthen the text, in particular when it comes to its transparency.

As you rightly mentioned, work in such an area is never finished, so I think we should periodically update it. We should acquire new knowledge and a better understanding of the environment in which we live, and this should then be reflected in appropriate policy answers and proposals. Many times when we update our proposals and approach you for approval, serious work is already taking place on the next necessary steps. That is the life which we are living.

I would like finally again to thank all of you in the European Parliament, in particular the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, and particularly Mr Ulmer, for a very good report.

3-337-000

Thomas Ulmer, *Berichterstatter* . – Frau Präsidentin! Ich bin seit nunmehr 30 Jahren Strahlenschutzermächtigt und habe viele zehntausend Leute untersucht. Ich weiß also genau um die Gefahren der Strahlung.

Wir sollten uns nicht gegenseitig vorwerfen, dass wir befangen sind. Es gibt keinen neutralen Menschen, es gibt keinen neutralen Politiker und natürlich auch keine neutrale Industrie. Aber das heißt nicht, dass wir uns gegenseitig nicht respektieren, dass wir nicht offen, ehrlich und auf wissenschaftlich solider Basis miteinander diskutieren sollten.

Der ganze Rest ist eigentlich schon gesagt. Ich freue mich auf die Abstimmung morgen. Vielleicht noch ein Satz: Wenn wir in die Tiefe der Quantenphysik vordringen, werden wir lange darüber nachdenken und wohl auch zu dem Ergebnis kommen, dass hochenergetische Strahlung irgendwann einmal die Grundlage für die Entstehung unseres Universums und letzten Endes auch des Lebens war.

3-338-000

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà giovedì 24 ottobre 2013 alle 12.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 149)

3-339-000

Monika Smolková (S&D), *pisomne.* – Ľudská populácia je vystavená permanentnému pôsobeniu ionizujúceho žiarenia bez ohľadu na to, či ide o prírodné alebo o umelé zdroje ionizujúceho žiarenia. Aj napriek malým dávkam žiarenia, ktorým sme vystavený istý čas, nás žiarenie môže ovplyvniť, pretože jeho efekt je kumulatívny. Podporujem správu, lebo si myslím, že uvedeným návrhom sa môžu naďalej zlepšovať podmienky na ochranu pred vystavením účinku ionizujúceho žiarenia. Taktiež očakávam, že sa odstránia niektoré doterajšie nezrovnalosti v existujúcich právnych predpisoch. Obávam sa, že aj napriek ďalším opatreniam bude žiarenie naďalej predstavovať pre mnohých pracovníkov a verejnosť veľmi veľké nebezpečenstvo, ktoré sa môže prejavovať v rôznych podobách, o ktorých teraz nechcem hovoriť (rakovina, následky na potomkoch). O vážnosti situácie svedčia štatistiky, ktoré hovoria o tom, že v krajinách EÚ sa vykonáva 750 až 2 200 rádiologických vyšetrení na 1 000 obyvateľov za rok (v priemere ročne 1 306 vyšetrení na 1 000 obyvateľov). Očakávam, že členské štáty premietnu všetky návrhy a opatrenia do svojich národných programov, a tak vytvoria čo najlepšie podmienky potrebné na zabezpečenie najlepšej možnej ochrany obyvateľstva.

19. Programma generale di azione dell'Unione in materia di ambiente fino al 2020 (discussione)

3-341-000

Presidente. – L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Gaston Franco, a nome della commissione per l'ambiente, la sanità pubblica e la sicurezza alimentare, sulla proposta di decisione del Parlamento europeo e del Consiglio su un programma generale di azione dell'Unione in materia di ambiente fino al 2020 "Vivere bene entro i limiti del nostro pianeta" (COM(2012)0710 – C7-0392/2012 – 2012/0337(COD)).

3-342-000

Gaston Franco, *rapporteur.* – Madame la Présidente, Monsieur le Commissaire, le Parlement européen approuvera demain l'accord politique conclu le 19 juin dernier avec le Conseil et la Commission sur le 7ème programme d'action pour l'environnement, et je m'en réjouis. C'est un très grand succès pour le Parlement, qui s'est battu pour que ce programme voie le jour.

Ce programme fixe les grandes orientations de la politique environnementale européenne à l'horizon 2020, avec neuf objectifs prioritaires et un ensemble d'engagements concrets pour améliorer l'état de l'environnement en Europe et dans le monde. Aujourd'hui, les défis restent de taille: les pressions exercées sur les ressources naturelles, la dégradation des écosystèmes, la consommation d'énergie, la pollution de l'air et des sols, les déchets – notamment marins –, les risques pour la santé ou encore le changement climatique.

Dans mon rapport et tout au long des négociations, je me suis attaché à défendre une politique environnementale qui soit à la fois ambitieuse et réaliste compte tenu du contexte économique difficile et des enjeux internationaux.

J'ai d'abord plaidé pour une protection élevée du capital naturel et de la biodiversité, conformément à mon engagement de longue date en faveur des forêts, des mers et des

océans, des espèces en danger, comme les abeilles, et des espèces protégées, comme les loups.

En ces temps de crise économique et d'austérité, mettre l'accent sur la politique de l'environnement pourrait apparaître secondaire. Mais il n'en est rien. L'action en faveur de l'environnement entraîne certes des coûts, mais aussi des bénéfices que les finances publiques et les investisseurs privés ne peuvent ignorer dans la période actuelle. C'est la raison pour laquelle la préoccupation environnementale ne doit plus être la variable d'ajustement, mais doit s'intégrer, très en amont, dans les différentes politiques sectorielles.

En proposant un schéma d'ensemble, ce programme se présente comme l'acte fondateur d'un *new deal* écologique européen, porteur d'une croissance plus "verte" et créateur d'emplois. Ce *new deal* se fonde sur une économie qui innove, qui utilise l'énergie et les matières premières de façon efficace, qui produit et consomme de façon intelligente en évitant les gaspillages, tout en préservant la compétitivité des entreprises.

Pour être mieux acceptée et mieux appliquée, la législation environnementale européenne doit reposer sur une solide base de connaissances scientifiques, aller vers plus de cohérence et de simplification, mais aussi respecter les principes de la réglementation intelligente. Je me félicite, à ce titre, de la communication de la Commission pour une réglementation affûtée et performante "REFIT". La mise en œuvre de cette législation doit être renforcée avec détermination dans l'ensemble de l'Union européenne à travers l'intensification des inspections et des contrôles. L'efficacité du financement européen dans le domaine environnemental devra également être améliorée afin de garantir des résultats tangibles sur le terrain. La communication de l'Union sur sa politique environnementale devra aussi être revue. Davantage de pédagogie est nécessaire.

Je terminerai par les aspects internationaux. Il était important de reconnaître dans ce rapport la nécessité de disposer d'un cadre juridique au-delà de 2020 pour la politique climatique et énergétique de l'Europe. Mais l'Union doit obtenir des pays tiers qu'ils s'engagent tout autant qu'elle dans ce domaine. Évitions également l'écueil de la naïveté en matière commerciale en luttant contre le dumping environnemental et la concurrence déloyale. Se contenter d'engagements unilatéraux ne serait pas perçu comme juste par les entrepreneurs européens et découragerait leurs activités sur le territoire de l'Union.

3-343-000

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, it has been almost a year since the Commission adopted its proposal for a new European Union Environmental Action Programme. We are now approaching the end of a very demand-driven process. This House, as well as the Council, has repeatedly called on the Commission to propose a successor to the Sixth Environmental Action Programme, which expired this year. Since then, you have had several discussions in this House about what the programme should focus on and why it was needed. Both the committees made their opinions known and the Member States adopted no less than four sets of conclusions.

Meanwhile, the Commission consulted a wide variety of stakeholders during the programme's development. What struck me most was the broad consensus that prevailed throughout this process. From the beginning, there was wide agreement on the environmental challenges we face, their importance for the economy and the priorities that should guide our efforts to tackle them. The result is a programme entitled 'Living

well, within the limits of our planet'. That is the title the Commission proposed, and it has not changed.

But thanks to the work of Parliament and the Council, the programme itself has improved in many ways. The political agreement reached in June sends a clear signal that the European Union and its Member States support a strong and smart environmental policy in Europe as a key condition for healthy living and a competitive, resource-efficient and low-carbon economy. This is well captured in the vision for 2050 set out in the programme.

The programme itself is a joint commitment of the Union institutions and the Member States to deliver the benefits of environmental action to people and businesses all over Europe. Tomorrow's growth will depend on making resource efficiency, natural capital and low-carbon technologies a much more central part of our economic policy. Our competitiveness depends on eliminating waste and cutting costs, and moving away from an economic model based on extraction, production, consumption and throwing away. Our well-being depends on further measures to cut the considerable risks to the health of our citizens from increasing exposure to air pollution and toxic substances. Finally, we simply cannot afford to continue letting our natural capital degrade further, at the risk of losing out on the valuable and often irreplaceable services that nature provides. Investing in nature is investing in our future. Evidence shows that nature repays us many times over.

I am therefore encouraged to see that the outcome of the negotiations between Parliament and the Council sets out a number of important objectives and targets to be achieved by 2020, for instance that we have to step up our efforts to implement the European Union biodiversity strategy. We also commit to discussing and agreeing on a strategy for a non-toxic environment and to addressing the combination effects of chemicals and safety concerns related to endocrine disruptors and nanomaterials. Under the programme, Member States should work towards integrating environmental considerations, including water protection and biodiversity conservation, into land-use planning decisions. It also stressed the need to address European Union soil quality, including through a binding legal framework.

The European Parliament and the Council agree on the need to define our climate and energy targets for 2030, taking into account the indicative milestones set out in the low-carbon economy roadmap to 2050. Finally, the seventh EAP provides an ambitious framework for taking our work forward on the Rio+20 follow-up. We now need to start elaborating on the EU position for goals and targets for poverty eradication and sustainable development beyond 2015.

Implementation is a cornerstone and a supporting theme of the seventh EAP. The main elements of the Commission's proposals to improve implementation were all endorsed, including the need to further develop inspection support capacities at EU level and find effective solutions to access to justice. We will work closely with the Member States so that each of us faces up to our respective responsibilities to deliver the environmental outcomes agreed as part of this programme.

The new environmental action programme provides the medium-term framework for EU institutions and Member States to join forces and implement the vision that we have defined. Only by working together at all levels will we be able to deliver the improvements in the environment, the economy and society that we need to continue living well, within the limits of the planet.

I would like to close by thanking and congratulating the rapporteur, Mr Franco, the shadow rapporteurs and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety for all their work on and dedication to this file. I would also like to state once again how much I appreciate the fact that the Irish Presidency gave such high priority to this file.

3-344-000

Daciana Octavia Sârbu, *Raportoare pentru aviz Comisia pentru agricultură și dezvoltare rurală* . – În primul rând, aş vrea să îl felicit pe raportor pentru munca depusă în acest dosar.

Noul plan de mediu 2020 urmărește tranziția către o economie eficientă din punctul de vedere al utilizării resurselor, cu emisii reduse de carbon și care să protejeze capitalul natural. Noul acord privind reforma politicii agricole comune conține elemente care îndreaptă agricultura europeană într-o direcție foarte bună în acest sens – în primul rând, mai multă echitate și mai multă grijă față de mediu.

O cotă de 30 % din suma acordată fiecărui stat membru prin programul pentru dezvoltare rurală va fi alocată obligatoriu pentru măsuri de agromediu. Aş vrea să subliniez în mod special rolul important pe care îl au agricultura și pădurile în atenuarea schimbărilor climatice, prin absorbția și înmagazinarea carbonului. Cercetarea și inovarea, de asemenea, sunt cruciale pentru valorificarea maximă a acestui potențial. De asemenea, plățile directe sunt condiționate de respectarea a trei măsuri de „greening” – de înverzire, adică – asigurându-ne că agricultura europeană va fi una mai durabilă.

Totodată, aş vrea să evidențiez și rolul foarte important al lanțurilor scurte de aprovizionare și al piețelor locale pentru produsele agricole. Acestea garantează alimente mai proaspete, mai sănătoase, sprijină dezvoltarea comunităților locale și, în același timp, pot reduce în mod semnificativ emisiile de carbon rezultate din transportul alimentelor.

În încheiere, aş dori să reamintesc nevoia ca reducerea risipei alimentare să fie una din priorități în perioada următoare. Sper ca acestea să nu rămână doar procente pe hârtie și, în anul 2020, mi-aş dori să putem spune că am îndeplinit tot ceea ce ne-am propus.

3-345-000

Richard Seeber, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion* . – Frau Präsidentin! Ich möchte mich beim Kollegen Franco für die Arbeit, die er hier geleistet hat, bedanken, aber auch bei Kommissar Potočnik. Es ist heute nicht einfach, als Umweltkommissar fortschrittliche Vorschläge zu bringen. Wir wissen alle, mit dem Zauberwort Wettbewerbsfähigkeit glaubt man alles rechtfertigen zu können. Trotzdem bin ich davon überzeugt, dass wir mit diesem Programm einen Schritt in die richtige Richtung gehen, denn es muss uns klar sein: Das Umweltaktionsprogramm ist nicht irgendwo am Rande der Gemeinschaftspolitik, sondern es ist zentral. Denn sämtliche Aktivitäten – seien es wirtschaftliche, politische, soziale oder kulturelle – finden eben in einer realen Umwelt statt. Nur wenn diese reale Umwelt gut funktioniert, haben auch alle anderen Aktivitäten, die wir hier setzen, insbesondere die ökonomischen, das richtige Ergebnis. Darum bin ich auch froh, dass wir konkrete Aktionen vorgeschlagen haben. Es ist jetzt die Kunst der Politik, die richtigen Rahmenbedingungen zu schaffen, damit die weitere Entwicklung für unsere Gesellschaft langfristig gesichert ist.

Die Geschichte zeigt eindeutig, dass immer die Gesellschaften am erfolgreichsten sind, die am effizientesten arbeiten. Wenn ich darum kurz das Kapitel Klima und Energie herausgreifen darf: Es ist für uns wichtig, dass wir für den Rahmen, den wir jetzt diskutieren, auch im Rahmen des 2030-Programms, diese drei Ziele wirklich beibehalten. Denn gerade

im Energieeffizienzbereich haben wir am meisten aufzuholen, wir haben am meisten *low hanging fruit*, wie man so schön auf Neudeutsch sagt, zu ernten. Das bringt sowohl den Konsumenten etwas als auch unserer Wirtschaft.

Die Zukunft der Energie wird nach meiner Überzeugung durch die erneuerbaren Energien gelöst. Darum kann man auch hier vermehrt investieren, und die Technologien, die reif werden, sollen langsam in den Markt entlassen werden. Natürlich müssen wir auch im CO₂-Bereich weitermachen, damit wir das 2-Grad-Ziel einhalten können.

Insgesamt bin ich froh, dass wir uns hier relativ schnell geeinigt haben und auch darüber, dass der Bereich Wasser dementsprechend Berücksichtigung gefunden hat. Jedenfalls noch einmal Gratulation an die unmittelbar Handelnden und Ihnen, Herr Kommissar, wie gesagt, weiterhin breite Schultern in der Kommission.

3-346-000

Mario Pirillo, *a nome del gruppo S&D*. – Signora Presidente, signor Commissario Potočnik, onorevole relatore, il settimo programma d'azione ambientale traccia un insieme di possibili politiche di lungo periodo per far fronte alle principali sfide ambientali, che si potranno affrontare solo attraverso un'implementazione coordinata delle politiche ambientali settoriali, così come indicato dall'accordo che voteremo domani.

Solo così potremo iniziare la transizione verso una società a basse emissioni di carbonio ed efficiente nell'uso delle risorse, in grado al tempo stesso di salvaguardare la salute e il benessere dei propri cittadini. Per ottenere risultati significativi, è necessario il pieno coinvolgimento degli attori principali, ovvero tutti gli Stati membri, che dovranno mettere in atto politiche nazionali capaci di rispettare gli impegni ambientali indicati nel programma, ma soprattutto è arrivato il momento per iniziare a definire i target per il pacchetto "Clima" post 2020.

Personalmente ritengo necessario accelerare l'azione legislativa per arrivare il prima possibile a stabilire i tre obiettivi vincolanti per il 2030, in modo da dare a tutti gli attori il tempo di adeguarsi per raggiungere i target di lungo periodo. La lotta contro i cambiamenti climatici deve continuare ad essere parte integrante dell'azione europea, e quindi si dovrà proseguire sulla strada già tracciata in questi anni, ovvero l'approccio globale in cui tutti i settori dell'economia devono contribuire nella prospettiva del conseguimento degli obiettivi ambiziosi per il 2050, che prevedono una riduzione delle emissioni dall'80 al 95 per cento rispetto al 1990.

Solo un'azione interna forte e compatta potrà permettere all'UE di giocare in un contesto internazionale un'azione di leader mondiale nella lotta ai cambiamenti climatici e insistere per un'azione vincolante in grado di coinvolgere i partner mondiali.

3-347-000

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Madam President, I would like to thank Gaston Franco and Commissioner Potočnik, and also the Irish Presidency for the role they have played.

I would also like to be honest about the rather uninspiring and also misleading title of the Seventh Environmental Action Programme, and particularly the subtitle: 'Living well, within the limits of our planet', which is far too defensive. I would like to rename this action

plan the 'First European Action Plan to Guarantee Well-being' – because that is what it is about.

In tomorrow's world, with 9-10 billion people and double the current number in the middle-income category, efficiency will determine our competitiveness. This is not about labour efficiency; it is about resource efficiency, energy efficiency and changing our economy from a linear to a circular one. That is what this action plan is about. It is not only about resource efficiency, biodiversity, waste and a low-carbon economy, but also about improving the implementation of EU legislation. The Commissioner referred to this as the cornerstone of the Action Plan, and he also mentioned the EU monitoring and control system, which is to be strengthened.

I am very satisfied with the agreement we reached with the Council, but it is now up to the Commission and the Council to live up to that agreement, and that is what always proves to be the most difficult thing. Look at what happened last year – the greening of the CAP was watered down. The Council no longer embraces the biodiversity strategy; and the Council, together with many of the Commissioners, regards sustainability as an obstacle to growth – although it is in fact a criterion for growth.

The good thing about what we are discussing here is that this 'First European Action Plan to Guarantee Well-being' shows that there is another way.

3-348-000

Margrete Auken, *for Verts/ALE-Gruppen* . – Fru formand! Tak til Franco. Jeg kan fuldstændig skrive under på det, som Gerbrandy faktisk sagde. Jeg tager også gerne titlen til mig, så jeg vil ikke gå ind og remse op, men henvende mig direkte til dig, Potočnik, og takke for den tale, du holdt. Det var jo næsten som at høre det bedste i mit eget lands miljøpolitik gennem et stykke tid, at nu går vi hen imod – eller vi bør gå hen imod en helt anden tankegang over både energi, klima, ressourcer, affald, biodiversitet osv. Jeg vil også istemme ønsket om, at du får opbakning i Kommissionen og måske endda hos vores regeringer.

Og så vil jeg gerne især her fremhæve det, du sagde i talen lige før om Greenpeace, for det var faktisk bevægende at høre, at vi her takker Greenpeace for at være vores stemme og vores awareness i dette område, hvor Arktis er med. Jeg vil også gerne sige til dig, at vi også er meget glade for, at vi har fået løfte om, at Århuskonventionen vil blive virkelig implementeret nu, således at mennesker som Greenpeace, men også andre borgere kan komme til at spille deres aktive rolle, så vi får holdt Rådet fast på det her, vi får holdt Kommissionen, os alle sammen fast på det, vi skal. Så det bliver altså en tak, som er indbygget i et meget stort håb om, at der er kræfter og kampmod til at holde ud i denne sag.

3-349-000

João Ferreira, *em nome do Grupo GUE/NGL* . – Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, viver bem dentro das limitações do nosso planeta é o mote que dá o título ao programa de ação da União Europeia para 2020 em matéria de ambiente.

Se considerarmos que o viver bem se aplica não a um punhado de privilegiados, mas à generalidade da população, a questão que se coloca é se tal será possível no quadro do sistema económico e social dominante à escala planetária. Se será possível moldar uma

relação harmoniosa e sustentável entre a natureza e a sociedade num quadro de um sistema que, lembrando as palavras de Marx, ou cresce e acumula ou morre.

Um sistema que, por isso mesmo, permanentemente se confronta com os limites de uma terra que, sendo generosa, é finita.

Perante isto, a solução não pode ser pintar de verde o capitalismo. Não pode ser mercantilizar a natureza e os seus recursos ou os ditos serviços, promover a apropriação privada do que é de todos e de todos têm efetivamente de ser: da água potável ao ar limpo, do solo fértil à biodiversidade, das fontes hidrotermais às jazidas minerais.

Importa também não esquecer que o ambiente não existe separadamente de tudo o resto. Precisamos, é claro, de um programa de ação em matéria de ambiente, um programa que não seja um mero desfiar de uma estafada, embora verde, cartilha neoliberal. Mas precisamos também, eu diria sobretudo, de integrar objetivos ambientais num conjunto muito amplo de políticas setoriais que inclua a agricultura, as pescas, a indústria, a energia, o comércio, entre outras.

E aqui a conclusão não pode ser se não a de que se impõem profundas modificações nas atuais políticas da União Europeia em todos estes domínios.

É que, com estas políticas, viver bem dentro das limitações do nosso planeta não será mais do que um mero *slogan* esvaziado de conteúdo substantivo e todos os dias contrariado pela prática política.

Muito obrigado.

3-350-000

Roger Helmer, *on behalf of the EFD Group*. – Madam President, the EU's climate and energy policies are probably unnecessary, certainly ineffectual and ruinously expensive.

Unnecessary, because the theory of man-made climate change is increasingly disputed, and there has been no global warming for nearly two decades. The earth's climate system is complex, chaotic and poorly understood. It is absurd to think that man-made CO₂ is the only driver of climate.

Ineffectual, because with 1 200 new coal-fired power stations in the global pipeline, nothing we do in the EU will make a scrap of difference. Levels of atmospheric CO₂ will rise for decades whatever we do.

Ruinously expensive: Energy Commissioner Oettinger said that Europe cannot continue to follow a unilateral climate policy. Commissioner Antonio Tajani said we face 'an industrial massacre', and he is right: businesses are moving out of the EU taking jobs and investment with them, and households are being forced into fuel poverty. Thousands of pensioners will die of cold in Europe this winter.

It is time to abandon our obsession with CO₂ and start to prioritise reliable and affordable energy supplies.

3-351-000

Franco Bonanini (NI). - Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, anch'io ringrazio il relatore per la proposta. Sostanzialmente concordo con quanto detto poco fa dall'onorevole Pirillo. Infatti, il programma generale di azione dell'Unione europea in materia di ambiente fino

al 2020 assume una rilevanza particolare nel caratterizzare un necessario salto di qualità delle politiche europee in tema.

È necessario investire per sostenere una vera crescita verde e politiche di riqualificazione del territorio, un'innovazione sostenibile attraverso vere politiche di incentivazione alle imprese virtuose, che produrranno benefici anche a livello occupazionale. Mi soffermo su un aspetto, quello degli incentivi allo sviluppo e all'istituzione di nuovi parchi e aree naturali o marittime. Su questo credo che dovremo avere maggiore ambizione e obiettivi più concreti.

Le aree protette garantiscono, infatti, una conservazione della biodiversità, la protezione delle acque e limitano l'impermeabilizzazione artificiale del suolo, che ha reso più vulnerabile la nostra terra ai cambiamenti climatici e alle catastrofi naturali, oltre a costituire un fattore di rischio potenzialmente grave per ambiente, economia, società e salute dei cittadini.

I comuni troppo spesso sono alle prese con problemi finanziari e sono particolarmente allettati dagli introiti dei cosiddetti oneri di urbanizzazione, che permettono la realizzazione di opere che certamente aumentano il consenso fra le popolazioni amministrate, ma innescano un circuito ecologicamente perverso.

Occorre individuare dunque meccanismi che consentano di invertire il *trend* attuale, premiando con maggiori finanziamenti gli enti locali che costruiscono di meno e obbligandoli preventivamente a provvedere alla riqualificazione del patrimonio edilizio esistente e delle aree dismesse con tecniche di bioarchitettura, prima di concedere l'autorizzazione per nuove costruzioni sia ai fini del contenimento energetico sia per eliminare i materiali tossici, quali l'amianto e altri, sia quelli dannosi che sono presenti nelle vecchie costruzioni.

3-352-000

Christa Klaß (PPE). - Frau Präsidentin, Herr Kommissar, meine Damen und Herren! Das Umweltaktionsprogramm ist ein wichtiges Instrument, um die verschiedenen Aspekte einer ausgewogenen europäischen Umweltpolitik sinnvoll und kohärent fortzuschreiben. Ganz entscheidend ist, dass es uns mithilfe des neuen Umweltaktionsprogramms in den kommenden Jahren gelingt, Umweltpolitik und Wirtschaftspolitik gut zu verknüpfen.

Ich möchte drei Themen aufgreifen. Erstens: Die Begrenzung der Deponielagerung auf nicht recycelbare Abfälle bis 2020 und das Ziel der Reduzierung von Abfällen in den Meeren müssen wir strategisch angehen. Das Bewusstsein der Bevölkerung für Abfallvermeidung gilt es zu schärfen und so die Abfallmengen insgesamt zu reduzieren. Auch Mehrfachnutzung muss gelernt werden.

Zweitens: Die Qualität unserer Böden. Sie ist Grundlage gesunder Umwelt, und sie ist Kapital guter landwirtschaftlicher Produktion. Leider beziehen wir uns in diesem Dokument wieder einmal auf eine europäische Bodenschutzrichtlinie, die im Lichte weiser Erkenntnis in den letzten Wochen von Kommissionspräsident Barroso im Rahmen des REFIT-Programms zurückgezogen wurde. Der Schutz der Böden liegt eindeutig in nationaler Verantwortung. Boden ist nicht verrückbar und auch kein Gut des Binnenmarktes, das grenzübergreifend gehandelt wird. Europa muss auf die Einhaltung bodenrelevanter EU-Gesetzgebung wie z. B. der Wasserrahmenrichtlinie, der Pflanzenschutzrichtlinie achten. Hier können wir sicher viele gute Erfahrungen austauschen.

Drittens: Die endokrinen Disruptoren. In Bezug auf die im Umweltaktionsprogramm genannten und erwähnten endokrinen Disruptoren kann ich die Kommission nur dringend auffordern, endlich einen Vorschlag für horizontale Kriterien für deren Identifizierung vorzulegen. Ende dieses Jahres sollte die Kommission eigentlich eine neue Strategie zu den endokrinen Disruptoren präsentieren. Dass nun zunächst eine Folgenabschätzung vorgeschaltet werden soll, ist nicht zu verstehen. Folgen, Herr Kommissar, kann man normalerweise erst dann abschätzen, wenn man weiß, was im Gesetz steht.

Zum Umweltaktionsprogramm und zum Bericht möchte ich dem Berichtersteller Gaston Franco ein herzliches Dankeschön aussprechen.

3-353-000

Маруся Любчева (S&D). - Околната среда е един от стълбовете на устойчивото развитие. Фактът, че благоденствието на хората зависи от политиките по околната среда изправят Европейския съюз пред много предизвикателства. От една страна, поради факта, че Европейският съюз е лидер в тези политики, от друга страна проблемите на околната среда не признават граници.

Необходими са общи усилия, защото различията между отговорностите на Европейския съюз и останалите държави, от друга страна, поставят на изпитание политици, бизнес, учени, граждани. Седмата програма за околната среда е амбициозна и по-висока стъпка, с която искаме да увеличим приноса си в прехода към ресурсноефективна, нисковъглеродна икономика.

Благодарности към комисията, благодарности към докладчика за представения ни материал. Имаме нужда от интегрирана европейска политика и от сътрудничество в глобален план. Екологизирането на икономиката изисква високо ниво на синхрон в преноса на екологичните компоненти, в характеристиките на стоките и услугите на пазара. Днес говорим за зелени технологии, за зелен растеж, за зелени работни места, които ще осигури тази програма, но в същото време трудно решаваме проблемите с климатичните промени, с натрупването на тонове отпадъци, със замърсяването на водните басейни.

Целите ни до 2020 г. са високи, но трябва да говорим и за конкурентноспособността на икономиката на страните членки. Понякога екологичната тежест се понася трудно от националния бизнес, например при търговията с въглеродни емисии или от гражданите, например по въпроса с електроенергията от възобновяеми източници. Това прави някои национални икономики трудно конкурентноспособни, поради високите цени на продукцията в сравнение с цените на стоки, които идват от страни отвън. Помощта на Европейския съюз към националните икономики е важна и прилагането на тази програма зависи от тази подкрепа.

3-354-000

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). – Gospodo predsjedavajuća, teško je u dvije minute izraziti sve što bih željela reći o ovoj temi. Postavlja se pitanje kako u isto vrijeme možemo biti čuvari okoliša i kreatori gospodarskog blagostanja. To jednostavno djeluje nepomirljivo, posebice danas u vrijeme velike krize kada mislimo da zaštita okoliša ne bi trebala biti prioritet. Međutim, to je kratkoročno razmišljanje. Sigurno je da treba pomiriti zaštitu okoliša, pomiriti održivi razvoj i gospodarstvo i gospodarski rast. Dakle to je naš ključni zadatak.

Međutim, ako ne donesemo zakonske okvire koji će nalagati zemljama članicama, a ne samo zemljama članicama nego i onim drugim zemljama, trećim zemljama, kako ih volimo

nazivati, dakle jedino ako budemo imali pouzdane partnere moći ćemo izvršiti 7. akcijski plan o zaštiti okoliša.

Ali nisu tu samo treće zemlje, nije tu samo Europska unija, tu je i pojedinac, tu je i građanin. A ima li boljeg trenutka od 2013. godine, koja je proglašena europskom godinom građana? Dakle, potrebno je da građani budu educirani, potrebno je da građani budu maksimalno uključeni i to na dnevnoj bazi. Ukoliko oni ne budu uključeni u sve ovo neće od ovog programa biti ništa.

Međutim, ja želim čestitati i g. Potočniku koji je povjerenik, i Komisiji, isto tako g. Francu koji je izvjestitelj, na izvrsno odrađenom poslu, ali moramo poslati snažnu političku poruku. Budući da dolazim iz Hrvatske želim reći da je to zemlja koja je u samom vrhu po količinama pitke vode, dakle željela bih da i moji unuci 2050. godine mogu piti pitku vodu iz slavine. I ponovit ću još jedanput danas onu staru indijansku: „Ovu zemlju nismo naslijedili od naših predaka, mi smo je posudili od naše djece, naših unuka i naših nasljednika.” I toga trebamo biti stalno svjesni.

3-355-000

Sergio Gaetano Cofferati (S&D). - Signora Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, il Settimo programma generale di azione ambientale è molto importante per le ragioni che i colleghi Le hanno esposto.

Personalmente, vorrei sottolineare un punto specifico. In questa parte del mondo, l'Unione europea ha un problema di competitività con il resto del mondo. Il mercato globale lo ha in qualche misura esaltato, e ci sono due modelli messi in campo. Il primo è quello di chi vuole guadagnare competitività producendo merci e servizi riducendo i costi di produzione, dunque a discapito delle soglie che erano considerate, soprattutto nella nostra cultura, come invalicabili.

C'è chi pensa, invece, che la competitività debba guadagnarsi attraverso la qualità di quel che si produce e del come lo si produce. La sfida alta, la competizione, quella cioè legata alla qualità, ha una serie di presupposti. Uno di questi è il rispetto dei diritti individuali e collettivi delle persone, che devono lavorare con tutta la dignità che l'attività esercitata deve contenere; un altro è quello del rispetto dell'ambiente.

Non possiamo immaginare che il nostro futuro sia legato alla distruzione del patrimonio ambientale semplicemente per guadagnare spazi in termini di competizione nel breve periodo. Ecco perché ogni azione volta a migliorare le condizioni ambientali ed a rispettare lo straordinario patrimonio che abbiamo avuto in eredità è utile non soltanto per l'oggi, ma ancor di più per il domani, perché possiamo e dobbiamo competere soltanto per quella via, escludendo l'altra.

3-356-000

Romana Jordan (PPE). - Najprej želim pozdraviti dobro prakso Evropske unije, ker že vrsto let pripravlja okoljske akcijske programe, kajti na ta način povemo, kako se bodo posodabljali okoljski standardi, to pa morajo vedeti tako nacionalne kot regionalne oblasti, pomembno je tudi za investitorje v gospodarstvu.

Želela bi samo to, da bi premislili, da bi mogoče naslednjič ta akcijski program sprejemali nekoliko prej, ne tik pred tem, ko bo že začel veljati.

Dobro bi bilo tudi razmisliti, da bi bil nekoliko daljši. Sicer se zavedam kratke življenjske dobe politikov, in da, če bi bil ta program zelo dolg, bi posegali v pristojnosti tistih politikov, ki še le bodo izvoljeni.

Vendar pa po drugi strani vem tudi, da recimo, ko se v energetiki odločajo o odločitvah, te odločitve, segajo v prihodnost tudi več desetletij.

Poleg tega menim tudi, da danes problem v Uniji ni slaba zakonodaja ali nizki okoljski standardi. Mislim, da najbolj šepamo pri pravočasnem in enotnem izvajanju politik.

Zato resnično pozdravljam namero Komisije, da bo horizontalno na vseh področjih okoljskega programa poskrbela za boljše izvajanje že sprejetih zavez. To se mi zdi bistveno.

Zdaj pa naj povem tisto, kar sem povedala že, ko smo obravnavali resolucijo za COP 19: sem namreč za ambiciozno, a uravnoteženo ukrepanje Unije na področju podnebnih sprememb.

Uravnoteženo pomeni upoštevanje vseh vidikov trajnostnega razvoja – tako okolja kot gospodarstva in socialnih vidikov. In ti so odvisni tudi od globalnih razmer.

Zato lahko svoje okoljske standarde še dodatno dvignemo le, če bodo nam primerljive države ukrepale podobno.

Sem tudi proti temu, da se z okoljskim programom sprejema odločitve, ki morajo biti obravnavane in sprejete v okviru sektorskih politik.

Sem za to, da se v sedmem okoljskem programu opredelimo do zavezujočega cilja za znižanje izpustov toplogrednih plinov.

Ne strinjam pa se s tem, da posegamo v energetska politika in zahtevamo zavezujoče cilje za obnovljive vire energije in energetska učinkovitost v tem dokumentu.

In vesela sem, da v kompromisnem besedilu ni teh zavez, in da naši pogajalci niso podlegli lobistom posameznih industrijskih panog in zato tudi čestitam gospodu Francu in pogajalcem za opravljeno delo.

3-357-000

José Manuel Fernandes (PPE). - Senhora Presidente, Senhor Comissário, permitam-me que, em primeiro lugar, comece por saudar o meu colega Gaston Franco e que lhe dê os parabéns por este excelente trabalho, por este excelente relatório.

Ao longo dos últimos 40 anos, foi instituído um amplo leque de legislação ambiental na União Europeia, que contribuiu para termos o acervo normativo mais abrangente e moderno do mundo.

Para além da legislação, existem programas de ação da União Europeia em matéria de ambiente desde o início da década de 70. Hoje, temos consciência que os objetivos ambientais propostos só serão atingidos se forem integrados em todas as políticas e atividades da União.

No domínio ambiental, a União Europeia tem realizado fortes progressos mas ainda subsistem muitos problemas. A utilização dos recursos continua a ser, em grande medida, insustentável e ineficiente, os resíduos não são geridos de uma forma adequada, a degradação dos solos continua a não ser controlada e há uma utilização insustentável da terra que está

a consumir solos férteis com impactos na segurança alimentar e na consecução das metas da biodiversidade.

Os níveis de qualidade da água e de poluição atmosférica são ainda problemáticos e, em muitas partes da Europa, os cidadãos da União Europeia continuam a ser expostos a substâncias perigosas pondo potencialmente em risco a sua saúde e bem-estar.

A União Europeia pretende combater estes problemas ou minimizá-los com a execução deste programa que vai vigorar até 2020. E espera-se que este programa tenha os recursos financeiros suficientes e, para tal, é necessária a vontade política da União Europeia, mas até sobretudo do Conselho, para que haja estes montantes para que se possa executar as políticas necessárias.

A União Europeia só tem a ganhar com o objetivo de se tornar numa economia inclusiva, verde, o que assegurará crescimento e desenvolvimento sustentáveis, a proteção da saúde e o bem-estar dos cidadãos da União Europeia e um futuro certo e solidário para as gerações futuras.

3-358-000

Zdravka Bušić (PPE). – Gospođo predsjednice, želim pozdraviti ovaj program koji ima jedan univerzalan cilj: kvalitetnije uvjete života svih građana Europske unije i naše planete. Glavni prioriteti koji se naglašavaju u ovom programu kao što su smanjenje emitiranja CO₂, briga za zaštitu i osiguravanje pitke vode, razvoj bioenergetike i obnovljivih izvora energije, razvoj ekološki prihvatljivih infrastruktura i slično, kao i njihova uspješna implementacija od dugoročnog su interesa za sve zemlje članice Europske unije.

Stoga glavni provoditelji politika, koji imaju za cilj osigurati održivi razvoj i zelenu ekonomiju, trebaju biti oni akteri koji svoju odgovornost preuzimaju na temelju načela supsidijarnosti. U tom slučaju trebamo naglasiti pozitivne primjere lokalnih zajednica koje uspješno provode zelenu ekonomsku politiku, pružiti im potporu, te osigurati da i ostale zajednice imaju najbolje moguće uvjete za takav razvoj.

S obzirom da pojedine globalne ekonomije ovakve politike gledaju kroz kratkoročni utjecaj na njihovu dobit, važno je ustrajno naglašavati kako se dugoročni rast bruto društvenog proizvoda i uopće napredak našega društva može jedino osigurati kroz trajno održivu zaštitu našega životnog prostora. Ranije se načelno prihvaćalo kako je svaki gospodarski rast nužno vezan i jedino moguć uz rast potrošnje materijala i energije, a takav rast je ujedno nosio i vrlo neugodne posljedice, razmjern rastu emisija i zagađenja svih vrsta. Taj trend se na sreću mijenja. Usuglašavanjem sa sadašnjim ekološkim standardima Europske unije napuštaju se čitave generacije zastarjelih, nečistih i energetski neučinkovitih tehnologija i usmjerava se prema novim rješenjima koja će dugoročno osigurati ne samo ekološko održiv planet, nego i njezin gospodarski napredak.

3-359-000

Seán Kelly (PPE). - A Uachtaráin, arís is ábhar an-tábhachtach é seo, b'fhéidir an t-ábhar is tábhachtaí idir lámha againn, mar is ábhar é atá ríthábhachtach don chomhshaol agus dár saoránaigh. Is é sin clár gníomhach don chomhshaol 2020 agus ba mhaith liom mo bhuíochas a chur in iúl don Choimisinéir agus don Fheisire Gerbrandy as ucht an mholadh a thug siad d'Uachtarántacht na hÉireann mar gheall ar an dul chun cinn a rinne siad faoin tuarascáil seo. Tabharfaidh mé an teachtaireacht sin ar ais don rialtas agus beidh áthas orthu é a chloisteáil.

The catchphrase 'Living well, within the limits of our planet' is a good one, and one with which many people can identify – as indeed is 'We have not inherited the Earth from our ancestors, we have borrowed it from our children'. That reminds me of what people often say when they take over a sports organisation or a business: they say that their aim is to leave the organisation on a better footing than when they were appointed.

I think this is something that most people in Europe would want to do. For that reason we should be tapping into the goodwill that is there, particularly now amongst the younger generation, regarding what needs to be done for the environment.

Young people have a very different attitude to older generations and a far greater awareness, and that is why it is right that we should have, first of all, a programme for 2020, followed by binding targets for 2030 and a vision for 2050. This will create a stable environment for investment and help us to have jobs and growth and, particularly, to nurture the green economy.

Some aspects which are mentioned are worth repeating. One is particularly in relation to recycling and ensuring that only goods that cannot be recycled are dumped. That is something I think that most people would do, but we need to create an awareness about it, because many people are actually not aware of what can be recycled and what cannot, and what they should do with it.

3-361-000

Radvilė Morkūnaitė-Mikulėnienė (PPE). - Madam President, the document that we are discussing today will guide our environmental policy for the next six years. Whereas previous action programmes focused more on the protection of the environment, the current document – through its title, 'Living well, within the limits of our planet' – reflects the principle of the integration of environmental issues into other policy areas.

One of the principles of our future economic models is a resource-efficient Europe. This means that we must perceive our environment and its protection not as restricting the economy but as offering further opportunities: stricter rules on waste management; the protection of natural resources, including drinking water; energy saving and efficiency; renewable energy. We can look to some non-EU members for good examples as regards technologies.

We should look at environmental policy from the right angle: not in terms of increased costs, but rather as presenting new opportunities for business, including the creation of new jobs and new eco-industries, based on sustainable practices. This document does not set goals in a strict sense; rather it allows the European Union to stay among the frontrunners in global environmental politics.

Therefore, I urge the Commission to present proposals for swifter implementation of the programme and for achieving its goals. At the same time, I hope that representatives of my country, Lithuania, will successfully complete the negotiations on the final text of this Seventh Environmental Action Programme.

I would like to thank the rapporteur, Gaston Franco, and his colleagues who worked on this report.

3-362-000

Presidente. – Non ci sono richieste per il "catch the eye".

Do la parola al Commissario Potočnik.

3-363-000

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, we are reaching the end of the long and winding road of the Seventh Environmental Action Programme and sending it on an even longer journey. I would like to touch on some of the issues you have mentioned in your reactions.

Regarding energy and climate and the plans until 2030, the Commission, as you know, is actively working on the proposal with the aim of its being presented by the end of this year.

On endocrine disrupters, I would like to be clear, concerning the strategy, that it is the aim of the Commission to finalise the new strategy for endocrine disrupters by the end of this year. The strategy will be accompanied by a review of the old strategy from 1999, and this will also constitute our response to the European Parliament's own-initiative report and its action plan for implementing the decisions concerning endocrine disrupters in the current programme which we are now discussing.

Concerning the criteria: yes, our original plan was firstly, to propose scientific criteria to identify endocrine disrupters in the form of a Commission recommendation, and then in a second step, to implement the criteria in the various new pieces of legislation. But given the vigorous debate in the scientific community, and also the claims by industry of the potentially high impact of the criteria on the availability of plant protection products, we are now carrying out both steps simultaneously. As a consequence, the Commission will present proposals for the introduction of criteria to identify endocrine disrupters for biocides and plant protection products rather later than foreseen. This does not, of course, mean that endocrine disrupters are not regulated in those regulations.

Fourthly, concerning the Soil Directive, I would like to be clear that in the REFIT communication the Commission did not propose withdrawing the Soil Directive. It did propose considering its withdrawal, and in the same document we have committed ourselves to soil protection in the way in which we proposed. So the fact is that, on the one hand we had seven years when we could not agree in the Council to support the directive, and on the other hand, in the very programme we are discussing today we have a very firm commitment to deal with the soil issue. So I think it is an ideal opportunity, on the basis of both these things, for us to start seriously and immediately discussing how we really want to protect soil in the future.

I do not think that it would be proper for us to leave it for the next seven years on the table like a kind of a Sleeping Beauty, because it is not of any help to the soil if we keep it for ten or fifteen years more. But it is important that we agree among ourselves whether we mean seriously to do the things to which we have committed in the Seventh Environmental Programme which we are discussing today. I would just remind the European Parliament that you have consistently supported the European Soil Directive from the first moment when it was proposed by the Commission.

Regarding the other, wider, issues which we are discussing as part of our core economic policy, I think it is really important to understand where the world today is going. We are all used to the figure that there will be nine billion of us in 2045 – maybe 2040 or 2050. What does nine billion mean? It means that in one generation there will be two billion more people on the planet, which is more than the total population was at the beginning

of the previous century. That is over 260 000 per day, which means in nine days the population of my own country is born – in nine days! – and that of Belgium in seven weeks. That is the world in which we are living. So if somebody thinks that when we are talking about those issues we are talking long-term issues, they are simply mistaken. This is here and now. And if somebody thinks that this is not a matter that concerns European competitiveness, they are terribly mistaken.

Europe is a densely-populated continent. We are locked into many resource-intensive industrial models, business models, financial models, structures of the economy. We are seeing rapid rises in the price of many resources. At the same time we are seeing the volatility of those prices increasing.

Already today, we see that those prices represent more than 40 % of our cost structure – compared to labour, which accounts for 18 % of the cost structure in German industry, for example. We are very much import-dependent when it comes to energy, and also rare earths: just take a Periodic Table and I will show you how much of that we import from various countries.

Taking all that into account, if we are really serious about keeping industry in Europe, we have to focus on producing products using less energy, less water, fewer raw materials, and re-using and recycling them, which is basically what we are proposing in the programme which is in front of us. That is our competitiveness if we want to protect it.

In the next year I will be focusing with all my energy precisely on the green economy and the question of how we can help re-make some of the potential which we still have in Europe. So I will be dealing a lot with waste, proposing and reviewing the waste targets, aligning all those waste targets precisely with the policy which we are discussing today in the orientations of the Seventh Environmental Action Plan, talking there about targets and indicators which are necessary, and also addressing specifically food waste, plastic waste, building waste and, basically, trying to make that proposal. Unfortunately it will not be discussed in the course of the current Parliament, but I think it is something that we all very much need to send to the future.

Finally, Mr Gerbrandy, you said that it would be better to have a European Action Plan to guarantee well-being, and that this shows that there is another way. I think you put it very well. I would actually correct you in that last statement. It is not showing another way, it is actually the only way. But we do not yet understand that this is the only way. But the sooner we understand, the better it will be for us.

Finally, I would like sincerely to thank the rapporteur again. Mr Franco, you have done an excellent job.

3-364-000

Gaston Franco, *rapporteur*. – Madame la Présidente, merci à toutes et à tous pour votre engagement sur ce texte. L'objectif désormais est que les engagements pris par l'Union et les États membres au titre de ce programme soient effectivement tenus et que la législation environnementale européenne soit pleinement mise en œuvre. Nous devons en finir avec les grandes incantations. Chacun doit assumer ses responsabilités. C'est un devoir de crédibilité vis-à-vis des citoyens européens et de notre planète.

Je tiens à remercier très sincèrement mes collègues rapporteurs fictifs des autres groupes politiques, avec une pensée particulière pour Jo Leinen, qui ne peut être présent ce soir,

ainsi que mon collègue Seeber qui m'a aussi beaucoup aidé. Je remercie également le commissaire Potočník pour son engagement sans faille sur ce dossier. Merci aussi à la présidence irlandaise pour sa motivation et sa grande efficacité.

3-365-000

Presidente. – La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà giovedì 24 ottobre 2013 alle 12.

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 149)

3-365-500

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D), în scris. – Pentru ca Uniunea Europeană să își atingă obiectivele prevăzute prin programul „O viață bună, în limitele planetei noastre”, este importantă existența unui echilibru echitabil între necesitatea combaterii schimbărilor climatice și programele pentru mediu. Este important, de asemenea, să păstrăm o relație echilibrată între om și natură, având în vedere presiunea exercitată asupra resurselor naturale, degradarea ecosistemelor, consumul de energie, poluarea, deșeurile, riscurile la adresa sănătății sau schimbările climatice.

Consider, deci, că este nevoie să reconciliem, în jurul conceptului de dezvoltare durabilă, activitatea economică și protecția mediului. Prin noul său program de acțiune pentru mediu, Uniunea poate transmite un mesaj clar privind mediul către cetățenii săi și către restul lumii, contribuind la realizarea unei noi ordini ecologice europene în perspectiva anului 2020, care să genereze creștere „ecologică” și să creeze locuri de muncă.

3-366-000

Владимир Уручев (PPE), в писмена форма. – Уважаеми г-н Председател, Колеги, „Благоденствие в рамките на нашата планета“ е наименованието на новата европейска програма за действие за околната среда до 2020г., която трябва да предложи също и амбициозна и реалистична визия до 2050г. Още в името се съзира конфликта между икономическата дейност и опазването на околната среда, както и необходимостта от съвместяването им в рамките на едно устойчиво развитие.

Във времена на икономическа криза и бюджетни икономии, политиките за опазване на околната среда би могло лесно да се възприемат като ограничение и тежест за икономическия растеж и заетостта. Но това не е далновидно. Действието в полза на околната среда изисква значителни разходи, но бездействието би струвало още по-скъпо. По тази причина загрижеността за околната среда не трябва повече да бъде променлива величина, а да се включи като неразделна част в различните секторни политики. Защото идеята за екологичен растеж се основава на икономика, която използва по-малко или по-добре енергията и суровините, която произвежда и консумира по разумен начин, като избягва разхищенията, която контролира изпусканията и отпадъците, намалявайки в крайна сметка натиска върху околната среда. Ние сме задължени да създаваме днешното благоденствие, но и да бъдем едновременно пазители на планетата, за да остане тя и за нашите деца.

20. Ordine del giorno della prossima tornata: vedasi processo verbale

21. Chiusura della seduta

3-369-000

(La seduta è tolta alle 20.50)