

**ПОНЕДЕЛНИК 10 МАРТ 2014 Г.
LUNES 10 DE MARZO DE 2014
PONDĚLÍ 10. BŘEZNA 2014
MANDAG DEN 10. MARTS 2014
MONTAG, 10. MÄRZ 2014
ESMASPÄEV, 10. MÄRTS 2014
ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑ 10 ΜΑΡΤΙΟΥ 2014
MONDAY, 10 MARCH 2014
LUNDI 10 MARS 2014
LUNEDI' 10 MARZO 2014
PIRMDIENA, 2014. GADA 10. MARTS
2014 M. KOVO 10 D., PIRMADIENIS
2014. MÁRCIUS 10., HÉTFŐ
IT-TNEJN, 10 TA' MARZU 2014
MAANDAG 10 MAART 2014
PONIEDZIAŁEK, 10 MARCA 2014
SEGUNDA-FEIRA, 10 DE MARÇO DE 2014
LUNI 10 MARTIE 2014
PONDELOK 10. MARCA 2014
PONEDELJEK, 10. MAREC 2014
MAANANTAI 10. MAALISKUUTA 2014
MÅNDAGEN DEN 10 MARS 2014
PONEDJELJAK 10. OŽUJKA 2014.**

1-002-000

VORSITZ: MARTIN SCHULZ*Präsident**(Die Sitzung wird um 17.00[nbsp]Uhr eröffnet.)***1. Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode**

1-004-000

Der Präsident. - Ich erkläre die am Donnerstag, dem 27.[nbsp]Februar 2014, unterbrochene Sitzungsperiode für wieder aufgenommen.**2. Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll**

3. Erklärung des Präsidenten

1-007-000

Der Präsident. - Meine Damen und Herren! Vor zwei Monaten wurde die Sacharow-Preisträgerin Razan Zaitouneh entführt. Ich habe schon mehrfach darauf hingewiesen. Eine bewaffnete Gruppe verschleppte die Anwältin zusammen mit ihrem Ehemann und drei weiteren Menschenrechtsaktivisten. Die Entführung fand in Douma, einem von Rebellen kontrollierten Gebiet in den Vororten von Damaskus statt. Seit zwei Monaten sind Frau Zaitouneh und ihre Mitentführten verschollen. Es gibt keine Nachricht von Ihnen.

Im Namen des Europäischen Parlaments fordere ich die sofortige Freilassung von Frau Razan Zaitouneh!

Sie erhielt den Sacharow-Preis 2011. Die mutige junge Frau hat ihr Leben dem friedlichen Kampf für die Demokratie und für ein freies Syrien gewidmet. Für diese Arbeit wurde sie vom Regime und von Rebellengruppen gleichermaßen bedroht.

Das Schicksal von Razan Zaitouneh ist kein Einzelfall. Ungezählte syrische Frauen wurden seit Beginn des Bürgerkrieges gefangen genommen, eingesperrt, verschleppt und barbarisch gefoltert. Frauen aus allen Schichten und jeden Alters werden zu Opfern dieser Kriegsverbrechen. Vergewaltigung – wie wir in diesen Tagen gut dokumentiert lesen können – wird systematisch als Kriegswaffe eingesetzt, um die syrische Gesellschaft weiter zu zersetzen.

Das Europäische Parlament verurteilt diese Kriegsverbrechen und diese Verbrechen gegen die Menschlichkeit auf das Schärfste.

Erst vor zwei Tagen haben wir den Internationalen Frauenrechtstag begangen. Wir müssen uns dem Auftrag dieses Tages stellen und Sorge dafür tragen, dass die EU die Organisationen und Personen unterstützt, die Frauen helfen, nach einem solchen Trauma ihr Leben wieder aufzubauen, Frauen, die gegen die Straflosigkeit kämpfen, zu unterstützen und vor allem dazu beizutragen, diese Verbrechen zu dokumentieren, um sie auch einer Verfolgung zuführen zu können. Ich fordere noch einmal die Freilassung unserer Sacharow-Preisträgerin!

4. Zusammensetzung des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll

5. Unterzeichnung von gemäß dem ordentlichen Gesetzgebungsverfahren angenommenen Rechtsakten: siehe Protokoll

6. Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

7. Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung (Einreichung): siehe Protokoll

8. Petitionen: siehe Protokoll

9. Übermittlung von Abkommenstexten durch den Rat: siehe Protokoll

10. Arbeitsplan: siehe Protokoll

11. Jahresbericht der Europäischen Investitionsbank 2012 (Aussprache)

1-016-000

Der Präsident. - Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Marian-Jean Marinescu im Namen des Haushaltskontrollausschusses über die Europäische Investitionsbank (EIB) – Jahresbericht 2012 (2013/2131(INI)) (A7-0137/2014).

Dazu begrüße ich herzlich den Präsidenten der Europäischen Investitionsbank, Herrn Hoyer. Herzlich willkommen, Herr Hoyer!

1-017-000

Marian-Jean Marinescu, Raportor. - Domnule președinte, Banca Europeană de Investiții a beneficiat de o majorare de capital de 10 miliarde de euro, ceea ce facilitează alocarea adițională pentru perioada 2013-2015 a 60 de miliarde de euro pentru împrumuturi pe termen lung pentru proiecte europene. Banca trebuie să se asigure că își îndeplinește obiectivul de a genera locuri de muncă pentru cel puțin o jumătate de milion de europeni în 2014, prin împrumuturi pentru proiecte de infrastructură, pentru eficiența resurselor, precum și pentru IMM-uri.

Consider că este necesară realizarea unei evaluări cuprinzătoare, care să ofere cifre viabile cu privire la locurile de muncă pe termen lung, create cu ajutorul împrumuturilor acordate de BEI și la impactul acestor împrumuturi asupra economiei. Cred că Banca Europeană de Investiții poate avea un rol hotărâtor în optimizarea investițiilor și poate constitui, în același timp, un catalizator în intensificarea cooperării dintre Comisie și statele membre în domenii extrem de importante, precum politica de coeziune. Cuplarea instrumentelor de partajare a riscurilor între Comisie și BEI, alături de crearea de sinergie între activitățile băncii și ale Fondului european de investiții, vor facilita implementarea obiectivelor Europa 2020 și vor sprijini Pactul de stabilitate și de creștere.

Multe state membre se confruntă cu rate mici de absorbție a fondurilor structurale. Banca trebuie să-și intensifice eforturile pentru a îmbunătăți capacitatea statelor membre de a absorbi resursele Uniunii, inclusiv fondurile structurale. Statele membre pot folosi o parte a alocărilor din fondurile structurale atât pentru a partaja riscul, cât și pentru a oferi garanții pentru împrumuturile contractate de la BEI.

Constrângerile în materie de finanțare, care afectează întreprinderile și sectorul public, continuă să influențeze negativ ocuparea forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor. Programul băncii de ocupare a forței de muncă în rândul tinerilor, cu un volum de creditare de 6 miliarde de euro, este de cea mai mare importanță pentru abordarea acestor probleme. Banca trebuie să-și lărgască domeniul de acțiune și să folosească instrumente suplimentare pentru a furniza stimulente viabile pentru generarea de locuri de muncă pentru tineri, în special în statele membre cunoscute pentru ratele ridicate ale șomajului în rândul tinerilor.

Principalele probleme din mai multe state sunt lipsa de fonduri și costurile de finanțare mai mari, în special pentru IMM-uri. De aceea, eforturile băncii trebuie să fie redirecționate către promovarea finanțării pentru IMM-uri, antreprenariat, exporturi și inovare, care sunt vitale pentru redresarea economică. Trebuie sprijinită inițiativa comună a Comisiei și a băncii de finanțare a IMM-urilor din cadrul noului cadru financiar, prin care se combină fondurile disponibile din programele COSME și Orizont 2020, fiind dedicate resurse în valoare de până la 8,5 miliarde de euro fondurilor structurale și de investiții europene cu scopul de a genera împrumuturi suplimentare pentru IMM-uri.

Cer statelor membre să participe activ, contribuind la instrumentele comune cu ajutorul creditelor primite prin fonduri, pentru a sprijini creșterea numărului de credite acordate IMM-urilor de pe teritoriul lor, sporind astfel efectele de levier la nivel global.

Accentuez responsabilitatea băncii de a crește nivelul de transparență în ceea ce privește selecția intermediarilor financiari și a partenerilor pentru proiectele cofinanțate, precum și în ceea ce privește beneficiarii finali. Este fundamental ca banca să-și mențină ratingul de credit AAA pentru a-și păstra soliditatea financiară și capacitatea de a injecta lichidități în economia reală. Concomitent, însă, banca, împreună cu Fondul european de investiții, trebuie să aibă în vedere, în anumite cazuri, creșterea angajamentelor în activități cu un grad mai ridicat de risc.

Nu în ultimul rând, susțin necesitatea unei supravegheri prudențiale a băncii de către Banca Centrală Europeană, în contextul viitoarei uniuni bancare.

1-018-000

Werner Hoyer, *President of the European Investment Bank* . - Mr President, it is a great pleasure and honour for me to report to you today on our activities in the past year. This is probably the last opportunity for me to speak in the plenary of the European Parliament during this legislative period, so let me take this opportunity to thank Parliament for its excellent cooperation and support given to the EU bank during these past years. In particular, allow me to thank the rapporteur, Mr Marinescu, who just presented his report, for a very thorough and well-balanced report on the activities of the European Investment Bank, and everyone else involved for the excellent cooperation with the EIB's services.

The EU bank is part of a concerted European response to the crisis, and there are signs that this common strategy is bearing fruit. It will be successful only if these fruits are sooner or later – hopefully sooner – visible on the labour markets.

Thanks to the capital increase of EUR 10 billion from the Member States, the EIB Group stepped up its financial support to promote growth and jobs significantly in Europe last year. The Group, comprising the Bank and the European Investment Fund, provided the economy with strong counter-cyclical support, supporting the real economy with loans amounting to EUR 75 billion. Within the EU we thereby increased our lending activities by 42% compared to the year before: 42% more.

For example, we have ensured access to finance for small and medium-sized enterprises by making our SME support become our largest policy contribution, amounting to an all-time high of EUR 22 billion – EUR 21.9 billion to be precise – in 2013. This allowed us, taking into account private investment, to mobilise more than EUR 50 billion in support of SMEs and mid-caps and to support a total of 230 000 SMEs with 2.8 million people employed across Europe in 2013. We also paid special attention to the peripheral countries where we lent considerable volumes to SMEs and mid-caps.

For Greece, Cyprus, Ireland, Portugal and Spain, we signed new loans worth altogether nearly EUR 7 billion. And we did not just extend our lending activities, we also added some new products to our toolbox. As you all know, the problems differ in the Member States; thus we reacted with tailor-made and efficient instruments.

In Greece we signed the first trade finance facility worth EUR 500 million. Here the EIB acts as a safe bridge between leading Greek and foreign banks, to the benefit of Greek

importers and exporters. We have already replicated this facility in Cyprus for EUR[nbsp]1 50 million, and other countries have shown great interest in this new tool.

Again in Greece, we set up the SME Guarantee Fund. The Fund is a joint initiative between the Hellenic Republic, the Commission and the EIB. Established by using EUR[nbsp]500 million from unabsorbed Structural Funds for Greece, the Fund will guarantee EIB loans to SMEs by our partner banks in Greece totalling up to EUR[nbsp]1 billion.

In Portugal we started an innovative portfolio state guarantee covering up to EUR[nbsp]6 billion for new investments. All these instruments enable us to operate in countries where commercial banks and other investors have reduced their activities substantially or have even withdrawn completely.

But let me be clear: our business model is based on a well-balanced portfolio across the entire Union. This is, of course, of utmost importance for our investors. In this context let me say a few more words on our business model and face some rumours that the EIB would be too risk averse and concentrate too much on its AAA rating.

As the rapporteur said, or implied, the AAA is not a fetish for us, but preserving good refinancing conditions when generating private capital from the market is vital for our business model. We borrow what we have to lend, and we need to do everything to protect our favourable funding conditions in order to be able to fulfil our mission, as laid down in the Treaties, to act counter-cyclically and help particularly those countries which need our help the most and to help with very favourable loan conditions.

Another area supporting growth and jobs is the Europe 2020 Project Bond Initiative (PBI). This initiative, which is a risk-sharing instrument created by the Commission and the EU bank, provides an opportunity for reopening capital markets as a source of financing for crucial transport, energy and communications infrastructure projects. In January 2014, together with the Commission we presented the PBI interim report to Parliament's Committee on Budgets.

Furthermore, we are enhancing the activities of the European Investment Fund to overcome existing financing constraints for SMEs. It is also a very powerful instrument for addressing market gaps, offering a broad range of equity, guarantee, risk sharing and lending products. The board of the EU bank – the EIB is the largest shareholder in the EIF – recently decided to strengthen the risk-taking capacity of the Fund by extending its mandate and subscribing to the EUR[nbsp]1.5 billion EIF capital increase.

The participation of the European Union in the capital increase of the European Investment Fund was voted on in Parliament's Committee on Budgets and will be tabled for the April plenary. We are grateful to Parliament for understanding the need to deal rapidly with this issue before the end of the legislature. This new capital will increase the Fund's capacity to share risk and provide capital in order to stimulate further SME lending.

In addition to the capital increase we will extend the EIF's activity by granting a new mandate. This will make up to EUR[nbsp]4 billion available in support of additional guarantees to be issued by the EIF over the next seven years. All in all, these measures should increase our funding capacity and expand our product offer for SMEs.

Politically, economically and socially one of the biggest challenges remains the fight against youth unemployment, which the European Council considered last year as a priority. In that context we launched a dedicated youth employment programme in July. I am very

proud to tell you that the volume initially committed of EUR [nbsp]6 billion for 2013 has been significantly exceeded. In just six months the Bank made available loans for almost EUR [nbsp]9.1 billion to tackle youth unemployment. This included projects for infrastructure for secondary education and vocational training, support for student loan schemes, as well as loans to SMEs and young entrepreneurs in regions where youth unemployment rates exceeded 25 [nbsp]%. Given the success of the youth unemployment programme – or youth employment programme, to put it better – we will extend our financial support this year because, as has been said many times but without losing any validity, we cannot afford to lose an entire generation, either economically or socially.

I should also mention briefly the EIB's external activities. As you know, roughly 10 [nbsp]% of all lending goes to projects outside the EU, to support the EU's policies beyond its borders. This is, given our overall size, a considerable amount of money – close to one third the size of World Bank lending to public and private sectors. With direct investments supporting the economic and social development of neighbourhood and partner countries, the EIB promotes EU interests and supports EU policies. In this context, I would just like to mention the current situation in Ukraine, which we can further elaborate on during our discussion.

The majority of the Bank's financing operations outside the Union are carried out under an EU budget guarantee set out in its external mandates for EIB activities in different regions of the world. Parliament and the Council have just concluded negotiations on the new external lending mandate, and you will vote on the text tomorrow.

I would like to thank you wholeheartedly for your support, which was decisive in permitting our lending activities to continue to support EU external policies at similar levels to those of 2007-2013: that is, up to EUR [nbsp]30 [nbsp]billion. In times of scarce budgetary resources, the external lending mandate is very important, given the high leverage of the EU guarantee – up to 25 [nbsp]% – which allows us to do more with less.

Let me say in conclusion that, in addition to our coherent and consistent approach, I would like to emphasise that we responded to the crisis with more Europe, and not less; with more integration and more trade support, and not with nationalisation or protectionism. This is for me a very important message for the upcoming elections for this Parliament. Thank you very much. The European Investment Bank reports that we have delivered.

(Applause)

1-019-000

Viviane Reding, *Vice-President of the Commission* . - Mr President, honourable Members, the Commission welcomes Parliament's report on the European Investment Bank and shares the recognition of the important role the EIB plays in supporting Europe's recovery from the financial crisis. We particularly welcome the establishment of the Growth and Employment Facility, which was enabled by last year's EUR [nbsp]10 billion capital increase and will generate EUR [nbsp]60 billion of additional lending over the next three years.

The implementation of the capital increase has progressed smoothly, thanks to the significant financial contribution from Member States, and we note with satisfaction that the EIB fully delivered on the agreed additional lending volumes in 2013.

In this context, we also welcome the support of Parliament for the launch of the instruments of COSME and Horizon 2020, which will be implemented by the EIB and EIF, and for the

joint SME initiative. These initiatives will considerably increase the effectiveness of joint risk-sharing instruments in support of SMEs and high value-added research and development projects.

At the same time, the expansion of risk-sharing instruments funded from the EU budget and from structural funds should be flanked by measures to strengthen the EIB's own internal risk-taking capacity to ensure that satisfactory leverage can be achieved for the EU funds. We share the comments made in Parliament's report in this regard.

While we recognise the need to control portfolio risks and the importance of the triple A rating, the EIB needs to optimise the value-added of its lending, taking into account country-specific needs. It is critical that the EIB deploys the fresh funds from its capital increase, which was financed by EU taxpayers, to high value-added projects across the 28 Member States, including vulnerable and programme countries, for which funds are not available from other sources on reasonable terms. There is still more work to be done here, as we note that a significant proportion of EIB lending continues to flow to blue chip companies with ready access to commercial loans. This type of business is best left to the private banking sector, as the EIB is not needed there.

Going forward, it will thus be crucial to demonstrate even more that the EIB can play a key role in the EU's efforts to restart growth and job creation, especially in vulnerable and programme countries. All this is not intended to call into question the EIB's business model but to ensure that all efforts are used to ensure that taxpayers' money is used as effectively as possible.

A clear example of successful EU-EIB cooperation is the EU Project Bond Initiative, which has launched a debate on the various models for promoting a project bond market in Europe. The transactions closed demonstrated the role of the project bonds in attracting investors to large projects with a higher risk profile than they would normally accept. This is largely due to the involvement of the Commission and the EIB, which proves to be crucially important to investors in terms of project deliverability.

The active promotion by the Commission and the EIB of project bonds for infrastructure financing has supported the development of capital market solutions. The two project bond deals signed show that project bond solutions could deliver value for money compared to bank solutions, effectively enabling governments to deliver more to taxpayers at the same or even lower financing costs.

The Commission and the EIB are currently looking at ways to improve the performance of the scheme and to implement it in a broader range of countries and in greenfield projects. The Commission will also look at the financing of smaller infrastructure projects and the potential use of European Structural and Investment Funds to support the development of the project bond market in a variety of infrastructure sectors in Europe, including renewable generation and smart grid assets.

From 2014 onwards, the Project Bond Initiative will be part of the Connecting Europe Facility, with an initial budget of EUR 230 million for 2014-15 and further allocations to be made after 2015, subject to the full independent evaluation of the pilot phase. The European Investment Fund, which is owned jointly by the EIB, the EU and a number of financial shareholders, has been another highly effective tool for supporting the economy in areas not adequately served by the commercial banking sector, including financing for SMEs and venture capital. This is an area particularly affected by the financial crisis and

the fragmentation of the EU's credit markets. Otherwise-identical SMEs now face different financing conditions, merely based on the Member State where they are based, and that is why the European Council of December 2013 asked us to further enhance the capacity of the EIF through an increase in its capital.

We are currently working with the European Parliament and the Council to complete the legislative process for the capital increase by May. We are grateful for the excellent cooperation with Parliament and the Council, which makes us confident that we can succeed with this important project within our ambitious timetable and get the first projects going this year.

As regards EIB external activity, a substantial level of EIB involvement in the pre-accession and neighbourhood countries is essential, in line with the EU's political and strategic priorities. EIB investment activity in these regions is of fundamental importance to facilitate the accession process and to bolster EU support to its neighbourhood. They should thus remain at the focus of the EIB's external lending activities. The Commission welcomes the recent creation of an Eastern Neighbourhood Committee by the EIB, because the Bank's support to the region is needed now more than ever, including in countries such as Ukraine.

We are satisfied with the progress achieved on the future external lending mandate under the 2014–2020 Multiannual Financial Framework, and we welcome the very constructive approach of Parliament on this important project. The timely conclusion of the legislative process will ensure that the EIB operations outside the EU will continue smoothly following the end of the current mandate on 30 June 2014.

We are waiting for the input from MEPs, and I will hand this over to my colleague, whom I replaced tonight.

(Applause)

1-020-000

ΠΡΟΕΔΡΙΑ: ANNY ΠΟΔΗΜΑΤΑ

Αντιπρόεδρος

1-021-000

Ingeborg Gräßle, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Präsident Hoyer! Frau Kommissarin, Respekt! Ihre Rede hat mir sehr gut gefallen, weil sie einen kritischen Grundton angeschlagen hat, den ja auch der Kollege Marinescu in seinem Bericht angeschlagen hat. Wir begrüßen diese Debatte über die Arbeit der EIB. Allerdings zeichnet sich die Arbeit der Bank nach wie vor durch die Intransparenz der großen Zahlen aus.

Für mich stellen sich viele Fragen: Die EIB-Programme zur Bekämpfung der Jugendarbeitslosigkeit sind eine wichtige Sache. Aber was hat die EIB tatsächlich gemacht und was hat sie erreicht in Sachen Wachstum und Beschäftigung? Ich erinnere daran, dass die Kommission uns nichts sagen kann, weil es angeblich keine statistischen Daten dazu gibt, wie also kann es die EIB? Wie wäre es, wenn statt einer Hochglanzbroschüre einmal eine Publikation über den Mehrwert der EIB-Kredite käme? Und bitte erklären Sie uns dann auch, warum die Programmländer, also die Hauptkrisenländer und unsere Hauptorgenkinder, nur 5% aller EIB-Investitionen ausmachen? Wird etwa dem gegeben, der schon hat?

Der zweite Punkt ist die Frage der Kapitalerhöhung der EIB. Wir fragen uns, wie die Bank in einem wirtschaftlich schwieriger gewordenen Umfeld ihr Qualitätsportfolio erhalten kann. Und dann wäre es interessant, einmal zu erfahren, wie hoch der Prozentsatz der Kredite ist, die die EIB vereinbart hat, aber dann nicht ausgezahlt hat.

Die dritte Frage, die ich mir stelle, ist, wie viele Kredite die EIB tatsächlich an KMU vergeben hat, die von ihrer Hausbank kein Geld mehr erhalten. Das sind ja die Unternehmen, die die Kredite ganz dringend brauchen. Wir haben große Probleme, die Darlehensvergabe der EIB tatsächlich zu bewerten, weil es keine Informationen über Endbegünstigte gibt. Es wäre auch wichtig zu erfahren, wie viele Kredite der EIB eigentlich an Banken selbst gegangen sind.

Zum vierten Punkt: Für die Arbeit in den Drittstaaten darf ich darauf hinweisen, dass wir mit der Gründung des Auswärtigen Dienstes sehr gut Bescheid wissen über das Mittelmanagement und die Kosten. Da bleibt die EIB inzwischen weit zurück, was die Managementleistung pro Mitarbeiter und Informationen über die Kosten der EIB-Infrastruktur betrifft. Ja, das interessiert uns wirklich.

Und der fünfte Punkt, die Frage der Einhaltung des EU-Rechts durch die EIB, also: Wie steht es mit der Umsetzung von CRD IV und Basel III? Gerne erwarten wir die Antworten auf diese Fragen!

1-022-000

Jens Geier, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion* . – Frau Präsidentin, Herr Präsident Hoyer, Frau Vizepräsidentin der Kommission Reding! Die Europäische Investitionsbank ist die Bank der EU. Sie finanziert die Ziele der EU entsprechend ihren politischen Prioritäten. Der Jahresbericht für 2012, über den wir heute diskutieren, behandelt die Governance, die Erfüllung der Vorschriften und den Kontrollrahmen. Er berichtet über die Stärkung der Unterstützung für kleine und mittlere Unternehmen, er erläutert den Beitrag der EIB zu den externen Politiken der Europäischen Union und die Kooperation mit anderen internationalen Finanzinstitutionen. Schließlich – und das ist etwas Neues – werden die Beratungskapazitäten beschrieben, die das Beratungszentrum für die *Public Private Partnership* darstellt. Das alles steht in keinem wesentlichen Widerspruch zur Haltung meiner Fraktion zu den im Bericht aufgeworfenen Punkten. Die EIB ist damit ein zentrales Instrument, um den Herausforderungen, die die Krise an uns stellt, zu begegnen und Wachstum und Beschäftigung zu fördern.

Für uns ist von fundamentaler Bedeutung, dass die EIB ihr *Triple-A-Rating* behält, um finanzielle Stärke zu bewahren. Wir wünschen uns zusätzlich, dass die EIB neue finanzielle, aber auch nicht-finanzielle Instrumente entwickelt, die geeignet sein können, kurzfristig Marktprobleme genauso zu lösen wie langfristige Probleme der EU-Wirtschaft unter den Bedingungen der Krise.

Zuletzt wollen wir begrüßen, dass die EIB angesichts der Gewalt auf dem Majdan zunächst die Aktivitäten in der Ukraine eingestellt hat. Das war ein starkes Signal, dass die europäischen Institutionen Verantwortung zeigen.

1-023-000

Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, *namens de ALDE-Fractie* . – Voorzitter, ook ik wil de heer Hoyer en commissaris Reding, en onze rapporteur Marinescu hartelijk danken voor hun bijdrage in dit debat.

Het jaarverslag 2012 lezend was ik weer onder de indruk van de omvang en ook de resultaten van de Europese Investeringsbank. Dat mag best wel eens gezegd worden. Ik denk dat weinig mensen weten dat de Europese Investeringsbank twee keer zoveel investeert als de Wereldbank bijvoorbeeld. En het is dan ook een cruciaal instrument voor de Europese Unie.

Maar ondanks die algemene positieve beoordeling heb ik ook een aantal punten van kritiek. Allereerst wil ik beginnen bij het gebrek aan transparantie. Volgens Bankwatch is de Europese Investeringsbank de minst transparante grote internationale bankinstelling en dat vind ik eigenlijk de Europese Unie onwaardig. Het is ook jammer vanwege de geringe zichtbaarheid van de Europese Investeringsbank.

Mijn tweede punt van kritiek betreft de keuze van sectoren. In 2012 ging zo'n dertig procent van de investeringen naar de infrastructuur voor transport. Ik denk dat het goed is – en dat staat ook in het *Operational Plan 2014-2016* – als de Europese investeringsbank sterk op de toekomst gericht is. De crisis heeft aangetoond dat Europa zich nog sterker moet maken voor een omslag naar een slimme en een duurzame economie. En daar heeft de Europese Investeringsbank natuurlijk een hele grote rol te spelen.

Helaas komt vooral duurzaamheid er nog wat bekaaid van af, terwijl daar wél de toekomst ligt. In de toekomst zal concurrentie veel meer gebaseerd zijn op de *efficiency* van het grondstoffengebruik, het minder uitstoten van schadelijke stoffen enzovoort. Ik zou het mooi vinden als de Europese Investeringsbank daar een grotere nadruk op zou leggen, niet alleen om het klimaat, om de aarde te redden, maar vooral ook om die economische structuur van Europa veel sterker te maken.

1-024-000

Bart Staes, *namens de Verts/ALE-Fractie*. – Voorzitter, collega's, mevrouw de commissaris, meneer Hoyer, ik ben erg tevreden met dit verslag van de heer Marinescu. Het biedt een goed overzicht van wat het Europees Parlement van de Europese Investeringsbank verlangt.

Twee zaken. Klimaat- en energiebeleid. Ik denk dat wij heel duidelijk zeggen dat er meer inspanningen geleverd moeten richting duurzame energieprojecten. Ik denk dat de balans ook duidelijker moet doorslaan naar hernieuwbare-energieprojecten. Ook moet slimme-energie-infrastructuur een grotere rol krijgen. Tegen 2015 moet men met een nieuwer plan te komen, een sterker plan, ook wat betreft de middelen, die zullen worden ingezet voor klimaat en energie. Meneer Hoyer, bent u ertoe bereid u zich daarvoor te engageren?

Transparantie en witwasbeleid. Ik denk dat er een hele reeks positieve zaken staan in dit verslag. Vooral dat er niet moet samengewerkt worden met bedrijven die duidelijk een slechte naam hebben op het gebied van transparantie, fraude, corruptie. Dat er niet moet worden samengewerkt als er gewerkt wordt in belastingparadijzen.

Ten slotte nog één ding, meneer Hoyer. Mag ik u vragen eens te reageren op die Nigeriaanse fraudezaak, die ook in het Britse Lagerhuis is aangekaart door mijn collega Caroline Lucas, waarover de Britse ombudsman zeer duidelijk zegt dat de Britse dienst van ontwikkelingssamenwerking zwaar in de fout is gegaan. Er zijn miljoenen verloren gegaan. Wilt u daar vandaag op reageren, meneer Hoyer?

1-025-000

Rina Ronja Kari, for GUE/NGL-Gruppen. – Fru formand! Jeg vil gerne starte med at glæde mig over, at der i Den Europæiske Investeringsbank er kommet øget fokus på at skabe vækst og beskæftigelse. Ser vi på de sidste års katastrofale udvikling, så er især beskæftigelse af afgørende betydning, og det kræver massive investeringer. Vi kan naturligvis ikke sidde overhørig, når ungdomsarbejdsløsheden i f.eks. Spanien rammer 57,7[nbsp] %.

Derfor er det også ærgerligt, at Unionens samlede indsats mod ungdomsarbejdsløsheden skal foregå inden for de skadelige økonomiske rammer, der dikterer nedskæringer over en bred kam. Men det er næsten endnu mere ærgerligt, at det på trods af gode intentioner, ikke er lykkedes Investeringsbanken at få investeret alle de ressourcer, der var til rådighed, i de mest udsatte lande. Det er simpelthen dybt utilfredsstillende.

Vi kan ikke løse problemerne alene igennem Investeringsbanken. Det kræver et egentligt brud med den økonomiske politik. Heldigvis er der med hensyn til Investeringsbanken håb om, at det kan blive bedre i de kommende år. Det må vi her fra Parlamentet lægge vægt på at følge op på.

Men også på et andet punkt må vi være særligt opmærksomme, nemlig spørgsmålet om, hvilke projekter der bliver investeret i inden for klima og energi. Det er vigtigt, at investeringerne er i tråd med den klima og energipolitik, vi har vedtaget, der tilsigter øget fokus på vedvarende energi. Det betyder selvfølgelig også, at Investeringsbanken ikke skal investere i hverken kul eller atomkraft, men også, at Investeringsbanken skal have særlig fokus på at inddrage lokalbefolkningen i store projekter, der har stor betydning for lokalmiljøet.

1-026-000

Jaroslav Paška, za skupinu EFD. – V júli 2012 bola zverejnením nariadenia č.[nbsp]670 spustená pilotná fáza iniciatívy projektových dlhopisov Európskej únie a Európskej investičnej banky. Animátorom spoločnej aktivity Využitie projektových dlhopisov určených na financovanie strategických transeurópskych dopravných, energetických a telekomunikačných projektov sa stala Európska investičná banka. Projektové dlhopisy boli určené aj na financovanie inovácií zmysluplných technológií zvyšujúcich konkurencieschopnosť Únie.

Prvá emisia projektových dlhopisov Európskej únie v objeme 1, 4[nbsp] miliardy[nbsp] EUR bola určená na podporu projektu Castor, realizáciu veľkého mimopobrežného zásobníka plynu v Španielsku. V súvislosti s nízkou výkonnosťou tohto projektu sa však ukazuje potrebné zo strany EIB poskytnúť podrobnejšie informácie o jeho príprave, najmä v súvislosti s uskutočnením geologických štúdií a analýz seizmického rizika.

Podľa dostupných informácií EIB doposiaľ schválila podporu z projektových dlhopisov prevažne na energetické a dopravné projekty. Z hľadiska zvýšenia konkurencieschopnosti EÚ by však bolo potrebné podporiť najmä sektor informačných technológií a oblasť výskumu, vývoja a inovácií. Preto myslím si by bolo zo strany EIB potrebné viac sa venovať aj zmysluplnosti a najmä inovačnému potenciálu dlhopismi podporovaných projektov.

1-027-000

Jean-Pierre Audy (PPE). - Madame la Présidente, Madame la Vice-présidente de la Commission, Monsieur le Président de la Banque européenne d'investissement, accompagné de son directeur général, je vous remercie et je vous félicite tout d'abord, Monsieur le

Président, de l'attention que, comme votre prédécesseur, vous accordez aux parlementaires, parce qu'au fond, la BEI est un instrument intergouvernemental.

Mes premiers mots seront pour remercier mon collègue [nbsp]Marinescu, qui a vraiment fait un excellent rapport, et mon propos portera sur deux sujets: premièrement, l'investissement et, deuxièmement, le contrôle prudentiel.

L'Union européenne n'investit pas suffisamment. Mes collègues le disent. Nous n'investissons pas assez et, d'ailleurs, le rapport dit que le pacte de croissance est une réponse importante mais pas suffisante. Je crois que nous sommes de plus en plus nombreux à considérer que le moment serait venu d'avoir ce grand plan européen d'investissement dans les infrastructures. Le Conseil européen a d'ailleurs demandé à la Commission européenne, qui l'a fait, de présenter un rapport sur les priorités et la mise en œuvre du pacte de croissance. Les infrastructures, l'énergie, le numérique, la recherche, la route, le fer, l'aérien, nous connaissons les têtes de chapitre. Nous n'investissons pas assez dans ces domaines. Il nous faudrait probablement un plan de 1 [nbsp]000 à 1 [nbsp]500 [nbsp]milliards d'euros d'ici à 2020.

Le rapport vous fait une proposition: c'est que nous ayons un débat politique avec vous, Monsieur le Président de la Banque européenne d'investissement, la Commission européenne, mais aussi le président du Conseil européen. Au cours du prochain Conseil européen des 20 et 21 [nbsp]mars va commencer l'évaluation de la stratégie Europe [nbsp]2020. Nous devrions faire un point sur l'investissement.

Dernier point sur le contrôle prudentiel. Monsieur le Président, vraiment, cela fait depuis 2007 que nous demandons que la Banque se charge du contrôle prudentiel. Je crois que vous n'y êtes pas opposé. Votre prédécesseur a dit dans cet hémicycle qu'il était d'accord. Le Parlement vous propose trois formules. Soit un recours à la base juridique qui a été utilisée pour l'union bancaire – [nbsp] l'article [nbsp]127 du traité sur le fonctionnement de l'Union européenne, mais il faut que le Conseil prenne une initiative [nbsp] –, soit un contrôle prudentiel dans le cadre de l'Union bancaire ou une démarche volontaire de la part de l'Autorité bancaire européenne avec ou sans la participation d'un ou de plusieurs superviseurs. C'est vraiment un élément de confiance pour l'investissement à long terme de la banque que vous présidez.

1-028-000

Inés Ayala Sender (S&D). - Señora Presidenta, en primer lugar quisiera agradecer y celebrar este ejercicio anual de transparencia y visibilidad de las actividades del BEI y reiterar la bienvenida a su Presidente, el señor Hoyer. Me referiré a tres puntos que me preocupan y concluiré con un ruego final.

Me felicito por la financiación de las energías renovables, en contradicción con las políticas energéticas erráticas y equivocadas de gobiernos como el del señor Rajoy en mi país, pero ello no obsta para que los recursos también se utilicen para invertir en proyectos de modernización y valorización energética del carbón autóctono europeo, único recurso de reserva estratégica seguro, haya sol o no, haya viento o no, y sobre todo en proyectos de captura y almacenamiento de CO₂, para que dejen de ser virtuales y sean de verdad reales.

Me congratulo también del apoyo a la política de vecindad. Entiendo que Ucrania es una prioridad hoy, por supuesto, pero ojo con olvidar países que han hecho ya un esfuerzo enorme de democratización y que lo necesitan desde antes, desde ayer —me refiero al caso de Túnez y a la urgencia de allegar los recursos para el desarrollo inmediato de este país—.

Por último, los nuevos instrumentos financieros, en casos como el Mecanismo «Conectar Europa» para las nuevas redes transeuropeas, deben aplicarse cuanto antes, sobre todo para desarrollar su nueva potencialidad; no estamos, sin embargo, dispuestos a aceptar lo que el Consejo pretende ahora, vía la revisión del marco plurianual, que es reducir su capacidad de aplicar la flexibilidad. No lo vamos a aceptar.

Para acabar, el ruego: necesitamos urgentemente que el empleo para los jóvenes fluya. Necesitamos ver, pues, que tanto el BEI como sus instrumentos no solo consiguieran proporcionar financiación, sino sobre todo hacer que estos empleos sean una realidad.

1-029-000

Jan Mulder (ALDE). - Voorzitter, het is al eerder gezegd, de Europese Investeringsbank heeft een benijdenswaardige reputatie: de bank heeft minder personeel dan de Wereldbank en leent meer geld uit. Zij kan dat doen - een en ander is trouwens goed uitgelegd in het verslag-Marinescu - omdat het een *triple A rating* heeft. Ook dat is een benijdenswaardige positie. Die komt onder andere doordat lidstaten het kapitaal van de Europese Investeringsbank garanderen. Mijn vraag, mijn opmerking in het algemeen is: als die lidstaten steeds lager geclassificeerd worden, ook hun *triple A rating* verliezen, wat voor effect heeft dat op de leencapaciteit van de Europese Investeringsbank?

Als wij kijken naar de recente meerjarenbegroting van Europa, dan is die voor de eerste keer in de geschiedenis lager dan de voorgaande. Automatisch hebben wij erbij bedongen dat meer verantwoordelijkheid zal worden gegeven aan die Europese Investeringsbank. Een euro die wordt uitgegeven via de Europese begroting is weg. Een euro die wordt gegeven aan de Europese Investeringsbank kan misschien wel twintig of dertig keer gebruikt worden. Dus op zichzelf is dat veel beter.

We hebben allerlei nieuwe programma's bedacht: eurobonds, transportbonds, meer werk voor het Europees investeringsfonds en noemt u maar op. Alles gaat gepaard met meer administratie, meer kleine projecten en dat soort dingen. Bij de Europese begroting zelf hebben wij daar geen goede ervaring mee. De Europese Rekenkamer weigert een betrouwbaarheidsverklaring af te geven voor diverse onderdelen van de Europese begroting. Hoe denkt de Europese Investeringsbank te vermijden dat haar projecten dezelfde moeilijkheden zullen ondervinden als soortgelijke projecten onder de Europese begroting.

Ten slotte, Voorzitter, er wordt gepraat over prioriteiten, over werkloosheid, energie, etc.. Ik zou zeggen, laten we ons, in het licht van de gebeurtenissen in de Oekraïne, vooral concentreren op duurzame energiebronnen.

1-030-000

Andrej Plenković (PPE). - Gospođo potpredsjednice, poštovana povjerenice Reding, poštovani predsjedniče Europske investicijske banke g. Hoyeru, prije svega želim čestitati kolegi Marinescu i Odboru za proračunski nadzor na ovom kvalitetnom i sveobuhvatnom izvješću.

U trenutnim teškim socijalnim okolnostima u nizu država članica gdje je velik broj nezaposlenih, gdje velik dio mladih ljudi ima poteškoća u pronalaženju posla, gdje je malim i srednjim poduzećima otežan pristup dugoročnim izvorima financiranja, Europska investicijska banka se pokazala kao dio rješenja za izlazak iz krize i tu je njezina uloga i njezina aktivnost do sada bila vrlo važna u promicanju i unapređivanju ciljeva Europske unije u pogledu rasta, u pogledu zapošljavanja, i prevladavanju poteškoća u kojima smo

protklih nekoliko godina. Zato smatram da je povećanje kapitala od 10 milijardi eura koje je odobrilo Vijeće guvernera omogućivši time dodatnih 60 milijardi eura za dugoročno kreditiranje projekata u prve dvije godine, od čega je dio već realiziran izuzetno pozitivan korak, kao i da je u 2012. čak 400 velikih projekata financirano u 60 zemalja. Pohvaljujem i želim da se održi visoki trostruki AAA rejting koji nam i omogućuje pozajmljivanje 71 milijarde eura s povoljnim kamatama na međunarodnom tržištu kapitala. Smatram da moramo i dalje provoditi projekte u pogledu radnih mjesta za mlade.

U vezi s vanjskim aktivnostima govorit ćemo sutra, želim samo pohvaliti jer prvi puta govorimo na hrvatskom u ovakvom kontekstu EIB-a, da je od 2001. čak 3,25 milijardi eura kredita plasirano u Hrvatsku, a vidimo povećanje u 2013. s 300 u 2012. već na preko 633. Želim reći također da bi bilo dobro da Europska investicijska banka zajedno s Europskom bankom za obnovu i razvoj i Razvojnou bankom Vijeća Europe usklađuje svoje mandate i izbjegava moguća preklapanja. U tom smislu podržavam sve ovo što je nabrojio u uvodnom govoru g. Hoyer kao dodatnu ulogu Europske investicijske banke unutar EU-a, ali u promicanju naših vanjskih ciljeva.

1-031-000

George Sabin Cutaș (S&D). - Doamnă președinte, doamnă vicepreședinte a Comisiei, domnule președinte Hoyer, stimați colegi, activitatea Băncii Europene de Investiții capătă o importanță deosebită în contextul nevoii acute de creștere economică și de reducere a șomajului și sărăciei în Uniunea Europeană. Doresc să reamintesc faptul că anumite state membre se confruntă în prezent cu rate ale șomajului mai mari de 25%, cu datorii publice superioare produsului intern brut sau cu un nivel ridicat al sărăciei și necesită investiții masive. De aceea salut recenta decizie de majorare a capitalului BEI, ce va permite punerea în mișcare a unui număr mai mare de proiecte benefice pentru cetățeni.

În același timp, având în vedere dificultățile întâlnite de întreprinderile mici și mijlocii, motorul economiei europene, atunci când se încearcă obținerea de finanțare, consider că acțiunile Băncii trebuie să se axeze în jurul promovării instrumentelor de finanțare pentru IMM-uri. Este totodată nevoie de direcționarea investițiilor către crearea de locuri de muncă, în special pentru tineri, și către proiecte de formare profesională și de deprindere a unor noi competențe.

1-032-000

Paul Rübzig (PPE). - Frau Präsidentin! Frau Kommissarin Reding, recht herzlichen Dank für den Bericht. Bei Präsident Hoyer bedanke ich mich für das Engagement und die Erfolgsgeschichte, die die EIB de facto in dieser Welt schreibt.

Die Kapitalerhöhung ist sehr gut dazu angetan ist, hier neue Standards zu setzen, vor allem im Bereich der Effizienz. Wir alle wissen, dass die Fazilität „Connecting Europe“ auf der einen Seite und die EIB auf der anderen Seite natürlich wichtige Impulse für die zukünftige Wettbewerbsfähigkeit Europas gestalten. Aber es geht vor allem auch darum, mit den Programmen zu zeigen, dass man mit *best practice* und Benchmarks natürlich auch neue Arbeitsplätze schafft. Neue Arbeitsplätze werden geschaffen, indem man die Selbständigkeit unterstützt und Selbständige dann die Hürde nehmen, den ersten Arbeitnehmer oder die erste Arbeitnehmerin aufzunehmen, sodass also Selbständige, KMU und Arbeitnehmer und Arbeitnehmerinnen eine wichtige Verbundwirkung haben.

Deshalb sollten wir auch sehen, wie der *return on investment* aussieht bei den Krediten, die vergeben werden, ob die Laufzeiten tatsächlich dem Bedarf jener entsprechen, die sie

brauchen, und wie die Ausfallraten in Zukunft reduziert werden können. Wir sehen auch, dass natürlich gerade im Mittelmeerraum eine große Attraktivität besteht, vor allem für erneuerbare Energie, für Umweltgesetzgebung und für Unterstützung, diese dann auch in den Ländern umzusetzen.

Zum Schluss gratuliere ich dem Europäischen Investitionsfonds, weil der natürlich auch eine ausgezeichnete Ergänzung darstellt.

1-033-000

Διαδίκασια "catch the eye"

1-034-000

Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE). - Először is szeretnék gratulálni Marinescu jelentéstevő úrnak, aki kiváló munkát végzett, bár a hangvétele kicsit kritikus, ugyanakkor azt gondolom, hogy helyénvaló, és jó áttekintést ad a riport.

Az Európai Beruházási Bank nem egy hagyományos kereskedelmi bank. Az a feladata, hogy a belső piacot kiegyensúlyozza, és egy egyenletes növekedést tudjon biztosítani. Figyelembe kell venni a tevékenységénél, hogy mik a problémás területek. Vannak ilyen térségek, vannak ilyen csoportok, és vannak ilyen vállalkozástípusok is.

Azt gondolom, hogy fontos, hogy amikor a bank a tevékenységét végzi, akkor ezeket áttekintse. Ezért tartom fontosnak és támogatandónak a kkv-eknek nyújtott hitelek kihelyezésének a növelését, akár hatásában ez 50 milliárdos nagyságrend is lehet, amit nagyon jónak tartok. Fontosnak tartom a tőkeemelést is, azonban szeretném megemlíteni, hogy ez a három A-s, tripla A besorolás nem lehet gátja annak, hogy a beruházási bank a célját és a feladatát elvégezze. Javasolni szeretném a hatástanulmányok szerepének a növelését, és olyan statisztikák elkészítését, amely alkalmas a célok visszamérésére is.

1-035-000

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D). - Doamnă președinte, salut raportul anual pentru 2012 al Băncii Europene de Investiții și realizarea planului operațional convenit, de a finanța circa 400 de proiecte în peste 60 de țări. Consider că se impune să se acorde o atenție mai mare investițiilor în creștere economică și în crearea de locuri de muncă pe termen lung. Cerem Băncii Europene de Investiții să dezvolte, în strânsă cooperare cu statele membre, planuri de investiții orientate spre rezultate, care să fie ajustate în mod corespunzător la prioritățile de creștere naționale, regionale și locale.

Solicităm Băncii Europene de Investiții, de asemenea, să stimuleze investiții viabile în instrumente de creanță, care să direcționeze capital privat către proiectele necesare de transport, energie și infrastructură în domeniul comunicațiilor și tehnologiei informației.

De asemenea, susținem necesitatea ca Banca Europeană de Investiții să depună eforturi mai intense pentru a sprijini capacitatea statelor membre de a absorbi resursele Uniunii Europene, inclusiv fondurile structurale, având în vedere ratele de absorbție extrem de mici care există actualmente în multe state membre.

Închei, doamnă președinte, spunând că este extrem de important ca mecanismul pentru interconectarea Europei să fie sprijinit și prin investiții prin BEL.

1-036-000

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). - Madam President, I would like to thank the rapporteur for his work on this report. I would be interested in some observations on paragraph []12 about the level of funding for the programme countries, but I also acknowledge that, in terms of Ireland, the support there has increased by 35[]% to EUR[]680 million in 2013 and that a lot of this investment has gone to communications, broadband, energy and education. So clearly they are vital parts of the economy.

In terms of SMEs, there is a fund of EUR[]200 million. Do you see the possibility of providing more for that sector? Because there are concerns that, in terms of credit and financing, Ireland could perhaps face another crisis in the SME sector when the bank stress tests are completed. It is something that I have a concern about. It was raised by Professor Morgan Kelly, who perhaps has a track record of predicting the unpredictable, and I think it might be worthy of comment.

1-037-000

Nikola Vuljanić (GUE/NGL). - Gospođo predsjedateljice, istraživanja koja je proveo američki znanstvenik Joseph Stiglitz govore da su prosječni prihodi radnika 2012. niži nego 1968. U tom je razdoblju bilo mnogo investicija, a mnoge je financirala i Europska investicijska banka. Nezaposlenost i dalje nezadrživo raste, pa ako bi mi netko objasnio gdje je tu uspjeh poslovanja? Očito da su i te investicije pridonijele bogaćenju uskog kruga bogatih, a ne povećanju standarda građana. Nije bez razloga povjerenje u kapitalizam temeljen na financijskom tržištu ne narušeno, nego ga više nema. Banka bi, kao i sav raspoloživi kapital, trebala biti mnogo više na usluzi svima pa i manjim poduzetnicima, pa bi u skladu s tim trebalo uvjetovati dodjelu sredstava nacionalnim razvojnim bankama, te više pažnje posvetiti korupciji do koje dolazi u tom postupku.

1-038-000

Andrew Henry William Brons (NI). - Madam President, the existence of the EIB is justified on the grounds of perceived need. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (ECON) bemoans the fact that there was a lack of sustainable and viable projects that were eligible for EIB funding. It appears that the EIB criteria did not match the investment need. There is certainly a need for investment in infrastructure in the Member States. However, investment can be carried out more cheaply, more efficiently and in a more targeted way by those Member States creating the credit themselves rather than borrowing from external institutions and adding sovereign debt.

The principle of 'what is physically possible must be financially possible' should be followed. President Obama, no less, when introducing the American Jobs Act, said it was a contradiction for a bridge in Maine to be in need of repair while construction workers were unemployed. However, the resolution of that contradiction seems to have eluded him.

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

1-039-000

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”*. – Doamnă președinte, aș vrea să adresez o întrebare antevorbitorului meu, care vorbea despre lipsa de proiecte durabile, vizavi de criteriile Băncii Europene de Investiții. Cu toate acestea, aș pune o întrebare, nu atât colegului meu, cât Băncii Europene de Investiții: ce

spuneți despre proiectul Nabucco, care devine cu atât mai durabil și mai important pentru Uniunea Europeană, mai ales în contextul crizei din Ucraina?

1-040-000

Andrew Henry William Brons (NI), *blue-card answer* . – (*Inaudible as microphone not switched on*) ... it is for the ECON Committee to reply to that and not for me to.

1-041-000

Ivana Maletić (PPE). - Gospođo predsjedavajuća, pozdravljam povjerenicu gđu Reding, predsjednika EIB-a g. Hoyera i zahvaljujem izvjestitelju na ovom izvješću, g. Marinescu. EIB je važan izvor financiranja za kapitalne investicije, nacionalni dio financiranja projekata koji se financiraju iz EU-fondova IPE, projekte srednjih i malih poduzetnika i poduzetničke infrastrukture te za inovativne i znanstvene projekte. Upravo ova ulaganja su pokretači rasta i razvoja te je zato uloga EIB-a u izlasku iz krize i preokretanju trendova jako važna. U Republici Hrvatskoj je još 2011. potpisan okvirni zajam s EIB-om za povoljno financiranje nacionalnog dijela za projekte koji se financiraju iz IPE, međutim sredstva se ne spuštaju do lokalnih jedinica nositelja projekata te se one i dalje nepovoljno zadužuju na tržištu. Važno je što prije aktivno koristiti izvore financiranja otvorene kroz EIB jer je cilj kvalitetna provedba kohezijske politike u svim državama članicama. Posebno je važan program Jaspers koji pomaže u kvalitetnoj pripremi infrastrukturnih projekata.

1-042-000

(Τέλος διαδικασίας "catch the eye")

1-043-000

Viviane Reding, *Vice-President of the Commission* . - Madam President, the current difficult economic and financial situation requires decisive policy action, and the EIB's activity is a crucial component of our efforts to bring back growth and employment to Europe. In this difficult environment it is important that the EIB assumes its role as a policy-driven bank, acts as a countercyclical institution and continues to provide financing to the real economy, especially in regions and sectors where funds are not available from other sources on reasonable terms.

I am convinced that Parliament's assessment of the EIB's activities in the year ahead will be as supportive as its opinion on the 2012 Annual Report, and I look forward to continued close and successful cooperation between the Commission and the Bank.

Finally, I would like to thank you again for the excellent collaboration in the preparations for the EIF capital increase. We look forward to bringing this important project to a successful outcome with you.

1-044-000

Werner Hoyer, *European Investment Bank* . - Madam President, let me start by thanking the Commission for its very good cooperation. The work that the European Investment Bank does would not be possible without the very close and trusting cooperation between the Commission and the Bank.

I would also like to thank all the Members of the European Parliament who have contributed to this debate today, as well as in the committee meetings. This has been very encouraging

for us. Of course, in a dynamic and vibrant Parliament there will also be contradictions in the arguments that are presented. I probably cannot do justice to each and every one of you who has contributed to this debate today, but I promise that we will come back to each of you individually if there are matters that I am unable to respond to here today.

Let me say that I read Bankwatch and publications from other institutions too. I believe that sometimes you may be misled a little and that the reinforcement of prejudices or stereotypes does not really serve any purpose. I would like to say here that it is pure nonsense that only 5% of the volume of investment goes to programme countries. We will come back to this in more detail.

I would also like to stress that the capital increase granted by the Member States – with the support of the Parliament and the Commission – has also enabled us to considerably raise the risk profile of the Bank's activities. This was very helpful for us, but raising the risk profile does not mean wasting money. This is a balance sheet. The EIB is not there to give grants. The EIB is first and foremost a bank. This is its *raison d'être* and the basis for everything we do, because every cent we lend comes from the capital markets.

We must have the strongest possible status in the capital markets in order to be able to do such business. I would also like to say that, when you enter upon a short-term request from the European Council concerning the big challenge of youth unemployment in Europe, you are under huge pressure to act quickly. Time is of the essence. If we want to address the issue of youth unemployment seriously, we must speed up the process.

We succeeded not only in beginning the disbursement of the pledged EUR 6 billion within one month from early July to early August, but also in disbursing 50% more than we had pledged. So do not expect the final analysis of the success story yet. It is simply too soon. I think we might even have to recalibrate – there is no doubt about this – after due analysis. We will do this.

There have been huge developments in the Bank. When this Bank was founded under the Treaty of Rome, nobody would have thought of doing business with SMEs on a short-term basis. At that time, the Bank was conceived of as a long-term lender for big infrastructure projects. Last year, we increased the volume of SME lending by almost a hundred percent to EUR 22 billion. This is a huge process that has changed the character of the Bank.

The developments on the capital markets and the state of affairs in banking are not such that we can assume that this pressure on SMEs will be reduced in the next couple of years. My concern is that, with the necessary changes in the process of achieving banking union, we might see a further credit crunch for SMEs in particular. We will therefore be present in this business as well.

The question about blue chip companies and SMEs is a contradiction that reflects old thinking. We are now living in a completely different world where the dual approach between SMEs and large corporations has produced the global value chain. Integration and interaction between companies of different sizes is therefore the name of the game in the modern world.

We can see that, in some countries, additional activity in SME business is probably necessary. We will come back to that, but I do not want to contribute to speculation about developments in the banking systems of individual countries. We can do that in detail as well.

I would like to express a major concern which I have for the European economy. Over ten years, the European economy has seen a reduction in investment. The investment level in the European Union and the Member States, today and over the last couple of years, is constantly some 15% below the value of 2007. What does that mean for the quality of the capital stock in the European Union? It is deteriorating from year to year because we do not invest enough. In addition to that, the European Union is losing ground to its global competitors when it comes to innovation, research, the promotion of technology, and education. The average contribution to innovation – the knowledge economy – in general in South Korea, Japan or the United States is far beyond 3% of GDP per year. In Europe for the last ten years, it has been consistently below 2%, with huge differences among the Member States.

So there is not only an investment gap but also an innovation gap in Europe. I wonder what our position in the world markets will be if we do not stop that trend very quickly. Therefore, I fully support the idea of doing more for SMEs. However, I also fully support the idea of finally jumping on the innovation wagon.

Is our infrastructure in Europe really perfect? I am rather doubtful about that. Consequently, I believe that it will be very difficult to end up with a balanced portfolio in the EIB. But this is something I am ready to discuss with you in detail, just as I am ready to give detailed answers to any of your questions individually if I could not give a quick response here today.

1-045-000

Marian-Jean Marinescu, *Raportor* . - Doamnă președinte, doamnă comisar Reding, domnule președinte Hoyer, tema cea mai dezbătută în ultimii ani în această sală a fost dezvoltare economică și locuri de muncă. Dezvoltare economică și locuri de muncă nu se pot face decât prin investiții și prin capital de lucru. Statele membre, datorită crizei economice, au scăzut investițiile publice; băncile, datorită problemelor pe care le-au avut, au scăzut creditele pentru IMM-uri și au și mărit costurile pentru finanțare. Dumneavoastră sunteți o bancă de investiții, ați putea să faceți exact aceste două lucruri: să dirijați credite pentru investiții și să ajutați să se mărească posibilitatea capitalului de lucru pentru IMM-uri.

Uniunea Europeană, prin fondurile europene, prin regulamentele noi pentru următorul exercițiu financiar, încurajează creșterea economică și crearea de locuri de muncă. Toate fondurile europene, toate regulamentele sunt elaborate în această direcție. Trebuie să colaborați cu statele membre, să puneți laolaltă fondurile dumneavoastră și fondurile europene astfel încât să puteți să ajutați și să vă îndepliniți acea promisiune de 500.000 de locuri de muncă în 2014. Este, cred, ceea ce trebuie să faceți dumneavoastră cu prioritate, și nu numai în țările foarte sigure, dar și în țările care au probleme. Și să știți că cei 5% sunt reali, aceste date sunt preluate din documentele dumneavoastră.

Mulțumesc colegilor pentru participarea la această dezbatere, mai ales pentru întrebările foarte pertinente puse și sper că ceea ce ați promis aici, ceea ce ați spus - v-ați angajat să răspundeți punctual la toate aceste întrebări - se va realiza foarte curând.

1-046-000

Πρόεδρος. - Η συζήτηση έληξε.

Η ψηφοφορία θα διεξαχθεί την Τρίτη 11 Μαρτίου 2014 στις 12.00 το μεσημέρι.

12. Ισότητα μεταξύ γυναικών και ανδρών το 2012 (συζήτηση)

1-048-000

Πρόεδρος. - Το επόμενο σημείο στην ημερήσια διάταξη είναι η συζήτηση σχετικά με την έκθεση της κ. Inês Cristina Zuber, εξ ονόματος της Επιτροπής Δικαιωμάτων των Γυναικών και Ισότητας των Φύλων, όσον αφορά την ισότητα μεταξύ γυναικών και ανδρών το 2012 [2013/2156(INI)].

Θα δώσω πρώτα τον λόγο στην εισηγήτρια.

1-049-000

Inês Cristina Zuber, relatora . - Comemorámos no passado sábado, dia 8 de março, o Dia Internacional da Mulher. Esta data não corresponde a qualquer acaso. Foi no dia 8 de março de 1857 que se deu uma luta heróica de trabalhadoras têxteis de Nova Iorque, luta essa pela redução do horário de trabalho de 16 para 10 horas, luta que foi brutalmente reprimida pela polícia.

É por esse motivo que a comunista alemã Clara Zetkin propôs, em 1910, a sua instituição. Quando celebramos o 104.º aniversário deste dia, urge olhar para a realidade verdadeira que atravessa a vida de muitas mulheres na União Europeia e, sobretudo, nos países da periferia económica e dos países onde a troica roubou não só os rendimentos, salários, pensões das suas populações, mas também os sonhos de muitas mulheres, o seu direito à emancipação e autonomia, negando valores que todos afirmamos partilhar: a igualdade entre homens e mulheres.

Todos sabemos que uma mulher sem independência económica está mais vulnerável em vários domínios da vida, muitas vezes mais vulnerável em relação à violência, tema que o Parlamento Europeu elegeu para discutir este ano.

Mas é precisamente nessa situação que o desemprego, ou o trabalho precário a tempo parcial, na qual trabalham um terço das mulheres da União Europeia as coloca: em situações de vulnerabilidade.

Todos dizemos que é necessário conciliar a vida profissional com a vida familiar e privada mas a proliferação das relações de trabalho ditas flexíveis em que as mulheres alternam de turno todos os dias ou todas as semanas, para além do aumento do horário de trabalho, como aconteceu no meu país, impede, na prática, essa conciliação.

Todos dizemos que a igualdade salarial é importante mas os estudos confirmam que, nos países intervencionados pela troica e devido às alterações das leis laborais que a própria Comissão Europeia acordou com os governos, o número de contratos coletivos de trabalho diminuiu exponencialmente.

Saberão os senhores que o trabalho com direitos, que os contratos negociados coletivamente são a melhor forma de garantir a igualdade salarial? Consideram aceitável que, na União Europeia, as mulheres tenham que trabalhar mais 59 dias para ganhar o mesmo que os homens?

Todos consideramos que a saúde sexual e reprodutiva é um direito das mulheres mas será que a diminuição de serviços públicos de saúde, o corte no investimento em saúde pública, ajuda na garantia desse direito? Certamente que não.

Todos consideramos que as mulheres devem viver com dignidade mas são mais as mulheres, 26% na União Europeia, do que os homens que se encontram em risco de pobreza. São as

mulheres que enfrentam, corajosamente, a triste realidade da pobreza infantil que está a crescer. Basta irem às escolas para perceberem este fenómeno da pobreza infantil, das crianças que vão para a escola sem comer.

Provavelmente, os cortes nos salários, os despedimentos, os cortes nas funções sociais do Estado, nos serviços públicos, nos apoios sociais não contribuíram para que a mulher vivesse com dignidade.

Aqueles que se confrontam com a realidade verão essa realidade por mais que a tentem ignorar. O próprio estudo que a Comissão Europeia fez sobre a igualdade de género em 2012, no qual esse relatório se baseia, atesta, sim, que, devido às medidas escolhidas para supostamente fazer face à crise, deparamo-nos infelizmente com um retrocesso ao nível da igualdade de direitos entre homens e mulheres. Seria lógico que a Comissão Europeia olhasse para os resultados dos próprios estudos que encomenda e alterasse, em consonância, a direção das suas políticas.

É que a luta pela igualdade não se mede em palavras nem em declarações de intenções, mas em ações concretas, transversais a vários domínios da política. Temos a certeza e a convicção de que as mulheres continuarão, corajosamente, essa luta pela igualdade.

1-050-000

Viviane Reding, *Vice-President of the Commission*. - Madam President, for over fifty years Europe has been leading the efforts towards gender equality. I am very proud of the substantial progress which has been achieved during those years – and also since this Commission took office – with the constant support of Parliament. I think the report which has just been explained by Madam Zuber is a testimony to the way Parliament has always taken the lead in advancing the cause of women.

We have come a long way, but we still need to reduce many obstacles which women are facing in their private, public and economic lives. Last year, in the framework of the Europe 2020 strategy for growth, the Commission addressed recommendations to 13 Member States aimed at promoting female employment. The Commission recommended that these Member States invest in childcare facilities and remove fiscal disincentives for second earners. In addition, the EU provides significant co-funding possibilities in order to help Member States to promote gender equality, notably through the European Structural and Investment Funds.

Perhaps the most manifest form of gender inequality – and here I agree absolutely with Madam Zuber – is the gender pay gap, which has barely decreased in recent years. Women earn on average 16.4% less than men, according to the latest figures. Now this, we all know, has multiple causes: women are working in undervalued and underpaid sectors and occupations; women are under-represented in senior and leadership positions; and they unequally share the burden of family and domestic responsibilities.

Other reasons, of course, are old societal patterns which say that women are not considered breadwinners by their employers, or simply the lack of information available to female employees. This is unacceptable, and we have to act.

The Commission has been consistently striving for equal pay to become a reality – be it by awareness-raising activities or by monitoring the application and enforcement of legislation on equal pay by the Member States. Last week, the Commission provided Member States with a toolbox of concrete measures to tackle pay discrimination and the persisting

gender pay gap in the form of a non-binding legal act. We adopted a recommendation on strengthening the principle of equal pay between men and women through increased transparency.

The first of its kind at EU level, this recommendation is a breakthrough, because more wage transparency could create further pressure for pay equality. The knowledge of different pay levels within a company or an industry is a powerful driver of change, and that knowledge is all too often missing today. This toolbox of measures builds on current best practices in the Member States and will assist social partners and national authorities to take concrete steps towards reducing the gender pay gap.

We should definitely continue to emphasise the economic reasoning against the gender pay gap and convince the overwhelmingly masculine business community that equality pays off. Women are still facing barriers to advancement into senior management positions. Today, they account for an average of 18% of the members of boards of directors in the largest publicly-listed companies. This is up from 12% three years earlier.

We have witnessed a real talent hunt in recent years, as companies started to hire more women for top senior positions in 2010, when the Commission first announced that it would consider targeted initiatives to improve gender diversity in companies. However, recent progress has not been evenly spread across the EU. Most of the significant improvements took place in countries which have taken or have considered taking legislative action.

As a consequence, the Commission adopted the proposed Directive for Women on Boards – you all know this directive – and I am very grateful for Parliament's support, as expressed in your first reading position. I really hope that the current blocking minority in the Council can be overcome. The Commission will continue to work constructively with co-legislators with a view to the speedy adoption of this landmark proposal.

Madam President, last week the Fundamental Rights Agency released the first ever European survey on violence against women in order to help us to understand the extent of the problem. You all know that the figures are alarming. You have called on the Commission to oppose violence against women, and we have responded. Together, we have put in place a comprehensive legal framework at European level to protect women against all forms of violence.

This framework includes the Directive on trafficking in human beings, the Directive against the sexual abuse and sexual exploitation of children and child pornography, the Directive on the European Protection Order applicable in criminal matters, the Regulation setting the European Protection Order covering the civil matters and, last but not least, the Directive on the rights of crime victims, stressing the need for specific and appropriate protection for victims of gender-based violence.

The European Commission also adopted a comprehensive policy package against female genital mutilation in November 2013. It co-funded, in this context, 14 national governments' campaigns against gender-based violence, as well as projects led by non-governmental organisations.

Madam President, honourable Members, we all know that it is only by uniting forces and by everybody taking their responsibility – at European level, at national level, at local level and at the level of the NGOs – that we can change things. We have to put our finger on the problem; we have to offer solutions to the problem. This we have done together in recent

years, and I thank Parliament for its very constructive and forward-looking actions. I also thank it for having really advanced the cause of women over the last few years.

1-051-000

Anne Delvaux, *au nom du groupe PPE*. – Madame la Présidente, Madame la Commissaire, ne nous voilons pas la face: si, en matière d'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes, des progrès sont enregistrés ça et là à l'échelle européenne, les chiffres de 2012 démontrent combien la tâche reste colossale. Il y a certes des nuances, par exemple quant au fait qu'en termes d'emploi et en chiffres absolus, les femmes ont, au départ, été moins affectées par la crise que les hommes, puisque ce sont prioritairement des secteurs d'activité dits masculins qui ont été frappés – ce qui démontre, ceci dit, l'inégalité structurelle du marché de l'emploi.

Néanmoins, pour ce qui est de la qualité de l'emploi des femmes, des salaires, des perspectives de carrière, de l'égalité des chances dans l'éducation, de la lutte contre les stéréotypes sexistes, par rapport aux violences conjugales, entre autres, toujours on en revient chaque année à se dire qu'il faut mener un combat de tous les jours pour toutes les femmes, quelles qu'elles soient.

Je veux dire par là que nous nous trouvons face à une question de droit fondamentale qui ne peut souffrir ni d'une récupération politique, ni d'une récupération idéologique. Malheureusement, en tant que rapporteure fictive, je déplore que le rapport qui nous sera soumis demain au vote se lise essentiellement à travers le prisme du travail, de la crise et des mesures d'austérité budgétaire qui ne toucheraient quasiment, selon la rapporteure, que les services publics. Il manque là, pour moi, toutes les nuances propres à nos vingt-huit États membres. Que dire des incohérences, des répétitions, des généralités, des déductions simplistes? Je prends par exemple le considérant Y qui, pour moi, est très illustratif.

Je ne rentrerai pas davantage dans les détails. C'est pour cette raison que nous avons décidé de déposer au PPE une résolution de remplacement qui nous paraît, elle, équilibrée et qui n'élude aucune question. Soyons bien clairs: nous prônons l'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes, mais les analyses et les solutions partisanes à l'échelle de l'Union ne sont ni réalistes ni applicables.

(L'oratrice accepte de répondre à une question "carton bleu" (article 149, paragraphe 8 du règlement))

1-052-000

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (S&D), *Întrebare adresată conform procedurii „cartonașului albastru”*. – Doamnă președinte, aș dori să o întreb pe dna Delvaux dacă nu consideră că raportul privind egalitatea de șanse între femei și bărbați ar trebui să includă și egalitatea în ceea ce privește reinsertia profesională a femeilor după perioade lungi de absență și mă refer aici la necesitatea ca statele membre să crească bugetul destinat asistenței copiilor, în special între 0 și 3 ani, dar chiar până la 7 ani, pentru a extinde rețeaua publică de servicii de îngrijire de zi, de grădinițe și de servicii care oferă servicii extracurriculare? Știm bine că în Europa sunt liste de așteptare pentru creșe și grădinițe, de până la 2 ani. Sunt convinsă că egalitatea de șanse trebuie să rezolve și această problemă.

1-053-000

Anne Delvaux (PPE), *réponse "carton bleu"*. – Je vous répondrai, Madame, que ce n'est pas ici, au Parlement européen, que l'on doit décider des crédits que l'on alloue au niveau national pour ces considérations-là. Sans cesse, vous invoquez la subsidiarité mais vous

ne comprenez pas ce que cela signifie. Nous nous retrouvons toujours avec des textes complètement fourre-tout. Dans le cas présent, il s'agit encore d'un texte où l'on mélange des compétences européennes et des compétences nationales. Je ne vous donnerai pas mon avis personnel sur ce sujet, mais je vous dirai simplement que, en tant que députée européenne, je me penche sur ce que nous devons pouvoir continuer à promouvoir ici et pas dans nos pays qui sont vingt-huit et donc très différents. Par conséquent, quand je vois des considérants comme le considérant Y – [nbsp] et je vous demande d'aller le relire [nbsp] –, cela me met en colère.

1-054-000

Edite Estrela, *em nome do Grupo S&D*. – Apesar dos progressos das últimas décadas, persistem muitas desigualdades: desigualdades no acesso ao mercado de trabalho e de progressão na carreira, desigualdades salariais, desigualdades no acesso à educação e à saúde e de participação nos processos de decisão, quer no setor económico quer na atividade política.

Com a crise e por causa da austeridade, a situação das mulheres europeias degradou-se, sobretudo nos países sob programas de ajustamento. Aumentou o desemprego, aprofundou-se o fosso salarial e aumentou a violência doméstica. Para além disso, verifica-se que as forças mais conservadoras europeias estão a aproveitar a crise para reduzir os direitos das mulheres. Estamos a assistir, por exemplo em Espanha, a um claro retrocesso no que diz respeito a conquistas civilizacionais como o direito à IVG legal e segura.

A conciliação da vida profissional e pessoal continua a ser um dos principais obstáculos à realização profissional e à independência económica das mulheres. A partilha das responsabilidades familiares e domésticas e a valorização da licença parental e de paternidade são condições indispensáveis à igualdade entre homens e mulheres.

Eu sou relatora da posição do Parlamento Europeu sobre a revisão da Diretiva sobre Licença de Maternidade que o Conselho mantém bloqueada desde 2010. Como é que os cidadãos vão confiar nas instituições europeias e acreditar que são genuínas as preocupações com o declínio demográfico?

1-055-000

Paul Rübzig (PPE), *Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“*. – Frau Estrela, ich möchte Sie fragen, warum eigentlich so wenige Frauen Unternehmerinnen sind. Und was könnte man eigentlich tun, damit sich mehr Frauen selbständig machen können und sich dann wirklich auch einen gerechten Lohn auszahlen können?

1-056-000

Edite Estrela (S&D), *Resposta segundo o procedimento "cartão azul"*. – Como eu disse, há muitas discriminações, há muitas desigualdades que persistem, ainda hoje, e há também os estereótipos que estão presentes na sociedade. Temos de combater os estereótipos, temos de combater as desigualdades e as discriminações. E há poucas mulheres empresárias precisamente porque têm mais dificuldade de acesso ao crédito: não é porque não tenham capacidade, não é porque não tenham competência, não é porque não sejam empreendedoras, têm mais dificuldade de acesso ao crédito e têm mais dificuldade em dispor de recursos para montar o seu próprio negócio. Mas quando as mulheres estão à frente das empresas, essas empresas têm tido bons resultados e têm aumentado a sua cotação, inclusivamente na bolsa.

1-057-000

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica, *en nombre del Grupo ALDE* – Señora Presidenta, señora Comisaria, quiero felicitar a la señora Zuber por este trabajo, porque creo que incorpora con fuerza una idea sobre la que hay que insistir: la igualdad de género, además de una cuestión de justicia, es una inversión. La desigualdad no es solo una injusticia. Además de generar marginación, lesionar derechos fundamentales y producir muchas veces violencia, es una catástrofe desde el punto de vista económico. La desigualdad implica desaprovechar la fuerza laboral, la formación y la capacidad de la mitad de la población. Y eso, además de injusto, es ineficiente.

Decenas de investigaciones demuestran que las mujeres, con la misma preparación que los hombres, aportamos otras habilidades a la economía y mejores dinámicas a la convivencia. Para empezar, porque hemos aprendido mucho sobre la gestión emocional y ese es hoy un factor de excelencia y de competitividad. Hay que empezar a medir estadísticamente esa aportación para que sea nítida y visible.

Lo necesitamos todas y todos, pero sobre todo los escépticos. Las cosas empezarán a cambiar de verdad cuando quienes se resisten a la igualdad —que suelen ser los mismos que, bajo el pretexto de la austeridad, están recortando el modelo social europeo— comprendan que estamos hablando sobre desarrollo, competitividad, innovación y eficacia, y también, además, sobre valores, humanidad y derechos fundamentales.

Si de verdad aspiramos a un desarrollo inteligente, sostenible e integrador, no podemos marginar por más tiempo el talento, la capacidad y el conocimiento solo cuando son las mujeres quienes aportan estos recursos. Esa conducta es insostenible y no produce cohesión social. La desigualdad es incompatible con la Estrategia Europa 2020.

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

1-058-000

Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE), *Kékkártyás kérdés* . – Nem gondolja a Képviselő asszony, hogy nem helyénvaló az a megközelítés, hogy nem lehet elégszer hangsúlyozni ezt a kérdést? Nem lenne sokkal hangsúlyosabb az, és fontosabb, ha koncentrálnánk arra, hogy mi az Európai Unió hatásköre és feladata és mi a nemzeti hatáskör?

Nem gondolja a Képviselő asszony, hogyha ez a jelentés koncentráltabb lett volna, akkor hasznosabb is lenne? Nem gondolja a Képviselő asszony, hogyha azzal foglalkoznánk, hogy a statisztikába miért nem kerülnek bele az önfoglalkoztatók, meg a mikrovállalkozásoknak az adatai, meg egyes ágazatoké, akkor teljesebb képet kapnánk erről a helyzetről? Nem lenne itt teendők még?

1-059-000

Izaskun Bilbao Barandica (ALDE), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»* . – Lo que creo es que este informe define claramente qué es lo que se pide a la Comisión y qué es lo que se pide a cada uno de los Estados miembros. Y lo que nos hace falta es voluntad política firme por parte de los responsables políticos, y sobre todo de los Estados, para acabar de una vez con la desigualdad, una desigualdad que, como vimos en el primer informe europeo, genera como una consecuencia directa unas cifras de violencia que son insostenibles.

Mantenemos todavía los estereotipos y persisten las dificultades de las mujeres para acceder al mercado laboral, porque son mayoritariamente ellas quienes se ocupan del cuidado de los niños y de los mayores. Por tanto, yo echo de menos más voluntad política, una voluntad firme de los Estados para aplicar programas concretos que están bien definidos en este informe, tanto lo que se pide a la Comisión como lo que se pide a los Estados.

1-060-000

Marije Cornelissen, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Madam President, this report gives us an excellent opportunity to look back and to look ahead. Looking back, I think the Commission – as well as Parliament – may be very proud of the directives that we have turned out, among other things, on maternity and paternity leave, and on women on boards. Unfortunately, however, no-one has benefited from these directives in practice, because the Council is not doing its part of the work. If the Council is serious about gender equality, unblocking these directives needs to be a top priority.

Meanwhile, the Commission need never be bored in the next term. Parliament is eagerly awaiting new proposals for directives, such as on the gender pay gap and – a binding one, please – on violence against women, on paternity, adoption and filial leave. If all three institutions do their part, EU citizens will be able to notice a change for the better.

Finally, a short remark on the report itself: though we support almost everything that is in it, we cannot vote in favour if paragraph 67 on prostitution is not deleted. I sincerely hope that it will be.

1-061-000

Ruža Tomašić, *u ime kluba ECR*. – Gospođo predsjedateljice, cijeli sam svoj radni vijek provela radeći poslove kojima dominiraju muškarci, prvo u policiji, a potom u politici, pa iz prve ruke znam koliki se izazovi nalaze pred ženom koja želi ostvariti profesionalnu karijeru.

Bila sam i jedna od onih koje ova rezolucija smatra posebno ranjivima – migrantica, jer sam kao maloljetna djevojka otišla živjeti, školovati se i raditi u Kanadu. Nisam imala poseban tretman kakav nam izvjestiteljica predlaže, ali sam zato danas sretna što mogu reći kako sam uspjela isključivo svojom zaslugom.

Duboko vjerujem u jednakost žena i muškaraca, ali sam sigurna da do tog cilja nećemo stići uvodeći još malo diskriminacije u cijelu priču. Naime, i pozitivna diskriminacija je diskriminacija i kao takva je nepoželjna u borbi za jednakost.

Želim ovim putem također poručiti da je daljnje plasiranje stavova o dobrovoljnom prekidu trudnoće kao ženskom pravu potpuno kontraproduktivno i da bi trebalo poštovati odluke ovoga doma koji ih je već nekoliko puta odbacio.

1-062-000

Mikael Gustafsson, *för GUE/NGL-gruppen*. – Fru talman! Det största hotet mot jämställdheten ligger inte inom ramen för jämställdhetsområdet utan inom det ekonomiska området. För åtstramningspolitiken har drabbat kvinnor dubbelt. Först genom att det blev färre arbeten i den offentliga sektorn och sedan, när service inom äldreomsorg, förskola, skola monterats ner, så är det kvinnorna som förväntas ta det obetalda arbetet.

Mot bakgrund av detta är det logiskt att min kollega, fru Zuber, har ett fokus i betänkandet på EU-krisen och dess effekter på jämställdheten och kvinnors rättigheter. För vi ser idag hur flera årtiondes kamp för jämställdhet och kvinnors rättigheter håller på att raseras. Otrygga anställningar, diskriminering på arbetsmarknaden, ökat ansvar för oavlönat arbete, tvång att arbeta deltid, försämrade pensioner och en ökning av våld i hemmet.

EU säger sig stå för jämställdhet, men driver faktiskt idag en åtstramningspolitik som leder åt det andra hållet. Så vi behöver inte ett välbalanserat betänkande, som fru Delvaux säger, utan vad vi behöver är en ny politik och en ny väg. För den nuvarande vägen, den leder mot ruinens brant.

1-063-000

VORSITZ: RAINER WIELAND

Vizepräsident

1-064-000

Jaroslav Paška, *za skupinu EFD* . – Veľká časť predloženej správy sa venuje sociálnej nerovnosti a diskriminácii žien vyvolanej opatreniami a politikou EÚ. Minulý týždeň zverejnená správa porovnáva úroveň odmeňovania mužov a žien v mojej krajine potvrdila skutočnosť, že ženy za rovnakú prácu dostávajú približne o [nbsp]20[nbsp]% nižšiu mzdu ako muži.

Napriek deklarovanému úsiliu Únie o odstránenie mzdovej diskriminácie žien sa v [nbsp]reálnom živote v tejto oblasti nič nemení. Popri uvedenej mzdovej diskriminácii voči mužom sú však ženy vo východnej Európe ešte výraznejšie diskriminované vo [nbsp]svojich mzdách v porovnaní so ženami pracujúcimi u tých istých zamestnávateľov v starých členských štátoch Únie.

Aj v mojej krajine pôsobia nadnárodné obchodné reťazce, ako sú Tesco, Billa, Carrefour, Lidl a pod. Ženy pracujúce v pokladniach, skladoch či prevádzkach týchto zamestnávateľov však v spoločnom hospodárskom priestore EÚ dostávajú za [nbsp]tú istú prácu, akú robia ich kolegyne v Nemecku, Rakúsku či Belgicku alebo Holandsku u [nbsp]tých istých firiem, iba polovičnú mzdu.

Za liter mlieka, chlieb pre deti či elektriku alebo teplú vodu však platia rovnaké ceny, aké sú vďaka spoločnému hospodárskemu priestoru prakticky po celej Únii. Teda také isté ceny tovarov, aké sú aj v bohatých štátoch EÚ.

1-065-000

Edit Bauer (PPE). - Egyetlen témát szeretnék kiemelni a jelentésből, a bérszakadék kérdését, úgy, ahogy azt a Biztos asszony is tette, aminek az ad különös aktualitást, hogy a Bizottság a múlt héten erre vonatkozó ajánlásokat fogadott el.

Annak ellenére, hogy hosszú távon javuló a tendencia, ahogy azt a Biztos asszony is említette, a rendelkezésre álló legfrissebb statisztikai adatok – melyek közt most is sok az előzetes – a 2012-es évet veszik alapul, és azt mutatják, hogy az utóbbi két évben, tehát 2010-hez képest a bérszakadék az EU-s átlagot, vagy az euróövezet átlagát tekintve nőtt 0,2%-kal. A tagállamok tekintetében pedig 16 országban mélyült a bérszakadék ebben az időszakban.

A Parlament 2012-es határozata ebben a témában hangsúlyozta, hogy a létező európai jog ezen a területen alacsony határfokú. A trend sem egyenes irányú, helyzetenként változik, s mint látjuk, a visszafejlődés, a negatív irányultság is a jellemzői közé tartozik.

A Bizottság múlt héten elfogadott ajánlásai összhangban vannak a Parlament határozatával, jó irányba mutatnak, és ezért üdvözlendőek. Ami azonban határozottan kívánnivalót hagy maga után, az az anyag jellege. Mivel az ajánlások nem hordoznak jogi kötelezettséget, nem várható, hogy hatékonyabbak legyenek, mint a kötelező joganyag. Annak pedig a nők milliói az elszenvedői, hogy a joganyag maga kevésbé hatékony.

1-066-000

Zita Gurmai (S&D). - Mr President, this report is the opportunity to have a genuine state of play for gender equality in the European Union and to acknowledge the progress achieved but also to identify the remaining shortcomings and imbalances. There are numerous equalities in the field of employment which, in decision-making as well as the elimination of violence against women, are far from being a reality. We need more efficient policies towards the reconciliation of work and private life to give women the chance to be fully integrated on the labour market. The gender pay gap is still very high, as my friend Ms Bauer mentioned, and produces an even greater gender pension gap: currently 39% on average in the European Union. In addition to these deeply-rooted inequalities, the crisis has hit women hard and widened these inequalities through the degradation of working conditions and as a result of the austerity measures. We need to learn from these failures. It is high time for concrete and better gender mainstreaming in all social and economic policies of the Union, from their conception to their implementation.

When it comes to the impact of the fiscal consolidation, this Parliament had already asked for a real assessment of these measures on equality between women and men. It is therefore important that the angle is included in the report. If we want to achieve a modern democratic European Union with equal opportunities, rights and these possibilities for all, we cannot overlook those issues. For equality between women and men is one of the most important prerequisites for prosperity, economic growth and the advancement of our society.

1-067-000

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE). - Herr Präsident! Frauen sehen sich mit Problemen wie Arbeitslosigkeit, prekären Arbeitsverhältnissen und Lohndiskriminierung konfrontiert. Wann ist es endlich selbstverständlich, dass Frauen bei gleicher Arbeit und gleicher Ausbildung das gleiche Geld erhalten? Ebenso sehen sich viele Frauen in der Europäischen Union mit Gewalterfahrungen konfrontiert. Wann wird es endlich den Tag geben, an dem es keine solchen Zahlen und Berichte gibt wie letzte Woche den Bericht *Violence against Women*? Es muss endlich selbstverständlich sein, dass Gleichstellung nicht mehr nur ein Wunsch ist, sondern Tatsache!

Frau Vizepräsidentin, Sie haben viel getan, Sie haben in der Tat dieses Thema immer sehr unterstützt. Wir können Ihnen alle sehr dankbar sein. Ich wünsche mir, dass die Kommission dies weiter betreibt, dass es für den Rat selbstverständlich ist, die Notwendigkeit zur Veränderung und zur Änderung endlich einzusehen und auch entsprechend voranzutreiben. Dann brauchen wir sicher keine solchen Debatten mehr.

1-068-000

Csaba Sógor (PPE). - A nők és a férfiak társadalmi egyenlőségének problémája számos kérdést vet fel, több szempontból elemezhető. Rendkívül fontos, hogy az egyenlő munkáért egyenlő bért alapelveket érvényesíteni tudjunk, hiszen a statisztikai adatok rendre alátámasztják ennek a rendkívül súlyos diszkriminatív helyzetnek a meglétét.

Meggyőződésem, hogy a nők döntéshozatalban való fokozottabb részvételének elősegítése, ezáltal a nők arányának növekedése a különböző testületekben jótékony hatással lenne döntéseinkre. Minden kérdésben szükség van arra a megközelítésmódra, amely inkább a hölgykollégáinkra jellemző. A probléma legfontosabb vetületének mégis a családpolitikai intézkedéseket, azok hiányát tartom.

Mindent meg kell tennünk annak érdekében, hogy a nők gyermekvállalása, a gyermekek száma kevésbé függjön a család gazdasági helyzetétől. Ne gazdasági döntés legyen az, hogy mikor és hány gyermeket vállal egy család. Ugyanakkor elő kell segítenünk, hogy a hölgyek ésszerű kompromisszumokat köthessenek a gyermeknevelés és a karrierépítés között. A cél az, hogy összeegyeztethető legyen a családi élet és a munka világa, ezen a téren pedig sok még a tennivaló.

1-069-000

Zdravka Bušić (PPE). - Gospodine potpredsjedniče, gospođo povjerenice, temu kojom se ovo izvješće bavi smatram jako važnom. Istina je da su žene na određenim pozicijama još uvijek manje plaćene od muškaraca na istim pozicijama. Žene teže dolaze do upravljačkih pozicija i postotak žena uvijek je manji na političkim funkcijama. Žene su i ugroženija skupina – na zadnjoj plenarnoj sjednici raspravljali smo o nasilju nad ženama. Brojke koje izvjestiteljica navodi jesu zabrinjavajuće i trebamo reagirati na njih, ali način koji izvješće predlaže je pristran i ideološki obojen te kao takvo izvješće ne bi smjelo postati službeno stajalište ovog visokog doma, jedinog legitimnog predstavničkog tijela građana Europske unije. Ono čime je ovo izvješće protkano i ono što se između redaka krije je relativizacija strukture temeljne društvene zajednice, a to je obitelj. Treba li Europska unija svakoj državi članici dati okvir kako bi obitelj trebala izgledati? Ovo izvješće predlaže niz vrlo problematičnih točaka. Navela sam samo nekoliko primjera iz ovog izvješća s kojima se ne mogu složiti. Ono što smatram zabrinjavajućim je činjenično stanje demografske slike Europske unije, ali taj problem se nikada neće riješiti ovakvim preporukama. Ženama treba omogućiti da budu majke i olakšati im majčinstvo poticajnim mjerama. Treba im omogućiti da budu nositeljice društva i vrijednosti i vrednovati tu njihovu ulogu.

1-070-000

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D). - Domnule președinte, Strategia pentru egalitatea între femei și bărbați 2010-2015 constată că, deși femeile reprezintă aproape jumătate din forța de muncă din Uniunea Europeană și peste jumătate din absolvenții de facultate, femeile sunt încă subreprezentate în procesele și pozițiile decizionale.

O problemă deosebită o reprezintă femeile din mediul rural, care au o rată de ocupare mult mai mică decât femeile din mediul urban. Multe femei din mediul rural nu au fost niciodată active pe piața forței de muncă; astfel, nu sunt înregistrate ca șomere, ceea ce conduce la probleme de ordin financiar și juridic în ceea ce privește dreptul la concediu de maternitate și la concediu medical, la dobândirea dreptului de pensie și securitate socială. Cotele de reprezentare, responsabilitățile familiale, egalitatea de remunerare, introducerea cotelor de gen pentru angajatori, cotele de reprezentare în procesul decizional, dublate de

competențe și abilități, sunt pași importanți, care pot contribui la egalitatea de gen în Uniunea Europeană.

1-071-000

Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE). - Igen, ezekben a napokban minden a nőkről szól, és ez a megbecsülés, ez a kiemelt figyelem nagyon fontos számunkra. Szívesen ide sorolnám ezt a jelentést, de nem teszem, mert valójában azt gondolom, hogy kissé zavarodott, struktúra nélküli, és nem tekintem elemzésnek.

Egyetértek képviselőtársaimmal, akik azt mondták, hogy politikai akarat szükséges ahhoz, hogy itt eredményeket tudjunk elérni. Valóban, én egy olyan politikai csoporthoz tartozom, amelynek a kormányzati munkája eredményes volt ezen a területen. Számunkra, a mi pártcsaládunk számára a nők és az édesanyák megbecsülése az elsődleges. Ezért olyan családpolitikai intézkedéseket vezettünk be, amely első helyen, és valódi módon kezeli ezt a kérdést. Önök beszéltek a GYES-ről, mi három évre kiterjesztettük. Beszéltek arról, hogy a munkát és a családot össze kell tudnunk egyeztetni.

Szeretném elmondani, hogy Magyarországon most már nem kell választani kényszerből a nőknek, hanem lehetőséget kapnak a szabad választásra, úgy, hogyha visszamennek dolgozni, még a gyermekgondozási díjról sem kell lemondaniuk. El szeretném mondani, hogy a közbiztonságot úgy tudtuk növelni, hogy a nők elleni erőszakot csökkenteni tudjuk. Olyan megbecsülést adunk az idős korú nőknek, hogy negyven éves munkaviszony után elmehetnek dolgozni. Olyan adórendszerrel vezettünk be, amely a családokat támogatja. Hosszú a sor, nem tudom felsorolni ezt, valóban politikai akarat kell hozzá, Elnök úr, és tisztelt jelentéstevő, és ez Magyarországon nem kívánság, hanem valósággá vált.

1-072-000

Biljana Borzan (S&D). - Gospodine predsjedavajući, na prošloj plenarnoj sjednici govorila sam o problemima nasilja nad ženama, a ovaj puta na dnevnom redu imamo izvješće o pravima žena koje u prvi plan stavlja ekonomsku jednakost. Istraživanja pokazuju kako unatoč tome što je više visokoobrazovanih žena od muškaraca, ipak muškarci zauzimaju 91 [nbsp]% najviših upravnih pozicija. Za ista radna mjesta žene su manje plaćene u odnosu na muške kolege te se procjenjuje da odrade čak 59 radnih dana godišnje besplatno. Kada se radi o djeci mlađoj od 12 godina, 90 [nbsp]% njihovih očeva, a 65 [nbsp]% majki je zaposleno. Viši je udio žena u broju nezaposlenih te su u većem riziku od siromaštva. Ta statistika koje se i Europski parlament svakoga ožujka, uoči Međunarodnog dana žena, sjeti govori puno sama za sebe. Međutim, ne smijemo zaboraviti da je to i stvarnost koju 52 [nbsp]% populacije Europske unije svakodnevno živi. Mi se svaki dan moramo boriti za prava žena jer nama je svaki dan Dan žena.

(Govornica se složila da odgovori na pitanje podizanjem plave kartice na osnovi članka 149. stavka 8. Poslovnika.)

1-073-000

Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris (PPE), Domanda "cartellino blu". – Signor Presidente, cari colleghi, in questa relazione si parla anche di interruzione volontaria di gravidanza, spesso questa scelta è dettata da condizioni di disagio economico. Lei ritiene che quando sia questa la ragione che induce a questa scelta dolorosa, le istituzioni debbano intervenire aiutando la donna a proseguire la gravidanza o favorendo il maggiore accesso alle pratiche di interruzione?

1-074-000

Biljana Borzan (S&D), odgovor na pitanje postavljeno podizanjem plave kartice. – Zahvaljujem se na pitanju. Ja sam po struci liječnica i ono što sam kroz cijeli svoj fakultet i kroz svoju praksu vidjela to je da zabranom pobačaja, nekakvim represivnim mjerama se neće djelovati tako da se smanji broj pobačaja odnosno povećat će se broj komplikacija i bit će ugroza života žene. No u svakom slučaju ja nisam za pobačaj u smislu da se on koristi kao kontracepcijska metoda, smatram da svako društvo treba pomoći ženi da na neki način regulira svoju obitelj, ali ne pobačajem ako je to ikako moguće.

1-075-000

Regina Bastos (PPE). - Senhor Presidente, Senhora Comissária, Caras Colegas, os direitos das mulheres e a igualdade de oportunidades continuam a ser uma ambição por cumprir. O relatório agora em debate é um alerta para a necessidade de mais progressos mas a forma escolhida pela relatora não é isenta de polémica.

A abordagem proposta pelo Partido Popular Europeu é mais equilibrada e justamente direcionada para as questões da igualdade salarial, para a conciliação da vida familiar e da vida profissional e para o combate à violência contra as mulheres.

Lamentavelmente, as mulheres mais jovens são mais diplomadas do que os homens, mas isso não significa que estejam mais bem representadas e tenham uma justa e equilibrada representação nos processos de decisão económica. Pelo contrário, as mulheres continuam a estar em maioria nos empregos precários.

Destaco uma desigualdade, entre tantas que prejudicam as mulheres e envergonham a nossa sociedade: a persistência de um fosso salarial de mais de 16%, que representa 60 dias de trabalho não remunerado para as mulheres, e a desigualdade na promoção das carreiras profissionais, que não pode ser tolerada na Europa do século XXI.

A conciliação entre a vida profissional e a vida familiar é uma condição essencial para eliminar os obstáculos que as mulheres enfrentam no acesso ao mercado de trabalho e para que a igualdade entre os géneros seja uma realidade.

1-076-000

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

1-077-000

Davor Ivo Stier (PPE). - Gospodine potpredsjedniče, doista jednakost između žena i muškaraca je jedno temeljno pravo i s druge strane vidimo da u Europskoj uniji ipak žene za isti posao dobivaju 16% manje nego muškarci. Zato sam se doista uvijek zalagao za jednakost žena i muškaraca, evo zajedno s potpredsjednicom Komisije smo napisali i jedan članak u hrvatskim novinama zalažući se za to da bude veći postotak žena i u upravama trgovačkih društava. Naravno da sam podržao i definiciju prostitucije kao nasilja nad ženama i jednakost u plaćama između žena i muškaraca.

S druge strane, žao mi je što je izvjestiteljica u ovom izvješću, pogotovo kad su neka pitanja kao što je pravo na život, išla jednim ideološkim pristupom i da će to onemogućiti i da svi zastupnici ili da velika većina zastupnika podrži ovako važno izvješće. Mislim da kada je pitanje ravnopravnost žena i muškaraca trebali bismo ostaviti ideologiju sa strane i doista staviti pravo žena u prvi plan.

1-078-000

Marita Ulvskog (S&D). - Herr talman! Jämställda löner är otroligt viktigt, men det finns en väg att gå innan vi hamnar där som är otroligt avgörande för att kvinnor och män ska leva lika rika och jämställda liv. Det är att det finns ett samhällsansvar för barnomsorgen, att det finns föräldraförsäkring som gör att både mamman och pappan kan vara lediga med sitt barn när det är fött och att både mamman och pappan kan få en relation till barnen i familjen.

Det är grunden för den vandringsomgång som sedan innebär att kvinnor kan skaffa sig utbildning om de inte redan har den, att de kan få ett jobb, att de har en egen lön. Det är ett jämställt samhälle som alla tjänar på i ekonomiska termer, i sociala termer, för barnens skull och för hela familjens skull.

1-079-000

Andrew Henry William Brons (NI). - Mr President, the explanatory memorandum in Ms Zuber's report says that the effects of austerity in Greece, Ireland, Portugal and elsewhere are that women are suffering disproportionately, but of course all workers are suffering from those measures, not just women. The urgent need is to end the austerity programmes she refers to, and membership of the euro area which is the thing that they are supposed to sustain. When those countries benefit from an export-led expansion following withdrawal from the euro area, there will indeed be prosperity to be divided fairly between men and women, which must happen. To seek to divide austerity fairly is to exonerate its architects from responsibility and distract attention from the cause of their suffering.

1-080-000

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedavajući, čuli smo danas puno podataka pa evo još jedan podatak koji govori da u svim parlamentima svijeta ima 45.848 žena, što čini 21,4% žena. Evo, već u parlamentima imamo nejednakost, a tako je gotovo u svim segmentima društva. Dakle, neprihvatljivo je da ima 51% žena na cijeloj zemaljskoj kugli, a da žene su diskriminirane i da su podcijenjene i nisu jednako tretirane. Ova rezolucija govori o tri osnovne teme, to su ekonomska neovisnost i jednake plaće, druga je jednakost u procesu donošenja odluka i treća je nasilje nad ženama. Želim se zahvaliti povjerenici Reding što je dio svog mandata posvetila upravo želji da do 2020. godine 40% žena bude na rukovodećim mjestima u malim i srednjim poduzećima. U svakom slučaju, treba što više govoriti i otvarati ove teme i želim zahvaliti... (Predsjedavajući je zastupnici oduzeo riječ.)

1-081-000

(*Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens*)

1-082-000

Viviane Reding, Vice-President of the Commission. - Mr President, I would like to thank all the Members who have insisted that much has been done, but also that so much remains to be done. It is true that the crisis has not helped women to develop further but has rather weakened the weakest part of our workforce.

Concerning specific issues, I would like to thank those Members who have emphasised the great effort that has been made in recent years to combat – in a concrete way and in

places where we can legislate – violence against women and to create directives that would help those who have become victims of such violence.

Concerning the Equal Pay Directive, you might remember that in December [nbsp]2013 the Commission adopted a report on the implementation of this directive in real terms. The findings of this report indicate that the main challenge for the Member States is the correct application and enforcement of rights in this directive. It is therefore the practical application of the directive and the way it is applied in real terms in the Member States that needs to be changed, not the directive itself.

One of the main findings of the report is that the implementation of the principle is hindered mostly by the lack of transparency in pay systems. That is the reason why we have presented the recommendation: in order to strengthen this principle of transparency. The measures include the entitlement of employees to request information on levels of pay broken down by gender for categories of employees doing the same work or work of equal value; the employer's regular reporting of wages by category of employee or position, broken down by gender – this would, of course, be limited to large and medium companies, because we do not wish to be hard on SMEs; conducting pay audits in large companies; and, most importantly, including equal pay issues and pay audits in collective bargaining. If this were to be implemented in accordance with the report which we have seen, it would help the Equal Pay Directive to be implemented in a more transparent way in real life.

I would like to thank all the Members for their strong commitment to promoting equality between women and men. Over the last few years, the combination of gender mainstreaming with specific measures to promote gender equality have borne fruit. We have achieved a great deal and we should continue with this dual approach in the future. We should also take on the main challenges still to be faced, which are laid out in the Parliament's reports and the amendments.

1-083-000

Inês Cristina Zuber, *relatora*. - Em primeiro lugar, queria fazer um comentário. Houve vários deputados aqui que consideraram o meu relatório ideológico. A questão é que essa não é uma acusação. Não se pode fazer uma acusação de ser-se ideológico porque todas as posições políticas, todas as decisões políticas são ideológicas. Elas são de diferentes ideologias. Podemos dizer: bem, eu não gosto da tua ideologia. Mas não podemos acusar de ser ideológicos porque isso é algo que é intrínseco à atividade política e não há aqui alguns que são ideológicos e outros que são neutros ou naturais ou o que quer que seja.

Em relação à resolução proposta pelo PPE, eu confesso que não entendo muito bem quais os problemas que têm com parágrafos do relatório. Penso que é óbvio que a pobreza também está associada à diminuição dos apoios sociais, isso está estudado. Penso que é óbvio que se devem rejeitar situações de flexibilidade que não permitem a organização e a estabilidade da vida familiar. Penso que é óbvio que devemos afirmar o princípio do salário igual para trabalho igual, aliás consubstancia a ideia da igualdade salarial. Penso que é óbvio que os governos e as entidades patronais têm que respeitar os direitos das mulheres a serem mães sem perda de direitos laborais. Penso que é óbvio que a crise económica tem favorecido vários fenómenos de violência. Penso que é óbvio que se devem aumentar os serviços públicos de saúde gratuitos às mulheres vítimas de violência.

O relatório que aqui está apresentado foi feito com base num relatório da própria Comissão Europeia que, precisamente, considera que a questão do emprego e da crise é, hoje, aquilo

que mais caracteriza a evolução ao nível da igualdade de géneros entre homens e mulheres e, por isso, foca-se nesses aspetos.

Nós não fazemos mais do que comentar esse relatório. Quero, por fim, agradecer a todos aqueles que contribuíram para que este relatório estivesse como está e espero que haja um relatório que...

(O Presidente retirou a palavra à oradora)

1-084-000

Der Präsident. - Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, den 11.[nbsp]März 2014, um 12 Uhr statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149 GO)

1-084-500

John Attard-Montalto (S&D), *in writing.* – The report on equality between women and men is a laudable one. It treats the aspect of gender equality from all facets. It is unbelievable that even in the Western World there is still the need to emphasise those areas where gender equality does not exist. Of course in many other regions of the world the situation is worse and needs to be addressed in a balanced way. Unfortunately the report includes references to reproduction issues and in particular to abortion. As is known throughout the European Union, Malta is adverse to these issues. The two political parties which dominate the political scene, the Church and non-governmental organisations are against abortion under any circumstances. In view of this I will have to vote against the articles referring to this subject. Against my will, I will also have to vote against the report as a whole. The reason is because, when the S&D Malta Delegation votes against specific clauses on abortion but then votes in favour of the report, it is unbelievable how we are criticised.

1-084-750

Monika Flašíková Beňová (S&D), *písomne.* – Hospodárska a finančná kríza výrazne zmenila tvár Európskej únie. Priniesla so sebou vysokú nezamestnanosť a[nbsp]destabilizáciu sociálneho systému v mnohých členských štátoch. Najzraniteľnejšími členmi každej vyspelej spoločnosti sú deti a ženy. Ženy sú vystavené vyššiemu riziku straty zamestnania ako muži. Ženy musia čeliť zníženiu skutočnej hodnoty ich dôchodkov a reálnych miezd a diskriminácií v odmeňovaní. Európska únia sa snaží o[nbsp]zrovnoprávnenie žien a mužov prostredníctvom stratégie rovnosti medzi mužmi a[nbsp]ženami 2010 – 2015. Doplnenie tzv. Barcelonských cieľov v oblasti starostlivosti o[nbsp]deti, zastúpenia žien v najvyšších rozhodovacích orgánoch spoločností a násilia páchaného na ženách považujem za veľmi významný krok vpred. Je veľmi dôležité, aby sme sa zamysleli v širšom kontexte nad dopadom rozsiahlych ekonomických a[nbsp]sociálnych reforiem, ktoré sa uskutočnili v posledných rokoch v členských štátoch a[nbsp]ich dosah na spoločenské postavenie žien a zníženie kvality ich profesionálneho života. Myslím si, že je veľmi dôležité, aby sme minimalizovali dosah uskutočnených reforiem, pretože mnoho mladých dievčat a žien sa ocitlo v situácii, keď majú sťažený prístup na trh práce.

1-084-875

Joanna Katarzyna Skrzydlewska (PPE), *na piśmie.* – Sprawozdanie pani Zuber powstał w ramach cyklicznych sprawozdań prezentujących corocznie sytuację kobiet w różnych

dziedzinach życia w aspekcie nierówności wynikających z niejednolitego traktowania kobiet i mężczyzn w Unii Europejskiej. Autorka celnie odniosła się do wielu istotnych problemów, z którymi stykają się kobiety w swojej codzienności. Należy do nich kwestia nierówności płac, utrudnień w przechodzeniu na kolejne, wyższe szczeble kariery zawodowej, niedostateczna reprezentacja kobiet w wysokich organach władzy jak również niższy udział kobiet w pełnym zatrudnieniu związany z brakiem infrastruktury opieki nad dziećmi i osobami starszymi. Poza tym, poświęcono dużo uwagi na podkreślenie, jak istotna jest przedsiębiorczość samych kobiet oraz zaproponowano rozwiązania służące jej wzmocnieniu. Sprawozdanie odnosi się również do przemocy wobec kobiet oraz wciąż utrwalanych stereotypów społecznych, których zwalczanie jest długotrwałym i złożonym procesem. Niestety, te pozytywne elementy sprawozdania gubią się mimo niewątpliwie dużego zaangażowania i wkładu pracy pani Zuber. Tekst jest zbyt długi i za obszerny. Przypomina wszechstronną analizę problemów społecznych wraz z próbą powierzchownego rozwiązania ich wszystkich dzięki propozycjom zawartym w jednym dokumencie. Przez to sprawozdanie traci na wartości, jest mało czytelne i brakuje w nim konkretnego przesłania, które by wskazywało, jakie pilne działania powinny należynały podjąć, aby faktycznie poprawić sytuację kobiet.

13. Erzeugung von Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial und dessen Bereitstellung auf dem Markt (Rechtsvorschriften für Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial) (Aussprache)

1-086-000

Der Präsident. - Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgt die Aussprache über den Bericht von Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris im Namen des Ausschusses für Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung über den Vorschlag für eine Verordnung des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates über die Erzeugung von Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial und dessen Bereitstellung auf dem Markt (Rechtsvorschriften für Pflanzenvermehrungsmaterial) (COM(2013)0262[nbsp]-[nbsp]C7-0121/2013[nbsp]-[nbsp]2013/0137(COD)) (A7-0112/2014).

1-087-000

Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, relatore . - Signor Presidente, cari colleghi, siamo oggi qui in plenaria, giunti finalmente alla discussione finale almeno per questa legislatura, su questo regolamento sulle sementi e il materiale vegetale di riproduzione.

Un *dossier* complesso, non solo per i particolari aspetti tecnici che vi sono compresi, ma anche perché controverso per l'importanza delle tematiche trattate e per le diverse sensibilità politiche che si sono espresse nel corso dei lavori.

Signor Commissario – non vedo il Commissario Cioloş, c'è il Commissario Borg – come ben lei sa, la Commissione europea e in particolare la DG SANCO aveva presentato lo scorso 6 maggio un pacchetto di misure per far fronte alle norme di sicurezza e di salute per l'intera filiera agroalimentare. In questo pacchetto era compreso il regolamento sulle sementi e le piante di riproduzione.

A partire dalla proposta della Commissione, in qualità di relatore, avevo elaborato un rapporto cui ho cercato di dare spazio alle diverse sensibilità e problematiche che mi erano giunte dal settore dell'industria, dagli esperti e dalle organizzazioni del biologico: tra queste, la necessità di chiarire meglio alcuni nuovi concetti introdotti nella proposta della

Commissione. Questo anche per creare certezze per gli operatori del settore e una sana regolamentazione del mercato.

Questioni che stavano particolarmente a cuore sono anche quelle della sburocratizzazione e della facilitazione all'accesso delle piccole imprese alle operazioni commerciali e della garanzia di sopravvivenza per tutti gli operatori non commerciali.

La riforma delle norme del settore delle sementi ha generato grande interesse e una lunga attesa. La mancanza di chiarezza su alcuni dei temi trattati nella proposta e la difficoltà di comprendere l'impatto per mancanza di uno studio di impatto, che questa avrebbe generato sul settore, si sono riflesse in un numero di emendamenti presentati, superiori ai 1400, solo la riforma della PAC ha avuto più emendamenti di questo testo.

Ecco allora Commissario, la prima di una serie di problematiche che hanno determinato la nostra decisione di oggi, cioè quella di chiedere alla Commissione di ritirare la sua proposta e di presentarne una nuova. Noi siamo qui per chiedere il ritiro della sua proposta. Presentarne una nuova al nuovo Parlamento che si formerà dopo le elezioni che si terranno a maggio.

I nostri timori rispetto al testo della Commissione sono anche legati al fatto che la proposta di regolamento contiene un gran numero di atti delegati, circa 90, che non permettono a questo Parlamento di lavorare con trasparenza e chiarezza su un tema chiave per il settore, rimandando a decisioni future proprio quei temi chiave – come alcuni dei nuovi concetti sul materiale eterogeneo o il materiale di nicchia – su cui il Parlamento europeo non può e non vuole sottoscrivere deleghe in bianco alla Commissione. Noi vogliamo svolgere il nostro ruolo di colegislatore, ma non di delegante.

Vogliamo svolgere il ruolo di codecisore e vogliamo su questo la possibilità di un testo che ci permetta di decidere con la Commissione, non di delegare con addirittura 90 atti delegati alla Commissione; quindi non c'è la volontà del Parlamento, della commissione agricoltura del Parlamento europeo di non affrontare il tema, al contrario! C'è la volontà di affrontarlo, ma di affrontarlo fino in fondo, senza troppi rinvii ad atti delegati, senza tempistiche ristrette, senza un carico burocratico che passando da 12 direttive a un regolamento, inevitabilmente viene a pesare come un'evidente forzatura, come carico burocratico sugli operatori.

E su questo voglio concludere: passando da 12 direttive a un regolamento e inserendo tra i temi anche quello del materiale di riproduzione, di moltiplicazione vegetale, crea un'evidente forzatura. Un unico ombrello in cui tanti argomenti, tra loro non necessariamente affini si ritrovano tutti insieme. Allora spero che questo dibattito, signor Commissario e ho concluso: insieme a tutti gli emendamenti che sono stati presentati possa

(Il Presidente ritira la parola all'oratore)

1-088-000

Tonio Borg, *Member of the Commission*. - Mr President, honourable Members, Mr Silvestris, I must admit something. I think that that our communication strategy on this proposal has failed. Because, if one were to look at the content of this directive, it is exactly the opposite of what it is being criticised for. For instance, the idea that traditional seeds will now be regulated gives the impression that they are not regulated today but that they will be.

On the contrary, today they are being regulated, and with the new proposal they will have a lighter registration procedure. The same applies to fees. Today Member States can impose any fees, but with this proposal, SMEs are exempted from fees. This does not mean that the Commission will not do its very best to engage itself with the co-legislators on some concerns which have been raised, but basically we believe the proposal is a good one, which had received considerable attention even before its launch in May 2013.

First of all, let me clarify certain key issues. This proposal seeks to regulate the marketing of seeds. It does not seek to regulate their use, so all these criticisms that we are regulating the use of seed, whether on farms or in private gardens, are just not true. Again, it does not seek to regulate intellectual protection of varieties or GMOs, nor plant breeding as such or the size of companies in Europe.

This proposal also does not regulate the use of seed by private gardeners. Private gardeners may buy, sell or produce material in small quantities without any testing and can exchange seeds with other private gardeners without falling under the rules of the proposed regulation. This was another main thrust of the criticism against this directive.

So the aim of this proposal is simply to ensure the identity, health and quality of seed sold to users – be they farmers, gardeners, foresters or consumers. As you will appreciate, seed is an important economic factor for farmers and therefore also for agricultural and food production in the European Union, and I would point out that European farming organisations – both organic and non-organic – support the revision of the legislation, as do seed suppliers and plant breeders, as well as the majority of Member States. After 40 years, and with 12 separate directives in place, the evaluation of the current legislation showed a clear need to update, streamline and revise our legislation.

First, on administrative burdens: these will be lessened with this directive, not increased. Procedures are not going to become more complicated; they are going to become simpler.

Second, the aim of the directive is to introduce flexibility, where under the current legislation there is no flexibility, and to foster innovation and respond to the needs of specific types of production, whether conventional, traditional or organic.

The third aim is to encourage innovation, with faster market access for new improved varieties and through sustainability criteria for variety testing. We believe the new concepts of plant reproductive material should lead to the creation of new business opportunities.

The fourth aim – and in contrast to what is often claimed – the new proposal leads to lower administrative burdens and lower costs, especially for micro-enterprises.

Finally, as I said in the beginning, traditional varieties and new concepts of plant reproductive material, such as heterogeneous material and niche market material, would benefit from a significantly simplified path of access to the market – this would not, as is alleged, strangle these traditional varieties – and this will contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources.

Let me highlight especially the issue of traditional varieties. For these varieties, market access has been made considerably easier, thus developing a much lighter regime in terms of both administrative burden and cost than is currently the case. At present – and some Members conveniently forget this – even traditional varieties have to be tested, officially or using results provided by the applicant, for distinctness, stability and relative uniformity, and there are quantitative and areal marketing restrictions as the law stands today.

According to our proposal – if it is approved – in order to register a traditional variety there will no longer be a requirement for any testing; all the applicant has to do is to provide a description which is recognised by the competent authority. Secondly, quantitative and areal marketing restrictions have been abolished and, since testing is no longer required, registration fees are expected to fall. Finally, all micro-enterprises – unlike the position today – will in any case be exempted from registration fees. So how can one criticise this directive by saying, with regard to traditional varieties, that it is making life harder? It is making life simpler.

Let me now come to another issue: the number of delegated acts. I appreciate that, each time we mention delegated acts, there is criticism from the European Parliament. But may I remind this Assembly that, with the current directive – if this is approved – the empowerments for secondary acts scattered in 12 different directives, amounting to 278, will – with the new directive – be reduced to 62: practically a 75% decrease in the enabling acts of delegated acts. And the number of secondary acts themselves will be reduced from around 80 to fewer than 40. So, we can say – contrary to certain claims – that the proposal contains more substantial provisions than the existing 12 directives and therefore implies an increased involvement of Parliament compared to the current situation.

Having explained all these points – and of course I defend the directive in so much as Members of Parliament criticise it – I can, however, assure you that I understand these concerns. I understand some of them; others I do not understand, and I would like to understand them. I understand the concerns regarding the highly technical nature of the proposal (but this is a technical matter), the high number of tabled amendments (I recognise that), and the short time available to examine the proposal. So I can also assure this assembly that the Commission is willing to study the concerns as expressed in the tabled amendments, to look at the issue of delegated acts – even though we have made a reduction of almost 75% – and to contribute to finding clarifications and solutions which take the interests of stakeholders into account, which is in the interest of this Parliament and of the Commission, and to find common ground to further improve this important proposal.

1-089-000

Pilar Ayuso, *Ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Industria, Investigación y Energía*. - Señor Presidente, señor Comisario, yo siento enormemente que hayamos tenido que rechazar esta propuesta después del excelente trabajo del señor Silvestris para unificar estas doce directivas en un solo reglamento.

Tiene usted razón, señor Comisario, en cuanto a las críticas de «copia y pega» que ha recibido esta propuesta. Realmente, no se las merecía. Pero reconozca que no es fácil incluir sectores tan diferentes entre sí dentro de una misma norma; pensamos que ello requiere un sosiego y un debate mayores que los que se pueden tener al final de una legislatura y al final de un mandato de Colegio de Comisarios.

No se entiende, por ejemplo, la inclusión del material forestal de reproducción cuando no tiene nada que ver con la seguridad de los alimentos, que es uno de los principales argumentos esgrimidos por la Comisión para presentar esta propuesta.

La propuesta resulta muy genérica al tratar de abarcar tantos sectores en una norma técnica. Además, propone definiciones poco precisas, dando lugar a amplios márgenes de interpretación, que redundarían en una enorme carga administrativa y en una inseguridad jurídica para los Estados miembros y para los productores. Esto explica el enorme número

de actos delegados —muchos son injustificados— previstos y que hacen imprevisibles futuras repercusiones.

Por último, ...

(El Presidente retira la palabra a la oradora)

1-090-000

Albert Deß, *im Namen der PPE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar Borg, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich möchte mich bei Sergio Silvestris als Berichterstatter für das, was er vorgelegt hat, bedanken. Er hat den Vorschlag der Kommission verbessert.

Aber es besteht die Sorge, Herr Kommissar Borg, dass wir als Parlament mit den neuen delegierten Rechtsakten hier nicht genügend Einfluss nehmen können. Wir stehen kurz vor der Wahl, dieses Parlament hat nur noch einige Wochen, und vielleicht, Herr Kommissar, sind Sie Leidtragender der negativen Erfahrungen, die wir als Parlament mit der Generaldirektion Landwirtschaft und ländliche Entwicklung bei den delegierten Rechtsakten zur Agrarreform gemacht haben. Ich bin überhaupt nicht zufrieden mit dem, was ich bisher zu den delegierten Rechtsakten bei der Agrarreform gehört habe. Es entspricht meiner Ansicht nach nicht den politischen Beschlüssen von Luxemburg, und deshalb sind wir so skeptisch geworden, Herr Kommissar. Dies ist mit eine der Hauptursachen, warum der Vorschlag im Agrarausschuss mit 37 zu 2 [nbsp] Stimmen zurückgewiesen wurde bzw. eine Ablehnung empfohlen wurde.

Ich bin der Meinung, dass der Vorschlag der Kommission hier – und gerade hat es die Kollegin Ayuso schon angesprochen – zu stark zusammenfasst. Wir wollen ja eine Verwaltungsvereinfachung, aber wenn das Ganze dann hinterher doch komplizierter wird als vorher – und ich denke an das Thema Forst, das gehört nicht in diese Saatgutrichtlinie hinein –, dann sind wir eben nicht damit zufrieden. Es besteht auch aktuell kein Handlungsbedarf, dass wir diese Sache schnell zum Abschluss bringen. Das bisherige System hat sich weitgehend bewährt.

Ich glaube, wir können Ihnen, Herr Kommissar, mit einer eventuellen Zurückweisung morgen die Chance geben, die Sache nach der Wahl in der neuen Wahlperiode in Ruhe zu besprechen, damit die Rechte des Mittelstands, der Kleinerzeuger und der Saatgutbenützer hier in Einklang gebracht werden. Ich glaube, wir können hier eine vernünftige Lösung finden. Meine Fraktion wird dazu einen Beitrag leisten.

1-091-000

Karin Kadenbach, *im Namen der S&D-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Die Überschriften der letzten Tage oder Wochen haben gelautet: Die EU gefährdet unser Saatgut! Ich möchte am Anfang meiner Ausführungen festhalten: Es ist nicht die EU, die unser Saatgut gefährdet, sondern es ist der Vorschlag, der von Ihnen, Herr Kommissar Borg, von der Kommission kommt! Der andere Teil der EU, nämlich das Parlament, hat sich sehr bemüht, hat sich sehr genau mit diesem Vorschlag auseinandergesetzt. Ich möchte mich als Schattenberichterstatterin unserer Fraktion im AGRI-Ausschuss bei allen Kolleginnen und Kollegen und auch beim Berichterstatter dafür bedanken, dass wir uns wirklich bemüht haben, diesen Verordnungsentwurf zu korrigieren.

Die erste Diskussion ist schon über die Architektur dieses Vorschlags ausgebrochen. Die Frage war generell, ob es sinnvoll ist, zwölf Richtlinien aus der Vergangenheit in einer

Verordnung zusammenzufassen, die weit über das hinausgeht, was die zwölf Richtlinien abgedeckt haben. Die guten Absichten, die Sie uns heute so schön geschildert haben, wie Vereinfachung des Systems oder Schutz der Biodiversität, finden sich in den konkreten Artikeln nicht oder nur sehr ungenügend wieder. Echte Verbesserungen des Status quo sind unserer Meinung nach nicht erkennbar. Dem gegenüber steht – entgegen Ihren Ausführungen – eine neue Bürokratisierung.

Die Verordnung orientiert sich in weiten Bereichen an den Bedürfnissen der Industrie und ihren Industriesorten. Kleineren Akteuren wird überbordende Bürokratie zugemutet, die Biodiversität und Vielfaltsorten sollen klar in Nischen abgeschoben werden. Auch den Bedürfnissen der Ökolandwirtschaft wird nur ungenügend Rechnung getragen. Und nicht gerechtfertigt ist die Vielzahl der sekundären Rechtsakte. Und die hat sich z.[nbsp]B. auch Österreich ...

(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

1-092-000

Britta Reimers, *im Namen der ALDE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, verehrte Kollegen, lieber Berichterstatter! Wir haben es hier mit einem Bericht zu tun, der inzwischen mehr emotional als technisch diskutiert wird. Es stimmt, was der Kommissar sagt: Es geht hier eigentlich mehr um die Vermarktung als um den Anbau des Saatguts. Aber wir sehen, dass in dem Vorschlag der Kommission wirklich sehr viel Sprengstoff enthalten ist, wenn man zwölf Richtlinien zu einer Verordnung zusammenfasst und dann auch noch Bereiche hineinnimmt, die vorher nicht unter diese Richtlinien gefallen sind.

Wir haben ein Bedürfnis in Europa, auf der einen Seite die alten Sorten zu schützen und deren Anbau zu ermöglichen, den kleinen Unternehmern unter die Arme zu greifen und den privaten Saatgutaustausch nicht zu behindern. Aber andererseits brauchen wir in Europa auch einen Zuchtfortschritt, wir brauchen einen Schutz des geistigen Eigentums bei diesem Zuchtfortschritt, wir brauchen eine Entwicklungsmöglichkeit für neue Sorten, denn wir haben hohe Ansprüche in Europa, die auf uns zukommen.

Wir brauchen mehr Gesundheitssicherheit bei den Sorten, wir brauchen einen höheren Umweltschutzeffekt dadurch, dass man Sorten züchtet, die weniger Pflanzenschutzmittel benötigen, wir brauchen eine Ertragssicherung, denn wir haben in Zukunft eine wachsende Weltbevölkerung zu ernähren. Wir müssen Sorten haben, die an den Klimawandel angepasst sind und wir brauchen auch neue Nutzungsformen, zum Beispiel für Bioenergienutzung. Das heißt, wir haben hier Positionen, die sehr weit auseinanderreichen.

Die Aufgabe der Kommission war es, beim Zusammenfassen dieser Richtlinien Brücken zu bauen. Was wir erreicht haben, ist, dass alte Gräben wieder aufgerissen wurden, was dazu geführt hat, dass man nicht mehr sachlich diskutiert hat, sondern nur noch emotional. Das spiegelt sich auch in der Vielzahl der Änderungsanträge wieder. Deswegen unterstützt auch die ALDE eine Zurückverweisung, um dann in einer ruhigeren Phase mit mehr Zeit eine sachliche Debatte darüber zu führen und dann auch sicherlich zu einer vernünftigen Einigung zu kommen. Denn wir tun uns in Zukunft nichts Gutes, wenn wir alles emotional diskutieren. Wir brauchen wieder mehr fachliche Sachlichkeit in der Politik.

1-093-000

Martin Häusling, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, ich bin einigermassen entsetzt von Ihren Ausführungen. Sie haben behauptet, dass ein

Kommunikationsproblem schuld daran sei, dass so wenig Zustimmung zu Ihrem Vorschlag da ist. Nein, der Vorschlag ist schlecht! Sonst wären wir uns im Agrarausschuss, wo wir uns selten einig sind, nicht in dem Punkt ganz einig, dass wir diesen Vorschlag zurückweisen wollen. Und er hat ganz gravierende Fehler, dieser Vorschlag. Er ist – das hat die Kollegin Kadenbach gesagt – zu sehr ausgerichtet an den Bedürfnissen der großen Konzerne, zu sehr ausgerichtet auf eine Saatgutproduktion der Uniformität und der konventionellen Landwirtschaft.

Sie wollen jetzt den Bereich der nachhaltigen ökologischen Produktion und der Erhaltungszucht in eine Nische hineindrängen. Da gehört er aber nicht rein. Das ist die Zukunftsproduktion in der Landwirtschaft! Wenn wir allein an die Antworten, die wir für den Klimawandel brauchen, denken, dann sind da die Reserven, die gefördert werden müssen und nicht in eine Nische hineingedrängt werden dürfen.

Und noch etwas haben Sie gar nicht zur Kenntnis genommen: Wir haben eine Studie vorgelegt, aus der deutlich hervorgeht, dass auch in Europa eine Konzentration auf dem Sektor der Saatgutzüchtung stattfindet. Nehmen Sie zur Kenntnis, dass 95[nbsp]% des Gemüsesaatguts von nur fünf Konzernen kontrolliert wird! Das müssen Sie irgendwie zur Kenntnis nehmen. Sie haben keine Antwort auf die Konzentration im Saatgutmarkt, Sie haben aber auch keine Antwort darauf, dass wir in den letzten Jahrzehnten 75[nbsp]% der Biodiversität im Agrarbereich verloren haben. Wo ist die Antwort in diesem Saatgutrecht? Wir müssen doch wirklich die Unternehmen fördern, die genau diese Biodiversität fördern!

Ich finde es auch einfach unglaublich, dass sich die Kommission jetzt hier hinstellt und sagt: Wir haben nichts zu ändern. Es gibt fast 1500 Änderungsvorschläge, die wir eingebracht haben. Nehmen Sie das zur Kenntnis! Sie haben jetzt Zeit bis nach den Wahlen, um einen neuen Vorschlag auf den Tisch zu legen. Und kommen Sie nicht mit dem alten Vorschlag, denn dann wird das Ergebnis dasselbe sein, nämlich dass wir das gemeinsam zurückweisen und die Interessen der Landwirte auch in diesem Bereich ernster nehmen, als Sie es tun!

1-094-000

Julie Girling, *on behalf of the ECR Group* . – Mr President, firstly I would like to thank the rapporteur for all his hard work on this file. I acknowledge what a difficult task that has been, with 1[nbsp]400 amendments to work through. Significant amongst those amendments – and quite unique, actually, in my short experience in this House – was a widespread desire to delete the package altogether and send it back to the drawing board.

The main aim of this proposal, we have been told, is simplification. The whole five-file package of proposals is headlined by the Commission as an improvement, creating a common framework and making all our lives easier. The problem is that there is little evidence of any of that happening at all. Whilst I hear the arguments of the Commissioner, I think he has to accept and acknowledge that he has failed to convince us with those arguments.

In many areas this proposal takes us one step forward and two steps backwards. Much of the justification for this regulation is based around the claim providing more certainty in food production, and yet it adds costs for farmers and the seed industry. For example, all new varieties of fruit and vegetables would need distinctiveness, uniformity and stability testing, which is not currently the case. All ornamental species will now be required to

have a detailed, officially-recognised description, leading to unknown and unestimated additional costs. The need for registration is extended to forestry reproductive material with no justification whatsoever.

It is clear from the impact assessment that the ramifications of many of these proposals have been underestimated or not considered at all. In short, I would say that the impact assessment is inadequate. The proposal fails to explain new concepts, such as niche markets and heterogeneous materials, and is unconvincing as to why these have been included. Normally reservations about a proposal would be dealt with at committee, with questions asked and Commissioners – hopefully – answering them, compromises negotiated and agreed – but this has not proved possible in this case. This is because of the sheer range of concerns and the real possibility that the final text which resulted would be a mixed and matched muddle of such proportions as to render it incoherent and unworkable: the exact opposite of the smart regulation principles that we have all been striving for over the last five years.

This is serious. A new regulation supersedes all current national regulation. Current legislation implements the 12 separate EU directives. Member States will be required to create new penalties for infringements, and we simply cannot go forward blindly on that. I look forward to taking this work forward in the next mandate.

1-095-000

Martina Anderson, *on behalf of the GUE/NGL Group*. – Mr President, I call on all Members to reject the Commission proposal on plant reproductive material and ask that no mandate for negotiations be opened. This proposal is a joke. It is not fit for purpose, and the Commission really needs to go back to the drawing board on this one. It does not need to go back to the drawing board in order to get a better communication strategy but to get a better proposal.

This is a simple case of the Commission putting the needs of industry before farmers. Should the Commission's proposal with this regulation proceed, it could result in established farming practices becoming illegal. Without doubt, seeds are a resource given by nature, and there should be no attempt whatsoever to regulate their use in agriculture. Any attempt to do so, especially in times of food insecurity, is absolutely preposterous. The Commission's proposal also severely limits the freedom of Member States and gives the Commission excessive powers over markets that they are far removed from.

I am happy to see that the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development have spoken almost unanimously, with 37 members to two rejecting the proposal. I also hope that tomorrow's vote will see proceed it no further.

1-096-000

John Stuart Agnew, *on behalf of the EFD Group*. – Mr President, I actually agreed with some of what Sinn Fein had to say (not all of it). That is unusual, isn't it?

Of course, proper democracy has certain characteristics. Laws should come from Parliament and not from officials. When a Parliament ends, so should its current work. An elected Parliament does not bind its successor as we are seeing an attempt here to do. The Silvestris report illustrates everything that is wrong with so-called EU democracy. Parliament is, of course, right to reject the report. The Commission is trying to introduce major new legislation far too close to the end of this Parliament.

The Commission proposal should be rejected and withdrawn, and these are propositions which we in UKIP would vote for, and that is where the whole thing should stop. But in the Alice-in-Wonderland world of EU institutions, nothing can ever be that simple. Both Lewis Carroll and Franz Kafka would be proud of that extra little phrase: 'and submit a new one!.

In a real Parliament, of course, that would just not be there; it would be for those elected in May to decide whether or not legislation should come in or not. But in the surreal EU version of democracy, the incoming Parliament is told what to do. Because laws come from the Commission – from bureaucrats – we know it will happen.

My group was refused a split vote; we wanted to say 'yes' to reject the proposal and 'no' to having the thing come back again, but you would not let us do it. So all we can do is abstain on the consolidated vote.

1-097-000

Димитър Стоянов (NI). - Г-н Председател, слушах какво каза Комисарят и честно казано не мога да повярвам на ушите си! Две комисии на този парламент почти единодушно гласуват против предложението на Комисията и Вие г-н Комисар се опитвате да кажете, че едва ли не парламентаристите в тези комисии са твърде глупави, за да разберат Вашата велика идея, тя е по-умна отколкото са избраните депутати в този парламент.

Не мога да се съглася с Вашите аргументи и за традиционните сортове, защото е доказано, че Вашето предложение щеше да изличи един от най-традиционните български селскостопански сортове – този на розовия домати. И нека в този момент Ви напомня, че когато доматите се развалят и хората са недоволни, те използват този плод само с една единствена цел – да замерят с него политици. Не се поставяйте на това място и си свалете ръцете от българското земеделие най-после и конкретно от розовия домати.

1-098-000

Elisabeth Jeggle (PPE). - Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar! Mein erster Dank gilt unserem Berichterstatter Herrn Silvestris, der sich hier für die EVP wirklich bemüht hat, uns dazu zu bringen, dass wir diesen Bericht bearbeiten. Ich habe in fünfzehn Jahren Parlamentsarbeit noch nicht erlebt, dass ein gesamtes Parlament – die Fraktionen – einen Bericht in dieser Weise an die Kommission zurückgibt. Ich habe auch noch nicht erlebt, dass ein Kommissar uns sagt: Hier waren wohl die Informationen nicht ausreichend. Ich würde sagen, es gab keinen Dialog, sonst hätten solche Unsicherheiten gar nicht entstehen können. Ich kann diese Zurückweisung nur unterstützen – mit Kollegin Köstinger waren wir beide die ersten, die das vorgeschlagen haben –, um Ruhe in die Debatte zu bringen und um die Debatte zu versachlichen, und auch, um die Informationen von Ihnen bekommen zu können, die wir brauchen.

Sie sagen: weniger Bürokratie. Sie müssten uns erklären, wo und wie. Wir brauchen ganz dringend Regulierung im großen Saatgutbereich. Das ist überhaupt keine Frage. Das hat hier auch gar keiner in Frage gestellt. Wir brauchen Klarheit, wir brauchen Rechtssicherheit und Sicherheit. Auch die Unternehmen brauchen das und die Landwirte, die das Saatgut benutzen, brauchen das. Aber wir brauchen viele Dinge nicht, von denen wir glauben, dass sie in den Vorschlägen drinnen sind. Und wenn sie jetzt nicht drin sind, kann es sein, dass sie über delegierte Rechtsakte reinkommen, wo wir dann keine Möglichkeit mehr haben, uns einzubringen. Das ist die Sorge insbesondere der Kleineren, der Mittelständischen und

übrigens durchaus auch derer, die kommerziell Saatgut produzieren. Die sagen: Wir sind an der Grenze dessen, was wir bürokratisch leisten können.

Wenn ein Vorschlag von niemandem verstanden wird, dann ist es gut, wenn wir diesen Vorschlag zurückweisen, dann ist es gut, wenn wir neu und besser miteinander reden und rechtzeitig in einen Dialog ...

(Der Präsident entzieht der Rednerin das Wort.)

1-099-000

Pavel Poc (S&D). - Pane předsedající, pane komisaři, měl jsem tu čest pět let pracovat v oboru zahradnickém. O tomto návrhu jsem jako stínový zpravodaj mé skupiny ve Výboru pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin absolvoval nespočet diskusí s odborníky, zájmovými skupinami i zainteresovanou veřejností. Nenašel jsem nikoho, kdo by návrh v té podobě, ve které byl předložen, uvítal. Nenašel jsem žádnou přidanou hodnotu, kterou by tento návrh přinášel.

Vidím pouze pokus sesypat do jednoho pytle produkci a prodej semen ze všech možných oborů, které spolu nesouvisí ani funkčně, ani věcně. Vidím riziko, že některá odvětví by návrh tak, jak byl předložen, efektivně ochromil nebo dokonce zničil. Právní předpisy Evropské unie týkající se produkce rozmnožovacího materiálu rostlin musí zachování biologické rozmanitosti v zemědělství a zahradnictví usnadnit a podpořit, ne ohrožovat. Proto jsem v listopadu minulého roku během projednávání tohoto návrhu ve Výboru pro životní prostředí, veřejné zdraví a bezpečnost potravin poprvé s těžkým srdcem navrhl předložený návrh zamítnout a 30. ledna t.r. se také tak stalo stejně jako později ve Výboru pro zemědělství a rozvoj venkova.

Věřím, že zítřejší hlasování o zamítnutí návrhu nařízení Evropské komise bude mít potřebnou podporu. Cením si jednoty Evropského parlamentu, který se v tomto případě opět postavil za zájmy evropských občanů a podniků. Věřím, že pro Evropskou komisi to bude dostatečný signál pro stáhnutí návrhu nařízení a pro přepracování tak, aby skutečně reflektovalo současné potřeby evropského trhu s osivy a semenářskou, osivářskou a zemědělskou praxí.

1-100-000

Bart Staes (Verts/ALE). - Voorzitter, collega's, commissarissen, zaden staan aan het begin van onze voedselketen en de Commissie stelt nu voor twaalf bestaande richtlijnen te verwerken in één verordening, terwijl nu al de zadenmarkt grotendeels en in toenemende mate in handen is van een handvol agroalimentaire multinationale ondernemingen. En dat is géén goede zaak. Niet voor de autonomie van boeren en boerinnen, niet voor de biodiversiteit, niet voor de voedselzekerheid, niet voor voldoende bescherming tegen ziektes en ook niet voor de prijsvorming. De door de Europese Commissie voorgestelde wetgeving zal de bestaande situatie nog verergeren.

Dit ontwerp stuit terecht op verzet, politiek èn maatschappelijk. Een nog meer geconcentreerde markt beperkt de keuze van boeren om andere zaadvariëteiten te gebruiken. Een minder divers aanbod van zaden zal ook zorgen voor minder bescherming tegen ziektes en tegen klimaatverandering.

Commissaris, trek uw conclusies. Het Europees Parlement wil niet weten van uw voorstellen. Trek dus na de verwerping in de plenaire stemming morgenmiddag uw voorstel in. Zorg

na de verkiezingen voor een nieuw voorstel, voor een serieus voorstel, voor nieuwe regelingen, voor betere afspraken. Zorg voor een voorstel dat de diversiteit in de lidstaten koestert. Zorg voor een voorstel dat de concentratie in de sector tegengaat. Zorg voor een voorstel dat de diversiteit in het aanbod van zaden respecteert. Zorg voor een voorstel dat de biodiversiteit, maar ook de genetische diversiteit van het aanbod van zaden stimuleert en mogelijk maakt. Zorg voor een voorstel dat de autonomie van boeren en boerinnen respecteert.

1-101-000

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). - Gospodine predsjedavajući, podržavam odbacivanje prijedloga Komisije jer držim da je u ovakvom obliku on prilično štetan za tržište biljnog reprodukcijskog materijala i europsku poljoprivredu općenito.

Prije svega, prilično je izvjesno da bi usvajanje ovog prijedloga dovelo do brisanja malih proizvođača s europskog tržišta jer bi ovako strogi uvjeti proizvodnje i certificiranja mogli stvoriti za njih nepodnošljivi financijski teret.

Zastupam stav kako pretjerano miješanje zakonodavca u zakonitosti tržišta ne doprinosi ekonomskom oporavku i rastu, već upravo suprotno, ali ako koga moramo zaštititi to su mali proizvođači.

Prijedlog Komisije je naročito skandalozan u onom dijelu u kojem dozvoljava Komisiji da delegiranim aktima širokog raspona donosi pravila mimo zakonodavnog postupka i daleko od očiju javnosti. Takve prakse predstavljaju udar na demokraciju i zato sam odlučna u odbacivanju ovakvog prijedloga.

1-102-000

Hans-Peter Martin (NI). - Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, zwei Ausschüsse stimmen ganz klar gegen Ihren Vorschlag, doch Sie nehmen das Nein nicht als Antwort, sondern sprechen von einem Kommunikationsproblem. Zitat: „Hauptsächlich wird versucht, bestehende Regeln zu vereinfachen und zu harmonisieren.“ Haben Sie das gesagt, oder sind das die Lobbyisten? Eine massive Kampagne gäbe es aus Fehlinformation und Beschuldigungen, um nicht nur den Kommissionsvorschlag, sondern den gesamten europäischen Saatgutsektor zu diskreditieren. Haben Sie das eben gesagt? Ja! Haben wir das heute wörtlich so bekommen von der größten Lobbyistenvereinigung? Auch ja! Herr Kommissar, Sie sind ein Lobbykommissar! Sie besorgen hier das Geschäft von ganz anderen. Und wir wissen, um Henry Kissinger zu zitieren, wer die Nahrungsmittelversorgung kontrolliert, der kontrolliert die Menschen. So, wie Sie hier vorgehen, spielen Sie die Macht über die Menschen in die Hand von ganz wenigen Konzernen. Gehen Sie, bitte!

1-103-000

Tonino Picula (S&D). - Gospodine predsjedavajući, priključujem se svima koji prepoznaju štetnost ove Direktive te podržavam prijedlog da se prijedlog Komisije odbije. Zbog velike raznolikosti, kao i prirodnih i kulturnih značajki, biljni reprodukcijski materijal regulira čak 12 direktiva osiguravajući postojećoj legislativi prilagođenost svim njegovim posebnostima.

Usvajanje Direktive dovelo bi do ozbiljnog rizika da se ne ispune potrebe potrošača ni očekivanja nadležnih tijela. Dapače, ona ugrožava nastojanja o očuvanju genetičke raznolikosti.

Također, Direktiva bi doprinijela dodatnom oligopolu najvećih tvrtki od kojih tri najveće već sada kontroliraju 53 [nbsp] % svjetskog tržišta sjemenjem, a deset najvećih kontrolira čak 73 [nbsp] % tržišta. Dodatne administrativne barijere mogle bi fatalno ugroziti male proizvođače.

Tijekom nedavnih rasprava o uvođenju dodatnih GMO vrsti, većina građana EU-a jasno se izrazila za očuvanje autohtonih sorti i protiv modifikacija.

Smatram da Parlamentu, koji o implementaciji ove Direktive ravnopravno odlučuje, treba više vremena kako bi se pitanje reproduktivnog materijala reguliralo na ispravan način i u interesu građana Unije.

1-104-000

Claude Turmes (Verts/ALE). - Herr Präsident! Herr Kommissar, bereits mehr als 7 [nbsp] 000 Bürger in Luxemburg haben an Sie geschrieben und fordern dasselbe wie die Parlamentarier: Dieser Verordnungsvorschlag muss zurückgezogen werden! Warum? Weil die Bürger die berechtigte Angst haben, dass Ihr Gesetz verschiedene Obst- und Gemüsesorten in Luxemburg nicht vor dem Aussterben schützt, zweitens, dass unsere Biobauern in Luxemburg aufgrund von unnötigen Hürden, die aufgestellt werden, verschiedene Weiterentwicklungen nicht machen können, und drittens, dass die mittelständischen Saatguthersteller – wir haben gerade mal drei in Luxemburg – durch dieses EU-Gesetz weiter unter Druck kommen und irgendwann vom Markt verschwinden werden. Übrigens ist das auch der Fall bei einem Parallelgesetz, das läuft, darüber, wie die Kontrollen in diesem Sektor bezahlt werden sollen.

Ehrlich gesagt, Ihr Eröffnungssatz, diese Arroganz, zu behaupten, es wären nur die Bürger und die Parlamentarier, die wären dumm und würden Sachen nicht richtig verstehen – das bringt uns in Europa nicht weiter!

1-105-000

Franz Obermayr (NI). - Herr Präsident! Ja, der Herr Kommissar ist ein schlauer und smarter Mann. Und daher nehme ich an, er glaubt das, was er hier so schöngefärbt hat, auch selbst nicht wirklich. Und es ist eine Verhöhnung, Herr Kommissar, wenn Sie uns allen Ernstes weismachen wollen, dass Sie uns, die Parlamentarier, ernst nehmen. Denn es ist ein Faktum, dass bereits 99 [nbsp] % des europäischen Marktes für Saatgut von nur acht Unternehmen gesteuert und kontrolliert werden.

Es ist eine Tatsache, dass die Vielfalt der Nutzpflanzen seit dem letzten Jahrhundert um ca. 75 [nbsp] % zurückgegangen ist. Und Ihr Vorschlag, den Sie heute vorlegen, heißt nichts anderes als Unterstützung der Monokultur und Unterstützung der Großkonzerne, die hinkünftig bestimmen werden, in welcher Vielfalt die Nutzpflanzen eingesetzt und angebaut werden. Und nicht zu vergessen, dass die Preise für Saatgut – und das ist auch nicht abzustreiten – in den letzten Jahren um 30 bis 40 [nbsp] % gestiegen sind. Das heißt, Herr Kommissar, der Verlust dieser Biovielfalt gefährdet eine ausgewogene Ernährung und Sie unterstützen Lobbys und sind gegen die Interessen der kleinstrukturierten Landwirtschaft und ...

(Der Präsident entzieht dem Redner das Wort.)

1-106-000

Kriton Arsenis (S&D). - Mr President, since the Commissioner took over, we have had watered-down legislation on tobacco with no plain packaging; a proposal for honey with no labelling of the GM pollen it contains, against the decision of the European Court of Justice; approval for the cultivation of GM corn; and now we have a decision that – for the first time in this Parliament – has been rejected by all the political groups and all the committees with a huge majority – almost unanimity.

Something is wrong. I call on the Commissioner to take the message on board and to understand that this type of proposal cannot be accepted. If the plenary rejects his proposal tomorrow, I call on him to resign, because there is constantly something wrong with the proposals he brings to this Parliament.

1-107-000

Paolo De Castro (S&D). - Signor Presidente, signor Commissario, onorevoli colleghi, il relatore e tutti i colleghi hanno esposto molte delle ragioni che hanno portato la nostra commissione a votare a larghissima maggioranza per il rigetto della proposta. Non è stata una valutazione facile, perché non volevamo abdicare al nostro ruolo e alle nostre prerogative di colegislatori che il trattato ci dà ed è per questo che inizialmente, pur avendo molte perplessità sulla proposta della Commissione, abbiamo iniziato con senso del dovere il nostro lavoro emendativo, che si è tradotto inoltre in 1 [nbsp]400 emendamenti.

Tuttavia, nel corso del nostro lavoro è apparso chiaro che non sarebbe stato possibile arrivare a un testo equilibrato, che tenesse conto di tutte le criticità presenti. Dal punto di vista istituzionale, il Parlamento deplora l'uso eccessivo degli atti delegati, Commissario. In questa proposta ce ne sono circa 90, molti dei quali su temi importanti e delicati. Inoltre sono state messe insieme 12 direttive, in un solo regolamento. Volendo legiferare su settori molto diversi tra di loro, che necessitano normative diverse, come il materiale riproduttivo vegetale, il materiale riproduttivo forestale e il settore delle sementi.

Chiediamo pertanto alla Commissione di ritirare la proposta, per tener conto della posizione del Parlamento, per assicurare le nostre piccole microimprese, così numerose in questo settore, e per dare un messaggio chiaro alle molte organizzazioni non governative e ai cittadini europei che in questi mesi hanno fatto sentire la loro voce.

1-108-000

James Nicholson (ECR). - Mr President, the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety on many occasions do disagree, but on this occasion they are agreed on what is actually happening, and I must say that I support the rejection of the proposed plant reproductive material. But we could ask the Commission to give real consideration to the many amendments tabled in both committees, should they present a new proposal.

As many of my constituents have made very clear, we should not allow the EU to prescribe what we can or cannot grow in our own gardens. Heritage varieties are an integral part of the rich countryside, and our constituents do not need to be inhibited in how they plant their gardens. The recent proposal threatens to effectively close down the ornamental market to new plant varieties under already restrictive registration requirements. If we are serious about promoting innovation and biodiversity in the EU, I find such measures very strange indeed.

This proposal is universally disliked...

(The President cut off the speaker)

1-109-000

Vicky Ford (ECR). - Mr President, I have found a place for this proposal, and it is on my compost heap, where it needs to go and rot. Diversity of garden plants should be cherished and championed, not regulated and restricted. As a gardener, I say we need our lupins, our lavenders, our dahlias and our day lilies. Gardeners in the UK can choose from over 50 000 different varieties of plants, and we must not have a system that is so costly that our choices will be cut down. Horticulture is not a hobby: it is also worth over nine billion to the UK economy alone.

Registering each one of these plants would cost a company over GBP 300, and we cannot have it. We have tried to change the law, to make it less damaging, but actually it is completely unnecessary. It is unwanted; it does not help the consumer; it does not help the industry. Let us dig it up and shred it!

1-110-000

Catch-the-eye-Verfahren

1-111-000

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). - Mr President, I will not add to the colourful contribution of the last speaker about compost heaps and all sorts of things, but I think this debate has been useful because there is unity of purpose in the Chamber. Commissioner, I would add my voice on a different level.

My concern is that it is a massive proposal. We are coming to the end of our legislature, and there is a danger of rushed legislation. I do not take it as a criticism of you (as others are suggesting) that you have come forward with it. I would rather you saw the value of a second look at this proposal. Some of the issues raised by colleagues are – I was going to say pedantic – but occasionally they come up with the fact that this is about endangering small farmers; it is about big business; it is about monoculture. It seems to me that there is one underlying issue here, which we all have a concern about, and that is the control of a very small number of players in the seed industry. Perhaps we need another Commissioner to look at that issue from a competition point of view.

1-112-000

Маруся Любчева (S&D). - Г-н Председател, колеги, изправени сме пред дилема - да приемем опита за манипулиране пазара на посадъчен материал, като приемем предложението на Европейската комисия, или да запазим сегашното законодателство и правото на страните членки и на техните селскостопански оператори да съхранят местното разнообразие.

Защо не приемам това предложение? То ще създаде неимоверно големи бюрократични пречки за малките селскостопански производители, свързани с единната регистрация на сортове. Ще унищожи много местни сортове с доказани качества и устойчивост за сметка на високодобивни новоселектирани сортове, но без необходимите вкусови качества. Все пак, г-н Комисар, става дума за храна.

Считам, че трябва да се даде право на страните сами да регулират тези процеси, спазвайки общи принципи, включително свързани със защита на сортовете от генно модифициране и в същото време да подкрепим местното производство.

1-113-000

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE). - Herr Präsident! Vielem, was bereits gesagt worden ist, kann und muss ich mich anschließen. Ich möchte es ganz kurz noch einmal aus meiner Sicht darlegen. Saatgutverordnung ist in meiner Heimat mittlerweile ein berechtigtes Unwort geworden. Wenn sich Bürokratie und Kosten negativ auf die Bauern auswirken, dann ist das wieder einmal eine der unnötigen Verordnungen, die unseren Bürgern und Bürgerinnen einzig und allein nur schaden.

Im Prinzip ist dieser Kommissionsvorschlag der Tod der Sortenvielfalt. Wollen wir denn wirklich einen Einheitsbrei im Saatgut? Ich denke: Nein. Diese Regelungen sind nicht einfacher. Sie machen die Bauern abhängig von der Industrie, und das geht so sicher nicht! Und daher werde auch ich, wie alle anderen, das morgen ablehnen!

1-114-000

Alda Sousa (GUE/NGL). - Do que importa falar verdadeiramente, hoje, é do impacto da proposta da Comissão na soberania alimentar, entendida como o direito de cada nação a manter e desenvolver os seus alimentos, tendo em conta a diversidade cultural e produtiva, como propôs a via camponesa.

Soberania alimentar significa decidir o que se come mas também o que se cultiva, ou seja, ter acesso às terras, à água e às sementes, e também ao controlo dos preços.

Soberania alimentar é uma forma de combater a pobreza. É, pois, um direito humano fundamental.

A proposta de obrigatoriedade de registo e certificação levaria a que muitas das variantes tradicionais fossem preteridas em favor de umas poucas variedades comerciais, favorecendo as monoculturas, o que só beneficia um pequeno grupo de empresas do *agrobusiness*, protegidas pela Organização Mundial do Comércio.

Sr. Comissário Borg, a Comissão vai ou não retirar a sua proposta da lei das sementes? Vai ou não a Comissão respeitar a soberania alimentar?

1-115-000

Marc Tarabella (S&D). - Monsieur le Président, protéger la biodiversité, protéger les petites entreprises du secteur, protéger les semences anciennes: comme bien d'autres ici, j'ai déposé de nombreux amendements au texte présenté.

Nous avons demandé que les variétés obtenues par pollinisation ouverte et appartenant au domaine public soient exclues du champ d'application de la législation puisqu'il est évident que celle-ci ne leur est pas adaptée. L'enregistrement est coûteux, aussi bien pour l'administration que pour les opérateurs, et il représente une charge disproportionnée au regard des enjeux attachés aux variétés du domaine public, qui n'intéressent qu'un public restreint. Nous avons aussi proposé que les variétés destinées exclusivement aux jardiniers amateurs soient exclues du champ d'application de la législation.

Je le répète, la protection de la biodiversité, des petites entreprises du secteur et des semences anciennes mérite une législation efficace, respectueuse et protectrice de ces valeurs.

Renvoyez donc le texte en commission pour qu'il soit retravaillé sur ces points essentiels et qu'il soit ensuite reposé sereinement à ce Parlement. En ce qui me concerne, j'y suis préparé.

1-116-000

(*Ende des Catch-the-eye-Verfahrens*)

1-117-000

Tonio Borg, *Member of the Commission*. - Mr President, I would like to thank the Members for this frank exchange of views. Perhaps it was a bit more than that. My view is that, in spite of the criticism, I think we can agree on three things. First of all, there is an urgent need to update and modernise this legislation, which has been repeatedly amended since the 1960s, in order to introduce a measure of flexibility. There are, of course, different views on this. We think that our proposal does this. Practically everyone in this Parliament is of a different opinion. I also think that we have to ensure harmonisation and implementation in all the Member States, thereby creating a level playing field within the EU market.

I take the opinions and concerns which have been expressed by the different political groups tonight very seriously. I believe that we need further discussion on how to improve the current text, as I disagree with some of the views. I agree that others need clarification and therefore, in my opinion, it is a good solution to refer this proposal back to the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development for further fruitful consideration.

1-118-000

Sergio Paolo Francesco Silvestris, *relatore*. - Signor Commissario, lei ha esordito dicendo che il problema di questa relazione sarebbe un difetto di comunicazione. Se così fosse, saremmo tutti degli imbecilli; saremmo degli imbecilli tutti noi deputati che siamo intervenuti nel dibattito, tutti assolutamente preoccupati per la portata della relazione e per la sua incapacità di affrontare in maniera adeguata alcune problematiche; sarebbero imbecilli tutti i gruppi politici che hanno condiviso questa proposta di rigetto e oggi la richiesta di ritiro della proposta da parte della Commissione; sarebbero imbecilli tutti i componenti della commissione agricoltura che, ad eccezione di due che non sarebbero imbecilli, hanno votato per l'emendamento di rigetto; sarebbero imbecilli i cittadini europei che si sono molto preoccupati della portata della proposta di regolamento. Allora probabilmente non è solo un difetto di comunicazione, il problema probabilmente, perché se così fosse saremmo tutti degli imbecilli, tranne lei ovviamente Commissario.

Siccome io non mi ritengo un imbecille, ritengo che questo Parlamento non sia fatto da imbecilli, le chiedo semplicemente di valutare l'esito del dibattito. Lei ha detto che ci vuole più tempo e più momenti di confronto. Un momento di confronto oggi lo ha avuto e ha registrato un parere sostanzialmente unanime da parte del Parlamento che le dice "ritiri la proposta", anche perché lo hanno detto alcuni colleghi e lo ripeto io, al netto delle singole questioni c'è anche una dinamica legata alla tempistica, alle elezioni imminenti, alla scadenza della legislatura che non ha permesso e che non permette con serenità di affrontare la questione.

Siccome Commissario, io so che lei è persona che rispetta questo Parlamento e so che lei non ritiene che noi si sia tutti degli imbecilli, le chiedo di prendere atto di una volontà mai così unanime, come su questo argomento in commissione e di ritirare la proposta.

Svolgerebbe dignitosamente il suo ruolo e dimostrerebbe il rispetto che ha per questo Parlamento, se lo facesse.

1-119-000

Der Präsident. - Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet am Dienstag, 11.[nbsp]März 2014, um 11.00[nbsp]Uhr statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 149 GO)

1-120-000

Amelia Andersdotter (Verts/ALE), *in writing*. – For a long time I have been raising with the Commission, most recently in my written question E-000606-13, the issue of the inefficiency of plant reproductive material monopolies. There are no quantitative or qualitative studies showing that certification systems and legal rights covering seeds bring benefits to the market or to biodiversity. This has been pointed out to the Commission in a study they themselves financed, but when I confronted them on this issue they had no response other than that their own investigation was flawed. We know that these rules on legal rights and heavy certification requirements concentrate market power in relatively few huge corporate agents from a small number of Member States. We would benefit more from a market acceptance of small actors and new actors, with low market entrance barriers. We should make laws with the intention of keeping market entry for newcomers as low as possible. But this requires the Commission not to dismiss its own research, and to value competition. I urge the Commission to rethink this initiative, and to be clever in its reform of the plant variety rights in 2015.

1-121-000

Béla Glattfelder (PPE), *írásban*. – A növényi szaporítóanyagokra vonatkozó jog reformjáról szóló bizottsági javaslat egyik jelentős problémája, hogy alapvető politikai kérdések esetén is delegált jogi aktusok létrehozására irányuló hatáskörrel ruházná fel a Bizottságot.

Az eddigi tapasztalat sajnos azt mutatja, hogy visszaélnék az ilyen típusú felhatalmazás gyakorlásával. A Bizottság rendszeresen és súlyos mértékben túllépi a hatáskörét.

Ez a probléma hatványozottan előjön a Közös Agrárpolitikát érintő delegált jogi aktusok tervezeteinél. A Bizottság olyan új követelményeket írna elő, melyekre az alaprendeletek értelmében nincs felhatalmazása. Amit nem tudott elfogadtatni a politikai megállapodásban, kerülő úton próbálja meg becsempészni a joganyagba. A Mezőgazdasági Bizottság már többször tételesen felsorolta azokat a szövegrészeket, ahol a Bizottság megsérti az uniós jogot.

Amennyiben a Bizottság az összes jogsértő rendelkezést nem javítja ki, a Parlamentnek a delegált jogi aktusokat meg kell vétőznia. Itt a Parlament hatáskörének a nyílt megsértéséről van szó, itt nem engedhetünk!

Kiemelkedő példája a hatáskörtúllépésnek a fás szárú energiaültetvények esete. A közvetlen kifizetésekről szóló jogszabály egyértelműen a tagállamokat jogosítja fel az ültethető fajok meghatározására. Ezért a Bizottság egy delegált jogi aktusban nem írhatja elő, hogy csak őshonos fajokot lehet ültetni!

Követelem, hogy a Bizottság azonnal szüntesse meg az összes jogsértést!

14. Ausführungen von einer Minute (Artikel 150 GO)

1-123-000

Der Präsident. - Als nächster Punkt der Tagesordnung folgen die Ausführungen von einer Minute zu wichtigen politischen Fragen (Artikel 150 GO).

1-124-000

Andrej Plenković (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedavajući, premda bi nakon prošlotjednog izvješća Komisije o utvrđivanju makroekonomskih neravnoteža i procjeni napretka fiskalne konsolidacije bilo logično govoriti o tom izvješću u nadležnosti povjerenika Rehna, ja ću danas istaknuti dva pitanja koja su važna za Hrvatsku, a ona su, prvo, u nadležnosti povjerenika Hahna – zbog elementarnih nepogoda u Zagrebačkoj, Karlovačkoj, Sisačko-moslavačkoj, Ličko-senjskoj i Primorsko-goranskoj županiji – te se upitati da li zbog prirodnih katastrofa koje smo doživjeli proteklih dana treba vidjeti je li prag za utvrđivanje zahtjeva za sredstva iz Europskog fonda solidarnosti primjeren odnosno previsok u slučajevima kada država samostalno podnosi zahtjev.

Drugo je u nadležnosti povjerenika Andora, puno otpremnika špeditera i dalje mi se obraća. Hrvatska Vlada kasni u operativnom programu za iskorištavanje sredstava Europskog socijalnog fonda. Zanima me što Komisija radi da pomogne Hrvatskoj kako bi pomogla ljudima koji su ostali bez posla s 1. srpnja prošle godine?

1-125-000

Luís Paulo Alves (S&D). - Intervenho hoje aqui para reclamar do Parlamento o tratamento da Comunicação da Comissão, dirigida também ao Conselho, sobre o setor do leite após 2015.

Trata-se de um assunto de importância vital para muitas regiões europeias que sofrerão impactos negativos, tal como consta do documento. Chamo a atenção para a necessidade de tratar com urgência as soluções previstas, nomeadamente as que resultam da minha intervenção na Conferência Europeia de setembro e que foi incluída na comunicação.

Referi que, se a importância do leite vai aumentar em todo o mundo e a União pensa beneficiar dessa oportunidade terminando com o sistema de cotas, então uma parte da riqueza criada pela sua abolição deverá ser dirigida a territórios afetados negativamente, através de programas específicos que estimulem a competitividade, a promoção das suas marcas e a qualidade dos seus produtos, pensando nas exportações.

Devem também em regiões remotas como os Açores, muito distantes dos mercados mas com grande vocação produtiva, compensar-se os percursos permanentes dos transportes para que possam também beneficiar destas oportunidades de mercado.

1-126-000

Pat the Cope Gallagher (ALDE). - Mr President, I have a keen interest in the delivery in Ireland of the Leader programme, which is more than 50% co-financed under the EU rural development programme.

As Minister with responsibility for the Gaeltacht, I was directly involved in the design of the first, pilot Leader programme in Ireland. The hallmark of the programme is its bottom-up approach, with the participation of local communities at the heart of the Leader

ethos. The approach in Ireland is recognised by the EU institutions as a template for other Member States to follow.

I am deeply opposed to the Irish Government's plans to change the Leader programme by adding extra layers of bureaucracy and red tape. This is another example of removing responsibilities from skilled and highly-experienced professionals. Regrettably, the Leader programme will face a 23% reduction in funding. Moreover, an interim fund is required to bridge the gap between the current and the next round of Leader funds. I strongly urge the Minister and the Government to provide this necessary funding.

Finally, I call on the Minister, even at this late stage, to reconsider ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

1-127-000

Νίκος Χρυσόγελος (Verts/ALE). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, Κύριε Επίτροπε, ήθελα να θέσω το θέμα του γενετικά τροποποιημένου καλαμποκιού 1507, και χαίρομαι που είστε εδώ. Ξέρετε πολύ καλά ότι στο Συμβούλιο Γενικών Υποθέσεων η συντριπτική πλειοψηφία των κρατών – τα 19 κράτη – ήταν αντίθετα στην εξουσιοδότηση να δοθεί άδεια καλλιέργειας, 4 χώρες απείχαν, μεταξύ των οποίων και η Γερμανία, και μόνο 5 ήταν υπέρ, από τις οποίες μόνο μία, η Ισπανία, ενδιαφέρεται για την καλλιέργεια του γενετικά τροποποιημένου καλαμποκιού. Ξέρετε πολύ καλά ότι η πλειοψηφία των πολιτών στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση είναι αντίθετη στην καλλιέργεια αυτή και επίσης αυτό εξέφρασε με ψήφισμά του το Ευρωπαϊκό Κοινοβούλιο.

Θέλω να σας ενημερώσω ότι η ομάδα των Πράσινων και άλλοι συνάδελφοι έχουμε συγκεντρώσει υπογραφές. Αν η Επιτροπή προχωρήσει σε αδειοδότηση, θα καταθέσουμε πρόταση μομφής στην Επιτροπή, και να είστε σίγουροι ότι θα το κάνουμε. Δεν θέλουμε να προχωρήσει πριν τις ευρωεκλογές η Επιτροπή σε παρόμοιες ενέργειες.

1-128-000

Marina Yannakoudakis (ECR). - Mr President, the tragic developments in Ukraine and the horrors of Syria are just a few of the more recent events that need to be seen not only in political terms but in terms of human tragedy. Whilst we all follow current events, we must not forget the events of the past that are still being played out. I refer to the 2900 people who now live in Camp Liberty – people who were thrown out of Camp Ashraf, refugees living in inhuman circumstances. Last week I was told that food lorries were even stopped. What was the point of this? Was it to starve these people to death? Is this the civilised world we live in? And whilst we talk about humanity, let us not forget the 52 refugees murdered on 1 September 2013 while protecting Camp Ashraf, and the missing seven innocent refugees – including six women – who were taken hostage.

I will hold a conference in London to seek answers on the fate of these hostages and I ask Vice-President/High Representative Ashton to join me and give families ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

1-129-000

Γεώργιος Τούσσας (GUE/NGL). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, το Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα Ελλάδας καταδικάζει τη δράση των ναζιστικών φασιστικών δυνάμεων, την αντικομμουνιστική εκστρατεία που κλιμακώνεται με την επιδίωξη απαγόρευσης του Κομμουνιστικού Κόμματος Ουκρανίας και της κομμουνιστικής ιδεολογίας, τις ενέργειες βανδαλισμού σε βάρος μνημείων του Λένιν και

άλλων αντιφασιστικών σοβιετικών μνημείων, που διαδραματίζονται στην Ουκρανία. Η αναρρίχηση στην κυβέρνηση της Ουκρανίας, με τη στήριξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης και των ΗΠΑ, αντιδραστικών φασιστικών δυνάμεων, όπως ο Δεξιός Τομέας και το κόμμα Σβόμποντα - ιδεολογικοί απόγονοι των Ναζί - χρησιμοποιείται για την προώθηση των γεωπολιτικών στόχων των ευρωενωσιακών μονοπωλίων στην Ευρασία.

Το Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα Ελλάδας απαιτεί να σταματήσει εδώ και τώρα κάθε προσπάθεια απαγόρευσης του Κομμουνιστικού Κόμματος Ουκρανίας και της κομμουνιστικής ιδεολογίας. Το ΚΚΕ καταδικάζει την ανοικτή ιμπεριαλιστική επέμβαση Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, ΗΠΑ και NATO στην Ουκρανία, εν μέσω οξύνσης της σφοδρής αντιπαράθεσης με την καπιταλιστική Ρωσία για τον έλεγχο των αγορών, της ενέργειας και των δρόμων μεταφοράς της, που εγκυμονεί αυξημένους κινδύνους πολεμικής σύρραξης με τραγικές συνέπειες για τους λαούς της περιοχής.

1-130-000

Corneliu Vadim Tudor (NI). - Domnule președinte, am vorbit de la acest microfon în mai multe rânduri despre justiția din România. E o rușine ce se întâmplă în acest domeniu. Uniunea Europeană are 27 de țări și o pușcărie - România. Există deținuți politici care, orice ar solicita, n-au nicio șansă! Totul li se respinge pe bandă rulantă. Acesta e cazul fostului nostru coleg din Parlamentul European, George Becali, patronul echipei de fotbal Steaua București, fostă deținătoare a Cupei Campionilor Europeni.

Zilele trecute, alți doi membri ai familiei Becali au fost aruncați în închisoare cu învinuiri foarte subțiri. Așadar, un neam întreg. Lor li se plătesc niște polițe de către un personaj foarte răzbunător. O teribilă nedreptate i se face și marelui fotbalist Gheorghe Popescu, fost căpitan al Naționalei României și al echipei FC Barcelona, condamnat doar pentru a se dovedi că justiția funcționează în România. Nu, nu funcționează, ci terorizează. Moare fotbalul românesc. Păcat.

1-131-000

László Tókécs (PPE). - Alig egy-két órája annak, hogy ma délután, a Székely szabadság napján az erdélyi Marosvásárhelyen a román hatóságok tiltó rendelkezései ellenére 20-30 ezres tömeg tüntetett Székelyföld területi autonómiájáért.

A román államnacionalizmus asszimilációs és betelepítési politikája következtében Erdély és Székelyföld magyarsága saját szülőhazájában már-már a krími tatárokéhoz hasonló helyzetbe jutott. Kisebbségi magyar közösségünk megmaradásának és jövőjének a biztosítékát az autonómiában látjuk. A jól működő európai autonómiák mintájára ennek megvalósításához kérjük és sürgetjük a román kormány, a nemzetközi közösség, az Európai Unió és az Európai Parlament hathatós támogatását.

1-132-000

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (S&D). - Domnule președinte, în secolul XXI, a-ți căuta un loc de muncă, a munci într-o țară străină și a locui acolo pentru a presta munca respectivă sunt drepturi fundamentale ale Uniunii. Persoana care dorește să muncească în alt spațiu geografic decât cel al țării sale beneficiază de același tratament ca și cetățenii țării respective în ceea ce privește accesul la piața muncii, condițiile de muncă și alte avantaje sociale și fiscale.

În egală măsură, dreptul la muncă presupune și dreptul la grevă, la atenționare într-o formă pașnică asupra încălcării unor drepturi fundamentale, așa cum au crezut de cuviință să facă și cetățenii români din Florența, Italia, agresați de autorități în timp ce interpelau pașnic

asupra drepturilor lor. Suntem în măsură, ca cetățeni europeni, să ne solidarizăm cu situația oricărui individ căruia i-a fost minimalizat sau anulat vreun drept garantat și absolut legal în Uniunea Europeană.

1-133-000

Chris Davies (ALDE). - Mr President, for 15 years I have heard members of the UK Independence Party (UKIP) come here and attack the European Union, but in reality, as we all know, they take their money while doing precious little to defend the 'interests' they hold dear.

Their attendance record is dire. They are not here when it matters. We have seen Nigel Farage, their leader, turn up to the Committee on Fisheries for the first time ever, only to resign, 'exhausted', after three hours' voting. Paul Nuttall, their deputy leader, serves on the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, alongside me. In four years I have seen him turn up to vote on just one occasion. That was last July, on the amendments to the Tobacco Products Directive and, in particular, on electronic cigarettes. His sole attendance in that committee only came after UKIP had received a donation of GBP []25 []000 from a manufacturer of electronic cigarettes.

So now we know it – GDP []25 []000 in political donations. That is the price of a UKIP vote. Let us remember that next time they try to lecture us all and claim the moral high ground.

1-134-000

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). - Hr. formand! Den amerikanske whistleblower, Edward Snowden, nævner i sit hørings svar til Europa-Parlamentet specifikt Danmark, men som de andre medlemslande afviser også min regering at tage affære over for NSA's spionage - ja de ønsker end ikke at forholde sig til, at der har fundet overvågning sted.

Det står klart, at NSA spionerede ved klimatopmødet COP15 i København. Jeg var med i Parlamentets delegation og kunne følge, hvordan en ambitiøs strategi gik i opløsning. Jeg vil gerne vide præcis, hvilken rolle NSA kom til at spille. Hvem blev overvåget? Blev europæiske interesser kompromitteret? Hvordan påvirkede overvågningen det nedslående resultat af klimatopmødet i København? At ingen af vores regeringer bekymrer sig over denne her sag, kan jeg simpelthen ikke forstå. Det er jo med til at skænde vores troværdighed, og det kan få meget grimme følger fremover, hvis det bliver ved at fortsætte på denne måde, og helt snævre diplomatiske nationale interesser tager magten.

1-135-000

Κυριάκος Τριανταφυλλίδης (GUE/NGL). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, όπως όλοι γνωρίζετε, ο αποκλεισμός της Λωρίδας της Γάζας επιβάλλει μια απάνθρωπη πραγματικότητα σε ενάμισι εκατομμύριο Παλαιστίνιους, που ουσιαστικά ζουν σε μια υπαίθρια φυλακή σε κατάσταση συνεχούς φόβου και φτώχειας για επτά τώρα χρόνια. Αυτός ο αποκλεισμός έχει χαρακτηριστεί από τη Γραμματεία των Ηνωμένων Εθνών για τις Ανθρωπιστικές Υποθέσεις ως άρνηση των θεμελιωδών ανθρωπίνων δικαιωμάτων κατά παράβαση του διεθνούς δικαίου. Το Ισραήλ έχει την πρωταρχική ευθύνη για την έλλειψη ευημερίας στη Γάζα, εφόσον ελέγχει τα σημεία εισόδου και εξόδου, τον εναέριο και θαλάσσιο χώρο της, το μητρώο πληθυσμού, τα τηλεπικοινωνιακά δίκτυα κ.ο.κ.

Γι' αυτό σας καλώ να επιμείνουμε στην άρση της πολιορκίας, ώστε να ανοίξουν όλα τα σημεία διέλευσης της Γάζας και να εξασφαλιστούν η αξιοπρέπεια και τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα του ντόπιου πληθυσμού. Όλοι οι περιορισμοί στην κυκλοφορία των ατόμων θα πρέπει να αρθούν, όπως θα πρέπει επίσης να εξασφαλιστεί η πρόσβαση στη γεωργική γη της Γάζας και να διευκολυνθεί η εμπορία και διαμετακόμιση εμπορευμάτων από τη Γάζα στη Δυτική Όχθη και το Ισραήλ.

1-136-000

Димитър Стоянов (NI). - Г-н Председател, в ръцете си държа чисто новия, приет преди няколко дни Изборен кодекс на Република България. Оставям на Вас оценката за това как може само три месеца, даже по-малко от три месеца преди предстоящите европейски избори да се приеме изцяло ново изборно законодателство. Но в този кодекс има текстове, които противоречат и са в разрез с акта за преки избори на представители в Европейския парламент.

И още нещо много важно беше направено зад кулисите. За първи път се разрешава отварянето на секции в страни извън територията на Европейския съюз. Деветдесет процента от българските граждани, които гласуват, се намират в Република Турция и всъщност те са на първо място турски граждани. И затова на предстоящите избори за първи път в историята ще сме свидетели, че няма да бъдат избирани само европейски представители, но и анадоолски представители.

1-137-000

Iuliu Winkler (PPE). - Az Európai Bizottság feladata, hogy az Unió minden polgárát, minden közösségét megszólítsa. Romániában közel másfél milliós magyar közösség él, a Bizottság romániai képviselőjének kommunikációjából mégis hiányzik a magyar nyelv. Nehezményezem, hogy Romániában a magyar közösség tagjai nem kapnak tájékoztatást a Bizottságtól az anyanyelvi médián keresztül.

A romániai magyarság lélekszáma nagyobb, mint egyes tagállamok összlakosságáé. Romániában annyi magyar él, mint Észtország össznépessége, többen vagyunk, mint Ciprus, Luxemburg vagy Málta lakossága. A romániai magyaroknak ugyanolyan joguk van az anyanyelvű tájékoztatásra, mint a Finnországban élő svédeknek, a spanyolországi katalánoknak, a belgiumi németeknek és a ciprusi törököknek. Kérem az Európai Bizottságot, hogy romániai képviselőjén vezesse be a magyar nyelvű tájékoztatást!

1-138-000

Luis Yáñez-Barnuevo García (S&D). - Señor Presidente, la crisis de Ucrania y la invasión ilegal de Crimea por Rusia han reactivado conceptos como la integridad territorial y su defensa como un bien jurídico y político.

Creo que la Unión Europea cometió un grave error reconociendo la secesión de Kosovo y ello abrió la espita de la tendencia secesionista en toda Europa. Jurídica y políticamente no existe el derecho a la secesión, pero como esta afecta no solo al Estado que la sufre en su territorio, sino a la Unión Europea en su conjunto, animo al Parlamento Europeo a que, haciendo uso de su derecho a decidir sobre asuntos que le afectan, refuerce los mecanismos jurídicos y políticos que pongan coto a la perversa moda separatista que ataca a bastantes de los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea y afecta, también, a su futuro como unión política.

1-139-000

Rina Ronja Kari (GUE/NGL). - Hr. formand! Jeg går ind for fri bevægelighed for arbejdskraften, men er der én ting, jeg ikke går ind for, så er det fri bevægelighed for løntrykkeri! Tag bare søfartssektoren. EU-Domstolen har slået fast, at søfart er omfattet af reglerne om ikkediskrimination. Alligevel har vi i Danmark DIS-loven, som siger, at søfarende uden bopæl i Danmark ikke kan omfattes af danske kollektive overenskomster. EU's regler om ikkediskrimination skal ikke kun gælde for adgangen til job, de skal også gælde for de løn- og arbejdsvilkår, man arbejder under. Tag f.eks. skibet "Ark Futura": Her må polske søfarere acceptere løn- og arbejdsforhold, der er langt ringere end deres danske kollegaers.

EU's ensidige fokus på retten til fri bevægelighed må stoppe. Det er tid til at sætte ind over for diskrimination i forhold til løn og arbejdsvilkår. Og der findes en enkel løsning, nemlig modtagerlandsprincippet. Det vil sige, at man skal arbejde under de forhold, der gælder i det land, man arbejder i. Kampen mod diskrimination og social dumping er uløseligt forbundet, og indførelsen af modtagerlandsprincippet er den eneste vej frem.

1-140-000

Diane Dodds (NI). - Mr President, in my constituency of Northern Ireland we have an outrageous situation where the previous Labour Government of Tony Blair introduced a secret scheme offering so-called 'comfort letters' to IRA terrorists known as on-the-runs. This scheme was introduced at the behest of Sinn Fein and administered entirely for their benefit. It only came to light when the trial against a man accused of the London Hyde Park bombing collapsed because he had such a letter preventing him from prosecution. There is no evidence to demonstrate that knowledge of the process went beyond a clique of Republicans, their confidants and the government.

It is time for truth and transparency. The First Minister in Northern Ireland has forced a judge-led enquiry into this scheme. The coalition government has stated that this scheme is over and will ensure that letters cannot be relied upon to avoid prosecution. The truth about a process which circumvented the UK Parliament and undermined the justice system must be exposed. On this European Day for Victims of Terrorism, the truth and ...

(The President cut off the speaker)

1-141-000

Ildikó Gáll-Pelcz (PPE). - Február 23-án az ukrán parlament elfogadott egy nyelvtörvényt. Ez a nyelvtörvény súlyosan sérti a kisebbségek jogait, mégpedig oly módon, hogy ott lehet kisebbségi nyelvet használni, ahol a kisebbség aránya eléri az 50%-ot. Ez az új szabályozás, ez az új törvény súlyosan sérti és korlátozza az Ukrajnában élő magyar kisebbségnek a jogait. Azon túl, hogy korlátozza ezeket a jogokat, úgy gondolom, hogy szembemegy az uniós normákkal.

Sajnálatos dolognak tartom, hogy az Európai Unió felé igyekvő Ukrajna első döntései egyike volt a kisebbségi jogoknak a korlátozása. Azt gondolom, hogy beavatkozásra van szükség, arra kérem a Bizottság elnökét, hogy aggodalmamat továbbítsa az ukrán parlamentnek, törvényhozásnak, és az ukrán kormánynak, hogy szabjon, határozzon meg olyan nyelvtörvényt, ami az uniós normákkal megegyező. S úgy gondolom, hogy megfogadva ezt az aggodalmat, ezt a kérést, sikerül egy jobb és megfelelő nyelvtörvényt létrehozni.

1-142-000

Claudette Abela Baldacchino (S&D). - Qeghdin niltaqgħu lllum proprju jumejn wara Jum il-Mara. Irrid nieħu din l-okkażjoni biex infakkar, mhux biss lin-nisa Maltin u Ghawdxin u lin-nisa Ewropej, iżda wkoll lin-nisa madwar id-dinja.

Nitkellem dwar dan il-jum b'ċertu dieqa. Ghaliex filwaqt li nirrikonoxxi li kien hemm nisa li għamlu suċċess f'hajjithom, nirrikonoxxi wkoll li hemm oħrajn li ma kellhomx l-istess opportunitajiet. Ghaliex dik it-tifla li tgħix f'dak l-isqaq remot f'dik il-gżira f'nofs il-Mediterran, x'opportunitajiet jista' jkollha jekk kemm-il darba ma jkollhiex aċċess għall-edukazzjoni?

Fl-istess hin, kif jista' dak it-tifel, illum raġel, ma jabbużax minn martu jew il-partner tiegħu jekk mhux mghallem li l-vjolenza domestika ma tagħmlekk raġel? Irrid nirrikonoxxi wkoll u nagħti għieħ lil dawk in-nisa kollha li, għax kienet għażla tagħhom u mhux bi sforz, iddeċidew illi l-karriera tagħhom tkun dik li jieħdu hsieb il-familja. Dawn ukoll jeħtieġu kull għajjnuna u rispettt. Daqskemm jeħtieġu għajjnuna u rispettt dawn in-nisa kollha li minkejja l-karriera, u anke a skapitu tagħha, iddeċidew li jieħdu hsieb il-ġenituri anzjani tagħhom minflok jibagħtuhom f'istituzzjonijiet.

Għalhekk għandna bżonn ta' politiki u strutturi li verament jgħinu lin-nisa. Għandna bżonn inħarsu b'mod olistiku lejn dan kollu u allura jeħtieġ sforz kollettiv f'hidma waħda sabiex naraw li l-mira tagħna tkun għall-iżvilupp ta' soċjetà ġusta.

1-143-000

PRESIDENZA DELL'ON. GIANNI PITTELLA

Vicepresidente

1-144-000

Alexander Mirsky (S&D). - Godātais priekšsēdētāja kungs, kolēģi! Lūdzu pievērst maksimālu uzmanību. 16.[nbsp]martā Eiropas Savienības teritorijā Latvijas valsts galvaspilsētā Rīgā notiks *Waffen SS* brīvprātīgo leģiona veterānu gājiens. Latviešu *SS* brīvprātīgo leģions tika izveidots no Trešā reiha soda bataljoniem, kuri zvērēja uzticību Ādolfam Hitleram. Šie varenie iznīcināja pusotru tūkstoti ciematu, nogalināja vairāk nekā 150[nbsp]000 mierīgo iedzīvotāju Lietuvā, Latvijā, Polijā, Krievijā un Baltkrievijā.

Nirnbergas tribunāls definēja *Waffen[nbsp]SS* kā noziedzniekus, tomēr šeit, Eiropas Parlamentā, visi izliekas, ka nekas nenotiek. Ir ļoti labs krievu izteiciens „*Народ, который не помнит свою историю, не имеет будущее*”, kas nozīmē „Tautai, kura neatceras savu vēsturi, nav nākotnes”.

Kamēr *Waffen SS* noziedznieki soļo pa Eiropu, Eiropai nav nākotnes. Paldies!

1-145-000

Csaba Sógor (PPE). - A mai napon Marosvásárhelyen újra békés tüntetésen kérték a Romániában élő magyarok a magyar többségű Székelyföld területi autonómiáját. A közel másfél milliós romániai magyarság több évtizede megfogalmazta azt az igényét, hogy a többségében magyarok lakta Székelyföld sajátos státuszú régiót képezzen, Románia területi integritását tiszteletben tartva nagyobb döntéshozatali jogosítványokat kaphasson.

A nemzetközi gyakorlat azt mutatja, hogy a különböző autonómiaformák nagyban elősegítik az etnikumok közötti békés és harmonikus együttműködést. A mai tüntetés üzenete az, hogy a Romániában élő magyarok helyzete kapcsán még számos tisztázatlan kérdés van, a közösség pedig békésen hangot ad elégedetlenségének és párbeszédre kéri a kormányt. Abban bízom, hogy a nemzetközi közösség is meghallja a romániai magyarok szavát.

1-146-000

Oleg Valjalo (S&D). - Gospodine predsjedavajući, u Republici Hrvatskoj je nedavno pokrenuta procedura prekomjernog deficita. U tom kontekstu želim ovdje istaknuti dvije važne činjenice. Prije svega, procedura prekomjernog deficita nije oblik zajedničkog kažnjavanja određene zemlje članice, nego je upravo suprotno. To je korektivni mehanizam kojim nastojimo postići ekonomsku ravnotežu na razini čitave Europske unije, i to na način da javne financije onih zemalja članica kojima je to potrebno zajedničkim snagama stabiliziramo i dovedemo u red.

Europska komisija u ovom procesu vladama pojedinih zemalja članica ne služi kao gonič robova, nego im treba biti pouzdani suradnik na čije se ekonomsko znanje i stručne preporuke upravo te vlade mogu s povjerenjem i osloniti. Ali, ako želimo da građani to zaista prepoznaju, onda je iznimno važno da Komisija u svojim smjernicama za konsolidaciju javnih financija pojedine zemlje ne robuje samo ekonomskim pokazateljima, nego se vodi i onim socijalnim, društvenim pokazateljima, pokazateljima u čijem se interesu nalazi mali čovjek i običan građanin, te naravno kvaliteti njegovog života.

1-147-000

Χαράλαμπος Αγγουράκης (GUE/NGL). - Κύριε Πρόεδρε, στις 6 Μάρτη στο κέντρο της Αθήνας αστυνομικές δυνάμεις επιτέθηκαν βάνουσα σε ανέργους εργαζόμενους και συνδικαλιστές που διαδήλωναν κατά χιλιάδες για μέτρα ουσιαστικής προστασίας των ανέργων. Στην Ελλάδα όπου η ανεργία είναι 27% και των νέων πάνω από 60% οι αρμόδιοι αρνήθηκαν να συναντήσουν αντιπροσωπεία των συνδικάτων, ενώ την ίδια στιγμή με εντολή της συγκυβέρνησης της Νέας Δημοκρατίας και του ΠΑΣΟΚ οι δυνάμεις καταστολής χτύπησαν τους διαδηλωτές. Η συγκυβέρνηση επιχειρεί με την ένταση της κρατικής βίας και καταστολής ενάντια στους εργαζόμενους να επιβάλει τη βάρβαρη αντιλαϊκή πολιτική της για να διασφαλίσει τα κέρδη των μονοπωλίων.

Καταγγέλλουμε την αντιλαϊκή πολιτική της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης, της συγκυβέρνησης του κεφαλαίου, Νέας Δημοκρατίας και ΠΑΣΟΚ, που πάει χέρι-χέρι με την κλιμάκωση του αυταρχισμού. Όλοι αυτοί είναι πολύ γελασμένοι εάν νομίζουν ότι με την καταστολή θα λυγίσουν το ταξικό συνδικαλιστικό κίνημα. Το Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα Ελλάδας με μεγαλύτερη αποφασιστικότητα θα συνεχίσει την πάλη για μέτρα ανακούφισης των ανέργων, μόνιμη σταθερή δουλειά για όλους με δικαιώματα.

1-148-000

Nicole Sinclair (NI). - Mr[nbsp]President, the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) is anathema to my constituents. It is promoted as a benefit of the EU, yet we see precious little of the money from the fund – which is, after all, UK taxpayers' money – being returned to us, and when it does come it is much reduced and has strings attached.

One ERDF-funded project is the Coventry Arena. In 2003 Coventry City Council received GBP[nbsp]4.75[nbsp]million from the fund. Last June I submitted a

freedom-of-information request to the council seeking to ascertain the purpose of the grant. At the same time, I submitted an official question to the Commission seeking the same information. Imagine my surprise when the answers did not match. In fact, they could not be further apart.

With other information that has come to my attention in the past year, and given Coventry City Council's constant refusal to meet me about these discrepancies in funding, I can only conclude that they have something to hide. When the Commission sought clarification of the situation, the council changed its position.

Today I can confirm that I am referring the matter to the EU anti-fraud office, OLAF, so that it can investigate this use of taxpayers' money. There is something rotten at the heart of Coventry City Council. Is there something fraudulent as well?

1-149-000

Roberta Metsola (PPE). - Il-Gvern Malti dan l-aħħar iddeċieda li jrid ipoġġi tanker tal-ħażna tal-gass li jkun ankrat fil-qalba tal-bajja ta' Marsaxlokk.

Jien ikkoordinajt petizzjoni ffirmata minn eluf ta' Maltin u Għawdxin li huma mhassba. Ahna rridu li l-Kummissjoni Ewropea tipproteġi r-residenti tan-Nofsinhar ta' Malta u tinvestiga l-perikli li hemm bid-deċiżjoni li ha l-gvern.

Nemmnu li l-mod kif se ssir il-ħażna jmur kontra d-Direttiva ta' Seveso. Irridu nkunu nafu l-gvern, bil-proġett tiegħu, x'impatt għandu fuq ir-residenti, l-ambjent, in-negozji, l-akkwakultura u s-sajjieda u l-bastimenti tagħhom. Dan li jrid jagħmel il-gvern hu totalment l-oppost ta' dak li għamlu gvernijiet oħra tal-Unjoni Ewropea, fejn ħadu l-prekawzjonijiet meħtieġa u bieghdu l-ħażna mill-art. Espert f'dan il-qasam qal li jekk ikun hemm "leakage" ta' gass, il-konsegwenzi jkunu diżastrużi, u 91% tar-residenti jaqblu miegħu.

Ahna lkoll irridu arja iktar nadifa u kontijiet orħos, imma nemmnu li dan jista' jsir mingħajr ma l-gvern ipoġġi lir-residenti fil-periklu.

1-150-000

Маруся Любчева (S&D). - Г-н Председател, дълго време преди българските граждани да получат правото на свободно придвижване и труд във всички страни членки на ЕС, бяхме свидетели на умишлено насаждана истерия от нахлуването на тълпи българи на 1 януари 2014 г. във Великобритания, Германия и други страни.

Днес определено можем да кажем, че такова не се състоя. Остана, обаче, горчивият привкус от несправедливото отношение към българските граждани, прокламирано на най-високо европейско и национално ниво в някои от страните членки. Остана привкусът на двоен стандарт.

Не съм чула или прочела извинение или опровержение от страна на колегата Фараж или от страна на официалните власти в Обединеното кралство за това, че "голямата беда, носена от българските граждани" просто не се състоя.

Мълчание, уважаеми колеги. Призовавам поне членовете на Европейския парламент да бъдат солидарни с европейските ценности, в името на чието съхранение те са тук, в този парламент, да не използват страховете на своите съграждани за своя политическа или собствена лична цел.

1-151-000

Presidente. - La discussione è chiusa.

15. Riesame del sistema europeo di vigilanza finanziaria (breve presentazione)

1-153-000

Presidente. - L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Sven Giegold, a nome commissione per i problemi economici e monetari, con raccomandazioni alla Commissione sul riesame del sistema europeo di vigilanza finanziaria (ESFS) (2013/2166(INL)) (A7-0133/2014).

1-154-000

Sven Giegold, Berichterstatter. - Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Zunächst möchte ich mich bei den Kollegen, insbesondere bei den Schattenberichterstattern – Frau Lulling, Herrn Sánchez Presedo –, für die gute Zusammenarbeit bei diesem Bericht herzlich bedanken. Wir haben ja vor drei Jahren schon einmal in einer etwas anderen Konstellation intensiv fraktionsübergreifend an der Schaffung der europäischen Aufsichtsbehörden für die Finanzaufsicht gearbeitet. Das war damals ein langer Prozess: 26 Triloge mit dem Rat, lange Diskussionen darum, wie wir die europäischen Aufsichtsbehörden nach der Krise so ausstatten und so effektiv machen können, dass sie tatsächlich zu einer wirksamen Finanzaufsicht führen können.

Jetzt sind nach langen, schwierigen Verhandlungen die Aufsichtsbehörden im Amt. Wir haben nach drei Jahren Bilanz gezogen. Wir haben zwei Studien in Auftrag gegeben, einmal über die sektorbezogenen Aufsichtsbehörden für Versicherungen, für Banken und für Märkte, und auf der anderen Seite über die makroprudenzielle Aufsicht. Das Ergebnis dieser Studien war höchst interessant, war auch sehr dicht bei dem, was ähnliche Studien der Kommission herausgefunden haben. Die Aufsichtsbehörden haben tatsächlich gut gearbeitet, sie haben ihre Mandate im Wesentlichen erfüllt, insbesondere bei der Gesetzgebung.

Aber wenn es um andere Rechte ging, die wir ihnen eingeräumt haben, so haben die Aufsichtsbehörden häufig ihre Arbeit nicht machen können. Dabei ging es insbesondere um die Frage: Was ist mit der Nichtumsetzung europäischen Rechts? In vielen Mitgliedstaaten wurde das europäische Recht letztlich nicht durchgesetzt. Die drei Aufsichtsbehörden haben praktisch überhaupt keine Rechtsbrüche festgestellt.

Genauso auch die verbindliche Streitschlichtung. Es ist nicht so, dass es keinen Streit mehr zwischen nationalen Aufsichtsbehörden gibt. Nur wurde die Befugnis der europäischen Aufsichtsbehörden zur verbindlichen europäischen Streitschlichtung nicht genutzt. Auch im Verbraucherschutz ist viel weniger passiert, gerade bei der Versicherungs- und der Bankenaufsichtsbehörde, als das eigentlich von uns geplant war. Mit anderen Worten: Die Studien haben festgestellt, dass wir nicht so weit gekommen sind, wie wir es eigentlich wollten.

Die makroprudenzielle Aufsicht, die für die Systemrisiken wichtig ist – auch dort haben wir wichtige Mängel festgestellt. Insbesondere ist die Behörde viel kleiner als etwa ihr US-counterpart. Sie ist auch nicht in der Lage gewesen, wirklich präventiv zu arbeiten, allerdings auch deshalb, weil wir noch mitten in der Krise stecken.

Über diese Diagnosen hinaus sagt mein Bericht auch klar: Wir haben einige Empfehlungen. Dazu gehört insbesondere, dass die Aufsichtsbehörden in die Lage versetzt werden sollen,

unabhängiger von den nationalen Aufsichtsbehörden Entscheidungen zu treffen. Im Moment ist es immer noch so, dass ohne eine Entscheidung im Aufsichtsgremium der nationalen Aufseher auf europäischer Ebene nicht einmal ein Arbeitsprozess gestartet werden kann. Da wollen wir die europäischen Aufsichtsbehörden unabhängiger machen, damit die Aufsichtschefs erstmals zum Beispiel einen Prozess zur Feststellung eines Rechtsbruchs auf nationaler Ebene einleiten können.

Generell enthält der Bericht eine ganze Reihe von Vorschlägen, wie wir die Macht der europäischen Aufsichtsbehörden stärken können. Zudem schlagen wir vor, dass die Zugänge zu Daten vereinfacht werden sollen. Alle europäischen Aufsichtsbehörden sollen die gleichen Daten haben wie auch die nationalen und sollen ihre Prozesse harmonisieren, damit das eben für die Finanzunternehmen mit weniger Befolgungskosten verbunden ist. Und wir wollen generell eine Stärkung der Finanzausstattung der verschiedenen Aufsichtsbehörden.

Jetzt hat die Kommission ein Jahr Zeit, unsere Vorschläge aufzugreifen oder zu begründen, warum sie dies nicht tun will. Ich verstehe, dass der Vorschlag der Kommission kurz bevorsteht. Wir warten mit Spannung darauf, was dort auf uns zukommt. Ich würde mich freuen, wenn sich viele unserer Vorschläge, die wir fraktionsübergreifend im Wesentlichen in großem Einvernehmen erarbeitet haben, in Ihrem Vorschlag wiederfinden würden, Herr Kommissar.

1-155-000

Procedura "catch-the-eye"

1-156-000

Astrid Lulling (PPE). - Monsieur le Président, je dois dire que, comme le rapporteur, je ne vois pas seulement les trous dans le fromage en ce qui concerne les prestations et le travail des autorités européennes. D'ailleurs, dès notre premier échange de vues sur ce rapport d'initiative, il y a sept mois, j'avais mis en doute l'utilité de cet exercice, notamment en raison du fait que la Commission européenne devait présenter en janvier de cette année son rapport sur le fonctionnement des trois autorités de surveillance créées en 2010. De plus, il faut savoir et ne pas oublier que la supervision européenne est elle-même en plein bouleversement avec l'accroissement du rôle de la Banque centrale européenne dans l'union bancaire en construction.

À mon avis, ce n'est pas au Parlement européen, en tant que colégislateur à part entière, de pondre un texte qui ressemble plus à un énième rapport de consultant en ce qu'il verse trop dans le pointillisme. Avec ses vingt-cinq visas, soixante-dix-neuf considérants, quatre articles, soixante-dix-huit recommandations, quinze questions à la Commission européenne, ce rapport devient illisible et inintelligible.

Je voudrais quand même dire, Monsieur le Président, que sur le fond il n'y a pas de gouffre d'incompréhension entre les groupes politiques, mais je reste sur ma faim en ce qui concerne la forme. Elle n'est pas dans l'intérêt du Parlement.

1-157-000

Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D). - Señor Presidente, el establecimiento del Sistema Europeo de Supervisión Financiera en 2010 fue un hito en el proceso de reforma financiera; esta es la primera revisión. Agradezco el trabajo del ponente, señor Giegold, y la cooperación

del resto de los ponentes en esta revisión, que se realiza después de la primera sentencia del Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea sobre la AEVM y que, en mi opinión, debe orientarse hacia tres grandes direcciones.

En primer lugar, mejorar la transparencia, la independencia y la eficacia del Sistema, mediante el acceso directo y el intercambio automático de información, sin duplicidades, a través de la independencia presupuestaria, el reforzamiento del papel del presidente, la posibilidad de delegación ejecutiva y el perfeccionamiento de los grupos de partes interesadas.

En segundo lugar, fortalecer el mandato con nuevas previsiones sobre transparencia y gobierno corporativo de las instituciones financieras y protección del consumidor, también reforzando la iniciativa en materia de mediación y control legislativo.

En tercer lugar, contribuir a reforzar la supervisión y la gobernanza económica europea, estableciendo la igualdad de los miembros del Sistema tras la integración en el mecanismo único de supervisión y posibilitando que las recomendaciones de la Junta Europea de Riesgo Sistémico se puedan dirigir al mecanismo único de supervisión y formar parte del Semestre Europeo.

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

1-158-000

William (The Earl of) Dartmouth (EFD), *blue-card question*. – Mr Sánchez Presedo, thank you very much for taking my question. You mentioned in your remarks what the interpreter translated as ‘automatic exchange of information’ and ‘transparency’. In your view, should automatic exchange of information and transparency include the role of Luxembourg as a tax haven for multinational companies within the European Union, and is it legitimate therefore for Mr Santer to put himself forward as a candidate for President of the Commission when he has presided over a tax haven?

1-159-000

Antolín Sánchez Presedo (S&D), *respuesta de «tarjeta azul»*. – Yo creo que son los partidos políticos y los ciudadanos los que tienen que establecer sus procesos democráticos y yo, evidentemente, soy partidario de que las autoridades que forman parte del Sistema Europeo de Supervisión Financiera puedan llegar a intercambiar la información de una forma automática, porque creo que es lo que más puede beneficiar al funcionamiento del Sistema, lo que puede reducir los costes y lo que puede incrementar la confianza entre todas las partes.

1-160-000

Seán Kelly (PPE). - A Uachtaráin, gan dabht ar bith is ábhar an-tábhachtach é seo agus tá moladh mór ag dul don rapóirtéir as ucht an dea-obair a rinne sé. Tá moladh ag dul freisin do mo chomhghleacaí Astrid Lulling, bean atá anois cúig bliana agus ceithre scór agus is eiseamláir í den tseirbhís phoiblí – tá jab maith déanta acu.

One of the key points made in Ireland as being the cause of our demise for a while – thankfully now we are recovering – was not the lack of regulation but the lack of application of the regulations. That was because of a lack of supervision.

I think having EU-wide rules and EU-wide supervision is necessary, firstly to learn a lesson from what transpired, and, secondly, to show that, no matter who is dealing with the situation, there should always be somebody above them to assess their work. I think this is what this will do. It will guarantee equality, it will guarantee consistency, and it will guarantee that the regulators do their job from now on.

1-161-001

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

1-162-000

Tonio Borg, *Member of the Commission*. - Mr [nbsp]President, on behalf of the Commission I would like to thank the rapporteur, Sven Giegold, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the European Parliament as a whole for the work done on this report on the review of the European System of Financial Supervision (ESFS). The report underlines the important contribution the ESFS has made to enhancing the quality and consistency of financial supervision in the internal market.

The ESFS was established to address the inefficient, uneven and fragmented regulation and supervision of financial institutions and markets, as revealed by the crisis, and the lack of coordination among supervisors. The report confirms that, overall, the authorities have lived up to the expectations we had of them. The report also points to some areas for improvement, particularly with regard to the governance of the authorities, which would benefit from a stronger focus on Union values and interests.

We very much welcome the contribution this report makes to the review. Based on our own assessment and consultations, we agree that the authorities are cornerstones of the comprehensive reform process that has been initiated since the outbreak of the financial crisis. They have successfully built functioning organisations, started to deliver on their mandates and developed their own profiles. Their roles should therefore be preserved and further strengthened.

We acknowledge that the establishment of a banking union will impact on the functioning of the ESFS, but it does not call into question its existence or the need for it. On the contrary, the European supervision authorities may have an even more crucial role to play than they do today in ensuring consistent application of EU law throughout the internal market. The recently-reviewed system of governance of the European Banking Authority (EBA) reflects that role.

The European Systemic Risk Board (ESRB) will remain the macro-supervisor for the Union as a whole, with a mandate unique in geographical scope and in the variety of sectors covered. An assessment of the interaction between the ESFS and the banking union would be premature at this stage, but this aspect will be closely monitored in the future.

We appreciate the report's consideration of some of the key issues concerning the functioning of the authorities. For example, we agree that due consideration should be given to how best to ensure that relevant decisions are taken in the European interest. We also concur that further streamlining of the funding arrangements should be considered, in order to ensure that the authorities can fulfil their mandates while taking into account the existing budgetary constraints at both national and European level. Moreover, we agree that the decision-making process in the ESRB General Board could be streamlined. The

Commission takes note of the recommendations addressed to it in the report and will carefully consider them when preparing its policy response in this area.

1-163-000

Presidente. - La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 11 marzo, alle 12.00.

16. Accesso del pubblico ai documenti 2011-2013 (breve presentazione)

1-165-000

Presidente. - L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione di Sophia in 't Veld, a nome della commissione per le libertà civili, la giustizia e gli affari interni, sull'accesso del pubblico ai documenti (articolo 104, paragrafo 7, del regolamento) tra il 2011 e il 2013 (2013/2155(INI)) (A7-0148/2014).

1-166-000

Sophia in 't Veld, rapporteur. - Mr President, I am glad we have the opportunity for a brief exchange on the topic of transparency. I would like to start my intervention with a little quote from one of my favourite television series, called 'Yes, Prime Minister', where Sir Humphrey Appleby is saying to the Prime Minister: 'open government, Prime Minister, freedom of information. We should always tell the press freely and frankly anything that they could easily find out some other way'. That is pretty much the attitude of the EU institutions today. Colleagues, we all know that the trust of the citizens is at an all-time low. So this is the moment when we need to make EU institutions more transparent and give the citizens more trust.

It is imperative that we develop a culture of transparency. For half a century, the European integration process has been driven by diplomats and civil servants – who did an excellent job, incidentally. But this is in the past. The diplomats have a culture of secrecy and discretion. They do not have a culture of transparency. Today we are in a political union in a Europe of citizens, and that means that transparency is a key element of the work that we are doing.

Before entering into the details of the report that has been adopted by the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs and that will be voted on tomorrow, I have just a few words on the EPP alternative motion for a resolution, which surprises me because it seems not to enhance transparency but actually to reduce it. I find this surprising, because there are also Members in the EPP Group who come from a tradition of transparency and openness. As a matter of fact, they are the very nationalities that have driven the process of transparency in the European Union.

If you read – I believe it is recital C in the EPP resolution – they do not seem to have a very high opinion of citizens' intelligence, because it reads 'the legislative decision-making process is very complex, with very many preparatory, confidential and secret documents being vital for the whole legislative process'. That reads a bit like 'do not worry your pretty little heads over it, citizens. We will sort it out behind closed doors'. And here I quote yet again 'Yes, Prime Minister', where his assistant Bernard says to Sir Humphrey Appleby: 'but surely the citizens of a democracy have a right to know', and Sir Humphrey replies 'no, they have a right to be ignorant. Knowledge only means complicity in guilt. Ignorance

has a certain dignity'. Now that may be fair for a comedy on television, but it is surely not fair for the way that we do politics in the European Union.

Now, regarding the recommendations: first of all, of course we urgently need to revise Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, for which Mr Cashman here is rapporteur. This is really urgent, and it is unacceptable that the Commission and the Council keep blocking progress.

Secondly, transparency must be the rule and secrecy the exception. It seems that the practice today is the other way round. We have made a couple of very pragmatic and practical recommendations. For example, every EU institution, including this House, could appoint a transparency officer today. We have plenty of civil servants; we can appoint somebody to oversee the process, make recommendations and develop a culture of transparency.

Secondly, having extensive experience with litigation in Court, I feel that we need lighter procedures to challenge negative decisions on requests for access to documents. It is absurd that we are burdening the courts with years and years of litigation. Yes, President, I am coming to a conclusion.

Finally, we need better procedures for classifying documents and for requests for in-camera meetings. Now it is a very random process which is left to high-ranking civil servants to decide. We want a regulation laying down criteria for the classification of documents and an independent oversight body to monitor that process.

1-166-001

(Interventi su richiesta)

1-167-000

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt (PPE). - Mr [nbsp]President, public access to documents is essential for enhancing citizens' trust in our work and bridging the gap between them and the European Union. Citizens have the right to know how decisions on their behalf are taken and to make us accountable for them. They have the right to know how public money is allocated and spent.

At times when Europe seems complex and far away, it is even more important to show our full commitment to transparency and openness. I am proud that Parliament is at the forefront of this and that most of our official debates are public and web-streamed, but we need to do much more, especially with regard to the rest of the European institutions. That is why I call on the Commission, the Member States and the Council to move forward with the regulation to improve public access to the documents of all EU institutions.

Let us open our doors. Let us encourage citizens to participate more. Let us make them feel that they are part of a community where decisions are taken for them in a democratic way. Let us continue to work together for a more democratic and transparent Europe.

1-168-000

Michael Cashman (S&D). - Mr President, can I congratulate Sophie on her excellent work, which I am pleased to say follows the revision that I have tried to undertake on behalf of Parliament. It is sad that, despite big compromises by Parliament, this is still blocked in Council and by the Commission. But I am hopeful that when we look at Sophie's report, which I think goes a bit further (which – if you allow me, Sophie – is a bit more avant garde), it will send a message to the Council and the Commission that Parliament, far from

backing way and taking perhaps a less moderate position, is increasing its demand for openness and transparency.

It is a great shame, but not a surprise, that parts of the EPP have tried to undermine this report – my revision, that is, and indeed the whole report – because what we need is more transparency, not less. I say to those elements – and Ms Sommer in particular – what are you afraid of? Where is there something to be afraid of in engaging your citizens? If you are afraid of democracy then please give up this job and find another, because democracy is all about accountability.

Let me finish on this: we need to look at one of the problems that was not envisaged, and that is the burden on NGOs of continuous and systematic requests of documents which undermine them and their ability to do their work.

I commend this report to the House and ask you to reject the alternative motion for a resolution, which does not have the interests of democracy at heart.

1-169-000

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, *(početak govora nerazumljiv)* povjerenje građana je na vrlo niskoj razini i stoga je vrlo važna transparentnost. Međutim, koliko je meni poznato u državama članicama postoji zakon o pravu na informiranje i temeljem tog zakona o pravu na informiranje građani imaju dostupnost svih dokumenata. Nadam se da je tako i da bi trebalo biti i na europskoj razini i vjerujem da ćemo sve više omogućiti građanima da imaju uvid u sve zakone i da sudjeluju u procesu donošenja odluka, i naravno da znaju kako se troši javni novac.

Smatram da je to neophodno, jer ćemo na taj način povećati interes i zaintrigirati naše građane da sudjeluju u procesima i da na taj način također možemo postići odaziv na izbore, jer smo rekli da nema dovoljno zainteresiranosti za odaziv na izbore. Mislim da je ovo jedan od načina kako možemo naše građane zainteresirati i zalažem se za što veću transparentnost, a što manju povjerljivost.

1-170-000

Seán Kelly (PPE). - Mr President, this is a very interesting topic. It is obvious that, in the age we are living in, the public, quite rightly, want more information and more transparency, and they want access to documents, above all given willingly rather than having to be extracted like hen's teeth. This has to be primarily in terms of the way we deal with issues in Parliament, but it must also apply to other institutions.

Sophia in 't Veld – who has done tremendous work in this area, along with Michael Cashman and Anna Maria Corazza Bildt – has mentioned the EPP. I am not directly involved myself but, having read their comments, I can see that they wish to make a distinction between access to documents, access to procedure and the space to think. This is obviously something that will probably need further discussion and negotiation in due course, but it would be ideal if we could get agreement across the House on what transparency is and which documents are available – and willingly available – to citizens at all times.

1-171-000

Tonino Picula (S&D). - Gospodine predsjedniče, transparentnost rada i rezultata tijela javne uprave te javna dostupnost informacija preduvjeti su za njihovu bržu komunikaciju s građanima i time ukupnu djelotvornost. Pravo na pristup informacijama jedno je od

temeljnih prava koje je potrebno osigurati građanima. Izuzetak mogu biti opravdani slučajevi kada dostupnost dokumenata ugrožava privatnost.

Zato je potrebno jasno definirati kriterije za klasifikaciju dokumenata na europskoj razini, a ne izbjegavati njihovu objavu generaliziranjem postojećih nejasnih pravila. Riječ je o temelju boljeg nadzora nad institucijama, ali i izgradnji društva informiranih građana kakvom Europska unija teži. Legitimnost demokratskog odlučivanja proizlazi iz dostupnosti relevantnih informacija koje građani koriste da bi donijeli utemeljenije odgovore. Zbog toga je ovo izvješće važno za demokratski i politički razvoj Unije ako kao cilj imamo transparentniji sustav za sve sudionike, od građana do službenika u javnim tijelima i institucijama. A takvo zaslužuje našu podršku.

1-172-000

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). - Gospodine predsjedavajući, podržavam ovo izvješće jer držim da je načelo transparentnosti jedno od onih oko kojih ne smije biti kompromisa. Cjelokupni rad političkih tijela i javnih institucija, kao i način te opseg njihovog financiranja, moraju biti otvoreno predstavljeni europskoj javnosti kojoj svi mi polažemo račune.

No, pomalo je paradoksalno da Parlament na vlastitu inicijativu želi donijeti ovakvu rezoluciju samo dva tjedna nakon što je u ovom domu izglasano produženje primjene članka 147. Poslovnika, čime je odgođena potpuna primjena hrvatskog jezika u ovoj instituciji.

Činjenice kažu da hrvatskim građanima u ovom trenutku nije zagarantiran ni polovičan pristup dokumentima institucija Unije na njihovom jeziku.

Ovim putem želim još jednom pozvati sve kolege zastupnike da stanemo na kraj ovakvoj isključenosti hrvatskih građana te učinimo sve kako bi oni u što kraćem roku imali puni pristup informacijama i dokumentima Unije na svom materinjem jeziku.

1-173-000

Renate Sommer (PPE). - Herr Präsident! Auch die EVP will Transparenz. Wir sind immer dafür eingetreten. Aber Transparenz muss da aufhören, wo Datenschutz gefährdet ist. Und, Frau in 't Veld, Sie treten doch sonst so sehr für den Datenschutz ein. In Ihrem Bericht tun Sie genau das, was Cashman auch immer gefordert hat und weshalb er ja auch mit seinem Bericht über viele Jahre gescheitert ist. Herr Cashman, ich bin im Übrigen froh, dass Sie das Parlament verlassen werden, wie ich gehört habe. Vielleicht kommen wir dann in diesem Bereich endlich mal weiter. Sie verwechseln den Zugang zu Dokumenten mit dem Zugang zum Verfahren. Und ja, das Gesetzgebungsverfahren ist komplex. Und ja, es gibt dort eine Phase, die man nicht in jedem Punkt offenlegen sollte. Das sind nämlich Triloge. Offensichtlich, Frau Berichterstatterin, haben Sie niemals in einem Trilog wirklich verhandelt. Denn sonst wüssten Sie, dass Sie der Lobby Tür und Tor öffnen würden, wenn Sie da der Öffentlichkeit den Zugang zu Dokumenten gestatten würden.

Sie wollen den Schutz der personenbezogenen Daten runterfahren. Sie wollen wettbewerbsrelevante Daten offenlegen, Sie wollen interne Verwaltungsvorgänge offenlegen. Das geht ganz einfach zu weit und gefährdet personenbezogene Daten der Mitarbeiter, der Verwaltungen, der Institutionen. Sie haben einen Absolutheitsanspruch. Sie haben nicht versucht, überhaupt mit der EVP zu sprechen. Im Gegenteil: Sie haben sich dominieren lassen durch unseren Kollegen Cashman, der diesen Bericht wohl eigentlich geschrieben

hat. Deshalb hat die EVP eine eigene EntschlieÙung verfasst, die nach unserer Ansicht die Dinge besser fasst!

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

1-174-000

Sophia in 't Veld, *blue card question* . - First of all, let me say that I am actually not happy that Mr Cashman is leaving us after having done a great job for 15 years. Secondly, I have spoken to the EPP and have supported quite a few of the excellent amendments by your EPP colleague Ms Corazza Bildt. But my question to you is: do you not actually think that the citizens themselves are the best judges of what information they should and should not get? Why is it that you refuse that kind of openness? It does not mean that everything is open; at the moment secrecy seems to be the rule. I do have experience in trilogues. I also have some experience in court, litigating for more transparency. Do you have that experience, Ms Sommer?

1-175-000

Renate Sommer (PPE), *Antwort auf eine Frage nach dem Verfahren der „blauen Karte“* . – Frau Kollegin! Ich bin seit 15[nbsp]Jahren Mitglied dieses Parlaments. Ich habe in schwierigsten Trilogen zu sehr strittigen Themen mit unglaublicher Lobbybeteiligung verhandelt. Deshalb weiß ich sehr genau, worüber ich rede. Ja, Sie haben EVP-Änderungsanträge der Kollegin Corazza Bildt akzeptiert. Warum? Weil diese Kollegin eine von denen ist, die Ihre Meinung teilt, Frau in 't Veld. Aber Sie haben sich mit den anderen Änderungsanträgen der EVP überhaupt nicht auseinandergesetzt. Und deswegen ist es richtig, was ich gesagt habe. Sie haben einen Absolutheitsanspruch. Aber Sie haben die Weisheit nicht mit Löffeln gegessen. Es gibt noch eine andere Weisheit. Und die lautet, dass man so viel wie möglich offenlegen soll, aber nicht alles offenlegen kann, was Sie offengelegt haben wollen.

1-175-001

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

1-176-000

Tonio Borg, *Member of the Commission* . - Mr President, I wish to thank the rapporteur, Ms Sophia in 't Veld, for underlining again the crucial importance of the principle of transparency in enabling democratic participation and fostering public trust in the European institutions.

It is certainly the joint responsibility of the Council, Parliament and the Commission to ensure the appropriate transparency in these institutions. This joint responsibility of the institutions also applies to one of the most significant instruments in the field of transparency – the right of access to documents implemented by the so-called 'Access to Documents' Regulation.

An ever-increasing number of documents are being disclosed following requests from citizens under this Regulation. The Commission, for instance, handles more than 6[nbsp]000 access requests per year. This illustrates that citizens are increasingly aware of their rights in this area. The Commission remains the institution handling by far the largest number of requests for access to documents. For instance, more than four out of five

requests are granted at the first stage, and there is a relatively low average number of confirmatory applications – approximately 200 per year. The Commission remains clearly committed to implementing access to documents legislation as fully, effectively and positively as ever. In doing so, the Commission takes full account of the comprehensive case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union, which has developed over time and to which the rapporteur herself has made reference.

The rapporteur is putting much emphasis on the issue of trilogues, and given the role of trilogues in legislative procedures, it is clearly the primary responsibility of the co-legislator to define the appropriate level of transparency in this area. The Commission supports the general aim to make the legislative process transparent and easily understandable. The right balance must be struck between transparency and the efficiency of the legislative process. As suggested by Ms Sophia in 't Veld, the Commission is ready to re-examine, together with the Council and Parliament, the format of our annual reports on access to documents, with a view to making them more comparative.

Finally, as far as the review of the Access to Documents Regulation is concerned, the Commission remains open to a genuine discussion with the two branches of the legislature on the basis of the existing Commission proposals.

1-177-000

Presidente. - La discussione è chiusa.

La votazione si svolgerà martedì 11 marzo, alle 12.00.

17. Attività della commissione per le petizioni nel 2013 (breve presentazione)

1-179-000

Presidente. - L'ordine del giorno reca la relazione annuale di Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa, a nome della commissione per le petizioni, sulle attività della commissione per le petizioni nel 2013 (2014/2008(INI)) (A7-0131/2014)

1-180-000

Jarosław Leszek Wałęsa, rapporteur. - Mr President, this is the final annual Committee on Petitions (PETI) report of the Seventh Legislature of the European Parliament, so it is more than just an outline of the Committee's activities in 2013. It is also an overview of the whole parliamentary term.

The basic document is divided into three parts. The first part details the work of the Committee and the summary of our achievements. The second and third chapters, entitled New Horizons and Working Methods, are basically proposals for new suggestions to make the Committee's work more substantial and visible.

One of these is the emphasis on collaboration with the other EU institutions and national authorities. As we all know, PETI is the platform for citizens to voice their concerns, and this enables dialogue. Therefore, it is very important to adopt final internal rules and to revise accordingly the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament to improve PETI working methods. Furthermore, we need clear deadlines to speed up the life cycle of petitions, but we must not forget to make the whole process more transparent and democratic.

Among the most important tools of the PETI Committee are the fact-finding visits. The revision of the rules on these is needed to introduce more efficiency and facilitate organisation. This is what we have to accomplish in the next term. As for the past, in 2013 the Petitions Committee was responsible for the organisation of the election of the new Ombudsman, Ms Emily O'Reilly, and dealt with a relatively higher number of fact-finding visits than in the past.

The PETI Committee held a series of public hearings on major subjects of petitions, such as citizenship and the importance of having single registration procedures for EU citizens in the national and European elections; the hearings on the impact of the economic crisis – petitioners here have criticised the unwillingness of banks to provide investment funding for small businesses – and the hearings on the rights of disabled people and, more precisely, of blind people.

The conclusions seem clear: annual dialogue between the members of the PETI Committee and the members of the petitions committees in the national parliaments is needed. On top of that, there is a strong recommendation for the use of new information and video facilities for future PETI Committee meetings which will bring further cost savings in the organisation of its hearings.

As for the statistics, since 2009 about 10[nbsp]000 petitions have been registered in the European Parliament, of which about 60[nbsp]% were declared admissible. In 2013 alone, 2[nbsp]800 petitions were registered. I am convinced that more and more Europeans will address petitions to the European Parliament in the future. We need to live up to their expectations and call on the European Parliament to adopt urgent measures to ensure the efficient and transparent processing of petitions.

This report should be viewed not only as an achievement but also as a stepping stone towards new reforms which would allow the Petitions Committee to further assist citizens and to set standards for the upcoming legislature.

1-180-001

(Interventi su richiesta)

1-181-000

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). - Mr President, I thank the rapporteur for his work on this report. I have just a few observations.

The Committee on Petitions is certainly a place of access for citizens, judging by the numbers of people who come to us. I still have some concern about how we handle all those people who bring petitions to us, the timeliness of our response, and also how we judge the admissibility of petitions, but it is clear that European citizens have greater trust in Parliament's Committee on Petitions than they perhaps have in their own parliaments' petitions committees. Even though we say there is a distrust of institutions, I am always impressed when people come to Europe for a solution to a national problem.

The Committee plays a key role in linking with citizens and very often achieves results. Sometimes it lets people down, because we take on petitions that we cannot resolve, and I was happy that one or two petitions could be returned to the Irish Parliament for consideration. However, it has done good work over this past legislature and will continue to do so in the next one.

1-182-000

Marino Baldini (S&D). - Gospodine predsjedniče, funkcija Europskog parlamenta je da ispravno rješava i razmatra zahtjeve građana EU-a i da u svom radu to čini demokratski i transparentno. Važno je da inicijative građana i pravo na predstavku budu što bolje zastupljeni u radu Europskog parlamenta. Osim što građanima daje priliku da se izravno obrate svojim predstavnicima u mnogim pitanjima, Odbor PETI predstavlja glavno sredstvo za implementaciju Povelje Europske unije o temeljnim pravima čovjeka. Po tome, inicijativa direktno poboljšava sposobnosti Parlamenta Europske unije i jamči temeljna prava svima i odgovara na preokupacije građana.

Zbog navedenog, važno je da ovo pravo mora ostati u potpunosti zajamčeno i neovisno od državnih interesa. Europi je potrebna vjerodostojna i vidljiva politika koja joj omogućuje suočiti se s lakoćom s današnjim i budućim izazovima. Uspješnom implementacijom mehanizama, kao što je pravo na predstavku omogućuje čuti svijest građana koji čine ovu Uniju, vidjeti probleme i s odgovarajućim rješenjima ojačati demokraciju i izbjeći slične situacije u budućnosti.

1-183-000

Andrej Plenković (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, zahvaljujem kolegi na izvješću o djelatnostima odbora za predstavke tijekom 2013. Smatram da ono nudi objektivan pregled rada odbora i sadržava niz konstruktivnih preporuka, osobito u pogledu administrativnih kapaciteta odbora. Za razliku od niza drugih odbora ovoga Parlamenta koji kreiraju zakonodavstvo Europske unije, Odbor za predstavke sluša građane i na temelju njihovih predstavki provjerava primjenu EU zakonodavstva u državama članicama.

Građani Unije su prepoznali ovaj instrument, koriste ga sve više, a važno je naglasiti da su pitanja okoliša, temeljnih prava i unutarnjeg tržišta tri glavna područja interesa podnesenih predstavki. U tom smislu 10 000 predstavki u ovom sazivu Europskoga parlamenta kao i 2 885 tijekom europske godine građana jasan su signal interesa naših građana za Europska pitanja, ali i odgovor i pomoć Parlamenta na ona pitanja koja njih muče. U tom smislu vjerujem da će u idućem mandatu upravo ovaj Odbor za predstavke biti važan za dijalog s europskim građanima o svim europskim temama.

1-184-000

Angelika Werthmann (ALDE). - Mr [nbsp]President, 2013 was indeed a very active year in the Committee on Petitions. I would like to focus on two points.

As you know, it proved possible to resolve numerous issues, and I would like to mention, in particular, the cooperation with the Spanish authorities during the year. They were very forthcoming and cooperated successfully in resolving the issue of the *Ley de Costas*. A lot has been achieved and we hope to continue in the same spirit.

If we had had similar cooperation on our fact-finding visit to Denmark, many Danish and non-Danish mothers, as well as non-Danish fathers, would be better off by now. They need our support. There is a serious systemic and structural problem here, and I expect all of us to take a clear stand on the side of these petitioners. Our people must be heard and taken seriously, and we in the European Parliament should encourage their active participation.

1-185-000

Margrete Auken (Verts/ALE). - Hr. formand! Tak til Wałęsa for den udmærkede betænkning, men der er to ting, jeg synes, vi skal være opmærksomme på i forbindelse med dette udvalg, som er Parlamentets egentlige borgernære udvalg. For det første er det det eneste udvalg, der ikke har fået tilført ekstra ressourcer efter Lissabontraktaten. Samtidig er mængden af andragender steget betragteligt! Løsningen her er ikke at sige, at vi skal indføre mere effektive metoder - jeg tror ikke, vi kan gøre arbejdet meget mere effektivt, end vi gør! Vejen frem er at få tilført flere ressourcer, så vores sekretariat bliver bedre udrustet.

For det andet vil jeg gerne støtte, hvad Baldini nævnte i sit indlæg. Han sagde det pænt: at udvalget bør være fri af alle stats- og partipolitiske interesser. Betænkningen indeholder forslag om, at der skal stemmes om, hvilke sager der skal behandles. Men det er en farlig vej, for så bliver det jo netop partipolitisk og ikke med fuld respekt for, at borgerne uanset partipolitiske interesser bliver hørt i deres klager til os.

1-186-000

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, ova europska građanska inicijativa koja je omogućila građanima participaciju nakon Lisabonskog sporazuma pokazala se jako dobrom, o čemu i govore brojke. Ako je 10 000 predstavnika bilo u zadnjih pet godina, a u zadnjoj godini 2013.-oj 2 800, vidimo da je to instrument koji građane zanima i žele ga koristiti, a povezan je i s prošlom točkom dnevnog reda.

Ono što se da zaključiti je da je potreban dijalog, ali posebno dijalog između članova odbora Europskog parlamenta i nacionalnih parlamenata, jer zaista je zabrinjavajuće da se građani prije obraćaju Europskom parlamentu, nego svom nacionalnom parlamentu, što znači da moramo graditi povjerenje i transparentnost o kojoj smo maloprije govorili. Ono što mi se posebno sviđa u ovom izvješću je da će se uskoro uvesti poseban PETI web portal, preko kojeg će se moći dati i *online* peticija s čime ćemo našim građanima bitno omogućiti da lakše iznesu svoje probleme.

1-187-000

Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE). - Señor, Presidente, como ponente alternativo de este informe quiero agradecer al señor Wałęsa su trabajo, pero también quiero recalcar varias cosas en este que será el último informe de esta legislatura.

La ciudadanía confía en la Comisión de Peticiones; el número de peticiones en 2013 ha doblado el de 2010 y se han recibido más de 10[nbsp]000 en el total de la legislatura. Por ello es necesario que la comisión sea dotada de más medios humanos y que el portal web sea puesto en marcha sin dilación. Pero estamos asistiendo a un intento del Partido Popular Europeo de rebajar el perfil político de la Comisión de Peticiones, con la intención de salvaguardar a los Gobiernos de los Estados miembros. A esa conclusión llegamos al leer la parte referida a los métodos de trabajo, donde se entra en detalles de procedimiento ajenos —en nuestra opinión— a un informe de este tipo, o la referencia en el considerando K a la adopción democrática de los órdenes del día, que puede otorgar a los grandes grupos la posibilidad de controlar los temas a tratar.

Por último, quiero llamar la atención sobre la importancia de aprobar la enmienda 7, que demanda la posibilidad para el peticionario de dirigirse a la Comisión de Peticiones en su lengua propia, tal como se puede hacer ahora por escrito con la Comisión o con el Comité

de las Regiones, como consecuencia de un acuerdo bilateral entre esas instituciones y los Estados miembros. Ello ayudaría a acercar el Parlamento a la ciudadanía y a defender uno de los principios de la Unión: la diversidad cultural y lingüística.

1-188-000

Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (S&D). - Wałęsa úr kiváló jelentése is bizonyítja, hogy 2009 óta a Petíciós Bizottság nemcsak az Európai Parlament, de az egész Európai Unió lelkiismeretévé vált. Reményt kellett nyújtanunk az elmúlt években azoknak a polgároknak, akik a demokratikus alapjogok megsértése miatt fordulnak az uniós intézményekhez. A magyarországi kordedvezményes és szolgálati nyugdíjak megszüntetésével jogtalanul fosztottak meg több tízezer embert. Ezeknek az ügye még napirenden van.

Fel kellett lépünk olyan ügyekben is, mint a kollektív bűnösség elvét kimondó Benes dekrétumok 2007-es megerősítése, vagy a szlovákiai állampolgársági törvény. Az EU nem maradhat néma és tétlen az alapjogok megsértésekor, legyen szó akár a szerzett jogok elvételéről, akár a felvidéki magyar közösség kollektív megbélyegzéséről. Sajnos az elmúlt időszakra jellemző az, amiről McGuinness asszony beszélt, hogy az Európai Bizottság nem tartja be az Alapjogi Charta szellemét és betűjét.

1-189-000

Seán Kelly (PPE). - A Uachtaráin, i slí amháin is dócha gurb é an coiste achainíocha (PETI) an coiste is tábhachtaí go háirithe do shaoránaigh a bhíonn i mbaol trasna na hEorpa: daoine a bhíonn in éadóchas, tagann siad anseo agus faigheann siad dóchas; daoine nach féidir leo cothrom na Féinne a fháil ina thír féin tagann siad anseo agus faigheann siad cothrom na Féinne. Tá moladh mór ag dul do na Feisirí óna Ballstáit éagsúla a éisteann le hachainíocha ó thíortha eile nach bhfuil aon bhaint acu leo. Déanann siad an-jab agus is fiú iad a mholadh dá bharr. Thug mé féin cúpla achainí anseo – ceann amháin a bhain le hionad salachair Inis Sionnach. Bhí an ráta galair don ailse 35% níos airde ná an méan. Tháinig siad anseo agus fuair siad cinneadh sásúil agus anois tá an t-ionad á ghlanadh agus cuirfear deireadh leis an salachar. Dá bhrí sin, déanann sé obair an-mhaith agus dá bhrí sin is fiú é a leanúint amach agus gach tacaíocht a thabhairt dó.

1-189-001

(Fine degli interventi su richiesta)

1-190-000

Tonio Borg, *Member of the Commission* . - Mr President, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Wałęsa, for his excellent report on the activities of the Committee on Petitions in 2013. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank Ms Mazzoni and the whole Committee on Petitions for their work.

The Commission has examined this report with great interest. It provides very interesting information about the activities of the Committee. Even though the nearly 3[nbsp]000 petitions that were received last year concerned a wide variety of subjects, the report clearly points to the most topical and sensitive policy areas which formed the subject matter of petitions in 2013. The Commission finds that the work of the Committee on Petitions is of the utmost importance, as it implements the right to petition, which is one of the most fundamental rights of all European citizens.

Many petitions have been submitted in relation to issues concerning fundamental human rights, the environment, the internal market and the economic and social consequences of the crisis. For instance, petitions have been filed on the rights of children of separated or divorced parents, on the right to legitimately acquire property, and – to mention some others – on the rights of disabled persons and the right of free movement without discrimination on any grounds.

The petitions show that the citizens of the EU are conscious of the problems and concerns in a very concrete and tangible way. Just by looking at the list of topics, it is very easy to understand why the citizens concerned are keen to get these problems solved. It is, of course, very important that these issues are addressed when the EU has the competence and capacity to act, and the Commission has a special role in this context as guardian of the Treaties.

As you know, the Commission contributes to the work on petitions. It finds that it is extremely important to contribute when citizens use this concrete and established way of signalling their concerns. At a time when the so-called 'citizen disconnect' is a recurring theme, it is crucial that citizens' concerns are heard. We hope that petitions can contribute to citizens regaining or consolidating their trust in the EU.

Many initiatives are being taken at present to reach out to citizens, and we see that they are using the available tools more than ever. The rise in the number of petitions – as has been mentioned in this Chamber – is proof of that. There are other examples, like the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI), on which I will say a few words. On the whole, I think we can be very satisfied with how this new transnational instrument of participatory democracy has been used and implemented so far. I have recently seen the submission of the first two successful ECIs: one on the right to water and the petition entitled 'One of Us'. More and more organisers are submitting requests for registration of their initiatives. The positive trends of the first two years clearly suggest that we are witnessing the emergence of what has the potential to become a popular and possibly influential means for our citizens to get directly involved in the work that our institutions carry out.

May I say, Mr President, that the Commission is grateful for the constant support shown by the Committee on Petitions, and by the European Parliament more generally, as regards the implementation of the European Citizens' Initiative, which is an important complement to our more traditional representative democratic structures. As with petitions, this is a clear way for citizens who want to engage on EU issues to do so directly with the institutions, and the Commission counts on your continuing support. This Commission looks forward to continuing and enhancing its fruitful cooperation with Parliament in the field of petitions in the coming months. I am confident that the new Commission will continue this excellent cooperation with the same commitment.

1-190-500

Dichiarazioni scritte (articolo 149)

1-190-750

Peter Jahr (PPE), *schriftlich*. – Der diesjährige Jahresbericht des Petitionsausschusses 2013 ist in vielerlei Hinsicht ein besonderer: So geht er nicht nur auf unsere geleistete Arbeit und die Erfolge ein, sondern skizziert darüber hinaus auch mögliche neue Perspektiven für die interne Arbeit des Ausschusses, aber auch in seiner Außenwirkung. Thematisiert ist beispielsweise das neue Webportal, das, sobald es online zur Verfügung steht, die Laufbahn

einer Petition im Ausschuss beschleunigen und unsere Arbeitsweise transparenter machen soll. Aber nicht nur online wollen wir für mehr Effizienz sorgen. Wir haben uns in dieser Legislaturperiode immer wieder Gedanken darum gemacht, wie wir auch die analogen Arbeitsabläufe straffen und verbessern können. Diesen Prozess gilt es fortzusetzen. Darüber hinaus beschreibt der Bericht die zahlreichen Aktivitäten, die der Petitionsausschuss unternommen hat. Diese reichen von der Organisation der Wahl der neuen Europäischen Bürgerbeauftragten Emily O'Reilly bis hin zu öffentlichen Anhörungen beispielsweise zur Unionsbürgerschaft. Der Petitionsausschuss ist sprichwörtlich der direkte Draht zu unseren Bürgerinnen und Bürgern. Mir ist es daher ein besonderes Anliegen, diesen Draht nach außen hin sichtbarer und nach innen straffer zu gestalten, um auch in Zukunft gewährleisten zu können, dass die Anliegen der Bürger in Europa Gehör finden.

1-191-000

PRZEWODNICZY: JACEK PROTASIEWICZ

Wiceprzewodniczący

18. Sektor ogrodnictwa (krótka prezentacja)

1-193-000

Przewodniczący. - Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Antheę McIntyre w imieniu Komisji Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi w sprawie przyszłości europejskiego sektora ogrodnictwa — strategii na rzecz wzrostu 2013/2100 (INI) (A7-0048/2014).

1-194-000

Anthea McIntyre, rapporteur. - Mr President, I am pleased to be able to present this report today, and I sincerely hope it receives wide support when it comes to the vote. Horticulture is a hugely important subject for Europe. I believe that horticulture can make a great contribution both to the European economy and to feeding the world at a time when we are all very concerned about food security. The report stresses the importance of promoting the horticulture sector and, particularly, of enabling it to compete better in the global marketplace through innovation, research and development, energy efficiency and adaptation to climate change, all of which the report covers.

Food security is a major issue for all of us. Within 20 years we will need approximately 40% more food than we currently produce. At the moment horticulture produces 18% of Europe's agricultural output using only 3% of the land, so there is great scope for pushing that forward. We must also be able to export, and my report emphasises the need to make it easier for our producers to gain access to third-country markets. The export value of our ornamentals is approximately EUR 1.9 billion a year.

There are many other things which I would like to bring to your attention, but I will not have time to cover all of them. The report very much supports producer organisations (POs), and it calls on the Commission, in its review of the fruit and veg regime which is just coming out, to give us some clear and practical rules on the working methods of POs and to adjust the scheme to fit the market conditions in the various Member States. We have seen, particularly in the UK, examples of POs being de-recognised simply because

they do not seem to fit the way that the Commission envisages them working. The rules need to be much more helpful to growers and their organisations.

Another aspect is integrated pest management (IPM), which is an area with much scope for future development. If we are going to compete in the global marketplace we must embrace new methods and new techniques. We cannot afford to bury our heads in the sand and say that we want to revert to completely organic, green, never-touch-anything methods. Developments like IPM give us the opportunity to improve the way we do things, but we cannot for the moment do without plant protection products, various sprays and indeed neonicotinoids. We must make sure that any decisions we take are based on scientific evidence and are not only hazard-based. I would like to pay tribute to organisations such as Harper Adams University, in my own region of the West Midlands, which are very active in this area.

Lastly, and particularly in the light of youth unemployment levels across Europe, we have a great opportunity to offer worthwhile careers in horticulture. We need botanists, agricultural engineers and plant scientists: all these fields offer fulfilling, worthwhile careers that we must encourage our young people to take up.

1-195-000

(Posiedzenie zostało zawieszono na kilka chwil.)

19. Sektor ogrodnictwa (krótka prezentacja) (kontynuacja)

1-197-000

President. - Dear colleagues, we wish our colleague Ms Patrão Neves all the best for her health, and we hope that tomorrow she will take part in our debates and in the voting.

We now continue with the debate on the report by Anthea McIntyre on the future of Europe's horticulture sector – strategies for growth (2013/2100(INI)) (A7-0048/2014).

Pytania z sali

1-199-000

Mairead McGuinness (PPE). - Mr [nbsp]President, thank you for your sensitivity in dealing with this terrible incident. We wish Maria well.

Briefly, I want to thank the rapporteur for this report and to concentrate on paragraphs [nbsp]14 and 15 concerning producer organisations, because the feedback I get is that, while they are a good idea in theory, there are huge implementation problems in the Member States. This needs to be addressed, because we promised producers that these provisions would be the answer to all their problems, and that is not the case.

The second really important issue – and perhaps we could do with more debate on it – is the content of paragraph [nbsp]16, which relates to unfair trading practices across the European Union. I fully support the proposal here that we need a legislative framework for a code of conduct for operators in the food supply chain, and a national adjudicator. I think the experience of the United Kingdom here is something which we all value, and which we should watch in terms of its effectiveness.

1-200-000

Hiltrud Breyer (Verts/ALE). - Herr Präsident! 2009 hat das Europäische Parlament, hat die Europäische Union die Pestizidverordnung beschlossen. Gefordert wurde darin, dass die Kommission Kriterien für endokrine Stoffe vorlegt. Das hat die Kommission leider auf die lange Bank geschoben. Als damalige Berichterstatterin des Europäischen Parlaments bin ich allerdings entsetzt, wie mit diesem Initiativbericht, der keinerlei Rechtsbindung hat, versucht wird, die Kriteriensetzung für diese endokrinen Stoffe in Abrede zu stellen.

Es kann doch nicht angehen, dass versucht wird, eine Verordnung, die demokratisch in transparenter Weise beschlossen worden ist, mit dieser Initiative, die eine einzige Werbebroschüre für die Pestizidindustrie ist, auszuhebeln. Damit schafft man keine Begeisterung für Europa, denn damit zeigt man, dass man sich vor den Karren spannen lässt, dass man Handlanger ist für die Pestizidindustrie und dass man leider die Verbraucherschutzinteressen und auch die Interessen der Umwelt mit Füßen tritt.

Ich finde sehr bedauerlich, dass es diesen Initiativbericht gibt, der überhaupt keine Rechtsgrundlage hat, und dass man versucht, damit quasi nur die Industrieinteressen voranzubringen. Das ist umso bedauerlicher, als das Europäische Parlament gerade jetzt, wo die Europawahl vor der Tür steht, damit das falsche Zeichen setzt. Es muss uns darum gehen, Verbraucherschutz und Umweltschutz voranzubringen. Daher hoffe ich, dass dieser Initiativbericht abgelehnt wird!

1-201-000

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, zanimljivo je ovo izvješće. Važna je promocija hortikulture, ali isto tako sigurna opskrba hranom. Ovdje su zanimljive brojke i disparitet između 18 % ukupne vrijednosti poljoprivredne proizvodnje, a istovremeno koristi se samo 3 % obradive površine.

Ja bih željela reći podatke iz Hrvatske, gdje poljoprivredni sektor nedovoljno iskorištava raspoložive resurse i potencijale. Puno je malih i rascjepkanih zemljišta na kojima je konkurentna proizvodnja gotovo nemoguća.

Mnogi drugi faktori su tamo koji ograničavaju učinkovitost proizvodnje. U prilog ionako već lošem stanju u hortikulturi izražavam duboku zabrinutost zbog toga što se između jedne trećine i jedne polovine proizvoda baca samo zbog svog izgleda i zato se slažem s time da Komisija treba pronaći rješenje kako oblikovati tržišna pravila da bi i ovi neki proizvodi mogli biti konkurentni.

Isto tako želim uputiti mlade da se uključe u ovaj sektor poljoprivrede, odnosno hortikulture.

1-202-000

Seán Kelly (PPE). - Mr President, I too would like to wish Maria well. Thank you for the way you handled the situation.

This is a very important topic, and unfortunately it could be described as the forgotten aspect of the agricultural industry. In terms of land, it is only 3% of land usage, but it nonetheless accounts for 18% of produce. Furthermore, 70% of the holders have less than five hectares. But where would we all be without fresh fruit and vegetables? The more local they are, the better. For that reason, we should be encouraging this sector as much as possible and dealing particularly with the issues that affect them greatly. My

colleague Ms McGuinness referred to the supply chain and unfair trading practices. That is one area.

Secondly, there is the area of workers, and particularly of ensuring that people have a career choice in this area, particularly by having third-level courses aimed at it and addressing its needs. Finally, there is research and development; we need to put far more resources into it to make it a better area to work in and also to have better practices which can be more profitable for the producers.

1-203-000

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE). - Ogrodnictwo to ważny sektor gospodarki – rolnictwa – sektor, który zapewnia nie tylko produkty żywnościowe ważne dla właściwego żywienia, a przez to i dla zdrowia naszych obywateli, ale także zapewnia producentom istotne dochody w ramach wewnętrznej sprzedaży, krajowej, unijnej, a także eksportu. To dodatkowe miejsca pracy, bo ten sektor – produkcja rolnicza – wymaga dużych nakładów pracy. Wreszcie ogrodnictwo to także produkcja roślin na potrzeby kształtowania terenów zieleni, a więc ten sektor jest wyjątkowo szeroki, jeśli chodzi o możliwości.

Co należy czynić dla jego rozwoju? Kreować potrzebę wzrostu spożycia – to zwiększa popyt, a więc daje dodatkowe dochody i jest także istotne dla zdrowia konsumentów; preferować bardziej ekologiczne metody produkcji, a więc przy mniejszym zużyciu środków chemicznych.

Wreszcie ogrodnictwo to produkcja charakterystyczna dla małych gospodarstw, a więc daje dodatkowe zatrudnienie. Myślę, że także warto stawiać na nowoczesne formy produkcji, bardziej oparte na doświadczeniach i badaniach naukowych.

1-204-000

Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE). - Mr President, I have been with Ms Patrão Neves and she is much better. There is a team there, a doctor is already there, and she is getting better by the minute. I hope there will be no serious findings later on. Concerning my speech, I think I made a mistake: I wanted to speak on the report by Véronique De Keyser, which may be the next one.

1-205-000

(Koniec pytań z sali)

1-206-000

Tonio Borg, *Member of the Commission* . - Mr President, the Commission firmly believes that improvement of the negotiating position for small farmers requires an increased degree of organisation in the sector. Fortunately, the available data show a steady increase in organisation, albeit at differing degrees in different Member States. The reformed Common Market Organisation regulation confirms and improves the provisions on producer organisations and associations in the fruit and vegetable sector.

Following the CAP reform, the Commission has started drafting the requisite delegated and implementing acts, and the input of Parliament and the Member States will be taken into account. These discussions will take place in the current year. The same will happen in relation to marketing standards, with further simplification where possible.

The Commission will present a report on producer organisations, operational funds and operational programmes in the fruit and vegetable sectors in the first quarter of this year. The conclusions of that report will be taken into account in the ongoing discussion on delegated and implementing acts. The Commission has noted the call to create two different approval processes for cisgenic and transgenic plants. The Commission has undertaken an analysis to clarify the legal status of the new breeding techniques under the current GMO legislation.

The Commission proposal for a regulation on plant reproductive material includes a number of provisions, such as fee exemptions and support for microenterprises, which are particularly relevant in the fruit and ornamentals sector. In addition, the proposal facilitates access to the market for traditional varieties and allows the marketing of heterogeneous material which contributes to genetic diversity within crop species.

Concerning organisms harmful to plants and plant products, the Commission emphasises that the current EU legislation already ensures that import requirements for third countries closely mirror the requirements for intra-EU trade.

The report also mentions the approval system for pesticides. Here the Commission acknowledges that we have one of the strictest procedures in the world. The overriding purpose is to ensure a high level of protection of human and animal health and the environment. The Commission recognises that this may have an effect on the availability of plant protection products for EU farmers, and thus possibly on competitiveness. To address this problem, the Commission has just adopted a report on the establishment of a fund for minor users, which will in particular benefit the fruit and vegetable sectors. Furthermore, the Commission, with Member States, will support a research coordination network – ERA-NET – on integrated pest management, with specific reference to minor users. This will contribute to the further development of integrated pest management, including non-chemical alternatives.

The report also addresses food waste. This issue is gathering a lot of political support – and rightly so – as people are shocked to learn that we waste 30-50% of the food we produce. This means we are wasting land, nitrates, water and energy and many other key resources used in food production. The Commission will present a communication on sustainable food by this summer. The communication will set out a number of areas for action, with food waste as a central theme. We are also looking at how we can support Member States in developing strategies to prevent food waste. A few examples of action are: offering clearer technical definitions of food waste, establishing an agreed methodology for collecting food-waste data, and setting targets for food-waste prevention as part of the revision of the Waste Framework Directive.

Another avenue of action is the establishment of a working group with stakeholders to establish the best possible support measures at EU level. One of the issues concerns the possible role of short food-supply chains in mitigating the loss and waste of fruit and vegetables. EU food hygiene legislation also includes derogations for small farms and short food-supply chains. This facilitates direct consumer access to agricultural produce whilst ensuring consumer safety.

1-207-000

Przewodniczący. - Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 11 marca 2014 r. godz. 12.00.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 149)

1-208-000

Robert Dušek (S&D), *pisemně*. – Zpráva o budoucnosti evropského pěstitelství je strategickým dokumentem a je jednou z prvních, která se věnuje pěstitelství ovoce a zeleniny. Pěstitelství ovoce a zeleniny představuje 18 % celkové hodnoty zemědělské produkce v EU a využívá přitom pouze 3 % obdělávané půdy. Spotřeba ovoce a zeleniny v Evropě nadále stoupá a konečně se stává světovým trendem se zdravě stravovat. Je ovšem nezbytné, aby ovoce a zelenina byly nejen čerstvé, ale zejména také biologicky hodnotné bez zbytečného zatížení pesticidy a dalšími chemickými postřiky. Celosvětovým trendem bohužel také je na obchodu s ovocem a zeleninou co nejvíce vydělávat a využívat moderní chemické prostředky pro co nejdelší konzervaci ve stejném stavu. Vyzývám zde proto k masivní podpoře biologického pěstování ovoce a zeleniny nejen v EU, ale i v jednotlivých členských státech. Předložená zpráva vyjmenovává výzvy, kterým bude v nejbližších letech pěstitelství čelit, a možná řešení. Pěstitelství ovoce a zeleniny má vliv na zaměstnanost v regionech a nabízí mnoho pracovních příležitostí pro méně kvalifikované mladé lidi, ženy i občany v pokročilejším věku. Je nezbytné pěstitelství biologicky nezávadného ovoce a zeleniny v Evropě plně podporovat. EU by měla být ze strategických důvodů v tomto odvětví soběstačná.

1-208-500

Maria do Céu Patrão Neves (PPE), *por escrito*. – A horticultura é um dos setores agrícolas que exige mais atenção pela sua diversidade, natureza perecível dos seus produtos, estando mais sujeita a abusos da grande distribuição, mais vulnerável às intempéries, com menor proteção das seguradoras, com maior impacto numa alimentação saudável em todas as idades, etc. Por isso, este relatório é tão importante, sobretudo quando a horticultura ocupa apenas 3 % da superfície cultivada e representa 18 % do total da produção agrícola europeia, e quando o número de produtores diminui a par do seu rendimento cada vez mais reduzido também. Do muito que há a fazer para proteger e dinamizar a horticultura, é urgente reforçar as organizações de produtores (OP), investir na formação técnica para jovens e na inovação associada à produção e transformação para um mercado competitivo; é urgente estimular os circuitos curtos de abastecimento, os mercados locais e o consumo, com os produtores a escoarem os seus produtos diretamente com melhor remuneração, e ainda a preço mais reduzido e com maior qualidade para os consumidores.

20. Wykorzenienie tortur na świecie (krótka prezentacja)

1-210-000

Przewodniczący. - Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Véronique De Keyser w imieniu Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych sprawie wykorzenienia tortur na świecie 2013/2169(INI) (A7-0100/2014).

1-211-000

Véronique De Keyser, *rapporteure*. - Monsieur le Président, je voudrais d'abord remercier les collègues qui m'ont soutenue dans le cadre de ce rapport. Je pense au rapporteur fictif, à Mme Gáll-Pelcz, à M.[nbsp]Donskis, à M.[nbsp]Demesmaeker, à M.[nbsp]Tannock et à Mme[nbsp]Vergiat, qui ont largement contribué à l'ensemble du rapport et aussi, derrière eux, à tous les fonctionnaires des groupes.

Ce rapport sur la torture, sujet ô combien difficile et délicat, est finalement très consensuel. Je tiens à préciser que ceci n'est pas une critique, tant s'en faut, de la manière dont l'Union européenne aborde ce sujet.

Je pense que l'Union européenne a fait et continue à faire beaucoup de chemin dans ce domaine, que ce soit en finançant des ONG ou en élaborant des textes fondamentaux. Je pense notamment à trois textes, à trois instruments qui sont essentiels aujourd'hui: le plan d'action européen sur les droits de l'homme et la démocratie, les lignes directrices pour la politique de l'Union européenne à l'égard des pays tiers, qui concernent la torture, et le règlement [n°] 1236/2005 du Conseil, qui a été revu.

Malgré ces trois textes, qu'est-ce qui fait problème? Qu'est-ce qui fait que la torture continue à se propager dans le monde, y compris, j'y reviendrai, à l'égard des enfants? C'est probablement parce que ces textes, tout essentiels qu'ils soient, ne nous ont pas apporté beaucoup d'avancées dans les domaines de la gestion, de la mise en œuvre, du suivi ou des analyses comparatives.

Nous n'avons pas beaucoup progressé, car la torture fait encore partie de ce que j'appellerai la "diplomatie silencieuse". Nous savons que cela existe, puisque, bien sûr, nous lisons les rapports des ONG. C'est toujours un peu désagréable d'en discuter avec les pays concernés. Je dirai que la partie concrète et la partie "mise en œuvre" de ces textes ne sont pas suffisamment prises en compte. Donc, au lieu d'inventer de nouvelles choses, je pense que le rapport, dans une grande partie en tout cas, vise à rendre ces instruments beaucoup plus opérationnels et beaucoup plus efficaces.

J'en arrive aux thèmes qui ont été des thèmes de prédilection ou, en tout cas, sur lesquels je me suis penchée avec plus d'acuité.

L'un d'eux est très douloureux: c'est le thème de la torture des enfants. Vous savez, Monsieur le Président, qu'aujourd'hui, de par le monde, on continue à torturer les enfants de manière intolérable, oserais-je dire de plus en plus.

Nous avons déjà largement discuté dans cette enceinte des enfants soldats, des enfants sorciers, des viols de très jeunes filles, des viols d'enfants, etc., des enfants dans des centres de détention, des enfants migrants et des traitements qui leur sont infligés. Ce sont des aspects que nous connaissons bien, que nous maîtrisons mal, que nous ne parvenons pas à éradiquer et qui sont intolérables, en tout cas pour nous, citoyens européens.

Ce problème de la torture est évoqué dans le rapport. Je n'ai voulu stigmatiser personne, parce que cela nous aurait divisés, mais je voudrais tout de même dire à quel point c'est un sujet important dans la mesure où, en juin 2013, par exemple, le comité de l'ONU pour les droits de l'enfant a sorti un rapport accablant sur les cas de tortures d'enfants palestiniens dans des prisons israéliennes. Je vous renvoie à ce rapport, je n'ai rien à dire de plus. L'Unicef en a parlé aussi.

Je voudrais aussi évoquer les cas de tortures d'enfants perpétrés tant par l'armée syrienne que par l'opposition syrienne. Ce sont des faits absolument insoutenables. Moi-même, je ne parvenais pas à lire les rapports à ce sujet.

Je voudrais dire aussi qu'il y a – [et je m'y suis attachée dans mon rapport] – quelque chose qui dépasse le cadre de la convention contre la torture commise par des entités étatiques et qui est un phénomène de la mondialisation: je veux parler de l'utilisation de l'internet pour la pédopornographie et pour le harcèlement des enfants. Il y a une

association –[nbsp]Inhope[nbsp]– qui travaille sur ce sujet avec le soutien financier de l'Union européenne.

Nous devons absolument trouver, au Parlement européen, les moyens de suivre ces situations de près, de les vérifier et d'agir pour les contrer, car elles sont insoutenables pour notre conscience européenne. Pour le reste, je vous renvoie au rapport. Excusez-moi d'avoir été un peu longue.

1-212-000

Pytania z sali

1-213-000

Miroslav Mikolášik (PPE). - Mučenie a iné rôzne druhy krutého neľudského alebo ponižujúceho zaobchádzania alebo trestania predstavujú najhoršiu formu porušovania ľudských práv, keďže priamo zasahujú do telesnej a duševnej integrity človeka.

Napriek absolútnemu zákazu mučenie pretrváva v mnohých krajinách sveta a týka sa miliónov obetí vrátane detí. Ľudské práva sa stali neoddeliteľnou súčasťou zahraničnej politiky EÚ, a preto musia byť koherentne zohľadňované pri výkone ostatných činností Únie. Nestačia len deklaratívne odsúdenia mučenia. Únia musí aktívne pristúpiť k vytvoreniu účinných mechanizmov smerujúcich k prevencii a[nbsp]potlačovaniu mučenia a rehabilitácií.

Čo sa týka problematiky tzv. núteného tehotenstva – toho by som sa rád dotkol –, apelujem na Úniu, aby zvolila veľmi citlivý a opatrný prístup, keďže situáciu matky nemožno riešiť nezávisle od jej nastávajúceho dieťaťa. Pripomínam, že Únia v[nbsp]súlade so svojimi záväzkami vyplývajúcimi z[nbsp]charty nesme propagovať činnosti vedúce k[nbsp]porušovaniu základného práva na život, ktoré prináleží rovnako matke ako dieťaťu.

1-214-000

Iñaki Irazabalbeitia Fernández (Verts/ALE). - Señor Presidente, en primer lugar quiero agradecer a la señora De Keyser su magnífico informe. La tortura y los malos tratos son una lacra que hay que erradicar y, en ese sentido, el informe va en la buena dirección en lo referido a terceros países. Hubiese sido conveniente introducir referencias a la implantación de la jurisdicción universal en los sistemas legislativos o instar a la prohibición de medidas de gracia para condenados por torturas.

Respecto a la situación en la Unión, peca de autocomplacencia. En los países de la Unión se tortura y se infligen malos tratos a los detenidos. España es uno de ellos, tal como lo han señalado Amnistía Internacional o el Relator Especial de las Naciones Unidas sobre la tortura. Durante más de veinte años, el Comité Europeo para la Prevención de la Tortura del Consejo de Europa ha solicitado repetidamente a las autoridades españolas que apliquen tres salvaguardas fundamentales para evitar que las personas detenidas bajo régimen de incomunicación sufran malos tratos y torturas. En vano. Ninguna de las tres ha sido aplicada.

La defensa del derecho a la vida de todas las personas lleva irremediabilmente consigo la defensa de la integridad física de las personas y una lucha sin tregua contra la tortura y los malos tratos. Y viceversa. La Unión debe también llevar a cabo una lucha sin cuartel contra los malos tratos y la tortura en los propios países de la Unión. Si no actuamos así, estamos haciendo trampas al solitario.

1-215-000

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). - Gospodine predsjedniče, mučenje je anti civilizacijski čin i kao takvo ne može biti prihvatljivo. Izvjestiteljica iznimno dobro detektira rastući problem mučenja psihičke prirode koji mladi ljudi vrše koristeći društvene mreže. Radi se o velikom izazovu, pa se nadam da ćemo što skorije reagirati pokretanjem snažnih kampanja koje bi trebale podići razinu svijesti o ovome problemu.

Izvjestiteljica prepoznaje i potrebu za osuđivanje mučenja u oružanim sukobima te poziva na rješavanje nekažnjenih slučajeva iz europske totalitarne prošlosti. Pozdravljam takvu inicijativu te izražavam nadanje da će i pred zemlje kandidatkinje biti stavljen takav zahtjev u procesu pristupanja Uniji.

Podsjećam vas da su hrvatski državljani sustavno mučeni i ubijani u logorima na teritoriju Srbije za vrijeme domovinskog rata te da službeni Beograd ni dan danas ne priznaje postojanje tih logora. Budimo dosljedni i zatražimo od Srbije da prizna postojanje logora, oda počast žrtvama i kazni počinitelje ovih teških djela.

1-216-000

Davor Ivo Stier (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, mučenje odnosno okrutno neljudsko ponižavajuće postupanje ili kažnjavanje je nažalost prisutno u mnogim dijelovima svijeta. Pojedine zemlje još uvijek koriste kamenovanje, genitalno sakaćenje te psihičko i fizičko mučenje ljudi na temelju vjere, političke opredijeljenosti ili stava.

Stoga pozdravljam ovo izvješće koje oštro osuđuje svaku vrstu mučenja i neljudskog postupanja te poziva na aktivniji pristup Europske unije u sprječavanju mučenja diljem svijeta. Ne zaboravimo da su mučenju često podvrgnuta i djeca. Više od 125 milijuna žena i djevojčica u 29 zemalja svijeta bilo je podvrgnuto genitalnom sakaćenju. Stoga pozivam i europsku vanjsku službu da u svim pregovorima s trećim zemljama uzme kao prioritet poštivanje ljudskih prava i iskorjenjivanje mučenja u svijetu.

1-217-000

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, iako je stvoren međunarodni okvir za apsolutnu zabranu mučenja i drugih okrutnih neljudskih ili ponižavajućih postupaka ili kažnjavanja, mučenje i dalje ustraje u cijelom svijetu. A uzimajući u obzir Opću deklaraciju o pravima čovjeka i ostale sporazume o ljudskim pravima i instrumente usvojene na razini Ujedinjenih naroda, budući da postoje važni izazovi u politikama kad je riječ o suočavanju s novim oblicima mučenja usmjerenih protiv ranjivih skupina posebno djece, ključna je uloga Unije u suzbijanju mučenja u svjetskim razmjerima, a u uskoj suradnji s Ujedinjenim narodima. Ima li većeg mučenja od genitalne mutilacije?

Dakle, dižem svoj glas protiv takvog mučenja, a najviše protiv mučenja djece koja su danas izložena raznim oblicima nasilja i komercijalizacije. U vremenima gdje su djeca izložena mučenjima, moraju se poduzeti dodatne političke, diplomatske i financijske mjere, ali i utjecati na poboljšanje situacije u trećim zemljama gdje je naročito izraženo mučenje djece, ali i žena.

1-218-000

(Koniec pytań z sali)

1-219-000

Tonio Borg, *Member of the Commission* . - Mr President, first of all my thanks to Ms De Keyser – and I must make an admission. This is one of my favourite subjects, because for five years I was a member of the Committee for the Prevention of Torture of the Council of Europe, which does fieldwork. It does not just discuss in plenary or in meetings, but its members actually visit prisons and prison cells. I was once accidentally locked inside a cell with a prisoner, and the prisoner had to ring for the guards to release me, so they take the job very seriously and do some excellent work. Because, as some Members of Parliament have said, we also have isolated cases of torture, of people in detention in our own countries in the European Union.

We welcome this report on the eradication of torture, and this is one of the most important rights. If we look at most constitutions, it is put third or fourth in terms of fundamental rights, and it was one of the few rights where there are no exceptions. Even the right to life has exceptions, but the right to protection from torture usually does not have any exceptions.

While the task of eradicating torture is, unfortunately, far from being achieved, we acknowledge the need to improve the overall coherence of EU policy in combating torture. As this House is well aware, in our fight against torture, we follow a so-called 'holistic' approach that encompasses all the essential elements: the prevention of torture, but also the protection and rehabilitation focusing on the victims of torture and ill-treatment.

Guided by the commitments of the EU Action Plan on Democracy and Human Rights and also the EU Guidelines on Torture, we promote the eradication of torture through all bilateral contacts with third countries. In particular, human rights dialogues with 42 states allow us to address individual cases of concern and to encourage the ratification of key international instruments, notably the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention Against Torture: the so-called CAT.

This being said, our anti-torture policy would be far less effective without the persistent efforts to address torture and ill-treatment within the UN framework. In this context, during the ongoing session of the UN Human Rights Council, the EU is following the situation in Syria, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Ukraine with particular attention. In all these cases, it is crucial to ensure accountability for perpetrators of grave human rights violations, including torture, and to provide rehabilitation and relief to victims.

We share the view that torture affecting those who are most vulnerable, notably children and women, amounts to one of the most abhorrent violations of human rights. In order to address the root causes of this phenomenon, the EU is engaged in efforts to reduce all forms of violence against children through more effective child protection systems and to raise greater awareness about children's rights, including their right to freedom from violence. In parallel, in order to prevent the torture of children, the EU asks the partner countries which have lowered the criminal liability age to reconsider their decision. Similar efforts are being made to eradicate violence against women, and our recent endeavours focus in particular on the elimination of female genital mutilation.

Taking good note of the need to improve the targeted use of political tools at our disposal, work is currently ongoing to guide EU diplomats in third countries in their work on eradicating torture. The specific guidance on this important issue will include advice on visits to detention centres, trial monitoring and follow-up to individual cases raised by the European Union. At the same time, in line with the request of Parliament and civil society,

in February this year we revived the Council Human Rights Working Group Task Force on Torture. The Task Force will remain an informal network of interested Member States providing impetus to the implementation of the EU Guidelines on Torture.

Last but not least, our anti-torture policy is effective only if it permeates all the external policies of the Union, including development and trade. In this regard, the Commission has taken the initiative for a review of Council Regulation 1236/2005, which restricts trade in certain goods which could be used for capital punishment or torture. In tabling this proposal, the Commission has taken into consideration the European Parliament's views expressed in its resolution of 17 June 2010.

Regulating EU trade in order to help prevent capital punishment and torture from occurring in third countries is essential and reflects the fundamental values on which the EU is based. However, as we know, such regulation is not sufficient to ensure that third countries abolish capital punishment and to prevent torture from occurring in such countries. Other actions, notably dialogue with third countries, and further action at the UN General Assembly level are also needed to achieve these goals.

As you can see, the road to a world free from torture and ill-treatment is a long and difficult one, but I am convinced that, united in our endeavours, we shall continue to make progress.

1-220-000

Przewodniczący. - Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się we wtorek 11 marca 2014 r. o godz. 12.00.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 149)

1-221-000

Kinga Gál (PPE), in writing. – Anyone can be a victim of torture - children or adults, religious people or atheists, intellectuals or uneducated people. I welcome the fact that the report refers in detail to the situation of children facing torture and proposes concrete actions to be taken in order to improve their protection. Action by state governments is also indispensable. States should develop child-friendly justice systems that empower children not only to assert their rights but also to report violations. The Member States can play an exemplary role in this field, as some of them have already implemented action plans, adopted or amended relevant laws, and developed special websites in order to improve their justice system and make it more child-friendly. I also welcome the fact that the text recommends that EEAS and the Commission pay special attention to individuals belonging to other vulnerable groups such as ethnic, linguistic, religious and other minorities, as these particular groups might be exposed to torture more often. Torture needs to be eradicated. I hope that this current report will be another step forward in this global struggle and will positively influence EU foreign policy on this issue.

21. Arabia Saudyjska (krótka prezentacja)

1-223-000

Przewodniczący. - Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie sporządzone przez Anę Gomes w imieniu Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych w sprawie Arabii Saudyjskiej – jej stosunków z UE oraz jej roli na Bliskim Wschodzie i w Afryce Północnej 2013/2147(INI) (A7-0125/2014).

1-224-000

Ana Gomes, *relatora* . - Senhor Presidente, a Arábia Saudita tem hoje importância no Médio Oriente, e além dele, nos planos político, económico e na luta contra o terrorismo, embora a sua ação, independentemente de declarações oficiais, nem sempre favoreça a segurança global e a luta contra o terrorismo especificamente, dado o papel do proselitismo *wahabi* ao influenciar e inspirar a atividade de grupos fundamentalistas e extremistas em vários países e regiões. Por muito que não resulte da vontade das autoridades governamentais de Riade, elas próprias alvo de ameaças terroristas, as consequências trágicas deste proselitismo religioso estão à vista, pagas em sangue, da guerra na Síria, à repressão no Egito e no Bahrein, à desestabilização na Líbia ou no Mali, ou à violência sectária no Iraque, Paquistão e Afeganistão, por exemplo.

Esta é uma questão que não pode continuar a ser silenciada nas relações da União Europeia com a Arábia Saudita, como se sublinha neste primeiro relatório do Parlamento Europeu sobre o tema. Não é aceitável que a União e os seus Estados-Membros continuem a lidar com o Reino Saudita valorizando sobretudo as dimensões económica e miopemente securitária por se tratar do maior produtor de petróleo mundial, de desempenhar um papel central no Conselho de Cooperação do Golfo, de ser membro do G20, ou de ser o principal comprador de armamentos e parceiro comercial.

Este relatório procura reconhecer a dimensão estratégica do relacionamento entre a União Europeia e Riade, sublinhando tanto as áreas e interesses de convergência como aquilo em que divergimos: e o domínio dos direitos humanos e da democracia não é escamoteável, não é irrelevante para a eficácia da luta contra o terrorismo, para a promoção da convivência entre civilizações ou para a resolução pacífica dos conflitos.

Apesar de ser uma monarquia absoluta, a Arábia Saudita está vinculada a obrigações em matéria de direito internacional e direitos humanos universais, incluindo os direitos das mulheres e dos migrantes. Esses temas, bem como a liberdade religiosa, têm de estar em destaque sem pruridos no diálogo da União Europeia com Riade.

Como pude observar na visita que fiz à Arábia Saudita, em novembro passado, a vida política, social e económica do país assenta na segregação contra o sexo feminino. Não obstante o elevado nível de qualificações granjeado pelo grande número de mulheres que acede ao ensino superior: só no ano passado foram nomeadas as primeiras 30 mulheres para a *Shura* e só em 2015 as mulheres poderão votar em eleições municipais. É atentatório da sua dignidade e uma violação grosseira dos direitos humanos o sistema que concede a tutela legal sobre as mulheres a algum familiar do sexo masculino, pai, marido, irmão, ou mesmo filho. Uma recente lei que visa proteger as mulheres da violência doméstica não passará do papel se essa sujeição não for abolida.

É necessário que a União Europeia se empenhe em apoiar todos aqueles e aquelas que na Arábia Saudita trabalham para eliminar discriminações contra as mulheres, seja no domínio económico, no acesso à educação, ao mercado de trabalho, à justiça, incluindo os impedimentos ainda persistentes a que conduzam: o argumento de que tais restrições se fundamentam em razões religiosas ou visam proteger a mulher tem que ser desmontado.

Mas não só as mulheres sofrem a negação dos direitos fundamentais na Arábia Saudita: a pena capital continua a ser aplicada num quadro de um sistema judicial medieval sem garantias elementares, refém como está de juízes de extração religiosa e sem sequer assentar em codificação penal escrita. Das estatísticas dos executados fazem parte não só nacionais adultos, mas também menores e estrangeiros.

É imperativo persuadir a Arábia Saudita a pôr termo às tensões arbitrárias e extrajudiciais, à prática institucionalizada da tortura e de penas corporais, ao assédio contra organizações e defensores de direitos humanos. É imperativo exigir que garanta os direitos das minorias, incluindo a xiita, incluindo a permissão do exercício público da liberdade religiosa, e também frisar a necessidade de ser abolida a prática do *kefala* e do tratamento abusivo de trabalhadores migrantes.

Não nos daríamos ao trabalho de elaborar este relatório no Parlamento Europeu se não considerássemos relevante o papel da Arábia Saudita na segurança regional e global e se não considerássemos que da interação da União Europeia com os vários interlocutores sauditas podem resultar progressos, desde logo fundamentais para resolver várias das contradições e intenções com que está confrontada a própria sociedade saudita, com uma população maioritariamente jovem, vibrantemente ativa nas redes sociais e cada vez mais a mostrar-se asfíxiada por um sistema anacrónico que lhe coarta oportunidades.

Termino, Senhor Presidente, dizendo que regionalmente nada poderá ser mais determinante do que o resultado das negociações para pôr sob controlo internacional o programa nuclear do vizinho Irão: em vez de se deixar marginalizar ou de obstaculizar o processo, Riade pode contribuir decisivamente para o seu sucesso, estabelecendo relações de vizinhança em proveito mútuo e assim contribuir para acabar com a *proxy war* na martirizada Síria, para a estabilização do Iraque, do Paquistão e do Afeganistão e para fazer finalmente avançar o processo de paz israelo-palestiniano.

1-225-000

Pytania z sali

1-226-000

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, imam pozitivno mišljenje o ovom izvješću i zahvaljujem obzirom da se Kraljevina Saudijska Arabija i Europska unija suočavaju sa zajedničkim izazovima, ali koji su globalnog podrijetla, kao što su migracije, energetska sigurnost i međunarodni terorizam.

Isto tako borba protiv terorizma i nasilnog ekstremizma podcrtana je i sporazumom o doprinosu za pokretanje protiv terorizma, a koji je potpisan od strane Ujedinjenih naroda i Kraljevine Saudijske Arabije.

Saudijska Arabija radi na regionalnoj stabilnosti, borbi protiv terorizma, stabilnosti globalnog goriva, finansijskim tržištima, međutim potrebna je posebna briga u vezi ljudskih prava. Uklanjanje prepreka na ostvarenju jednakosti spolova smještena je na prvo mjesto liste zemalja sa zakonima koji ograničavaju gospodarski potencijal žena i zato treba učiniti sve da se ženama omoguće osnovna ljudska prava, jer to su zaista oblici diskriminacije i segregacije i u privatnom i u javnom životu i zemlja treba omogućiti da se najosnovnije životne odluke žena moraju moći odobriti bez odobrenja muškog skrbnika.

1-227-000

Davor Ivo Stier (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, Europska unija je najveći trgovinski partner Saudijskoj Arabiji. Suradnja Europske unije i Saudijske Arabije naravno važna je ne samo na trgovinskom, energetskom planu; ona ima jednu geostratešku dimenziju, važna je za regionalnu stabilnost, za suradnju Europske unije s drugim islamskim zemljama.

Saudijska Arabija ima vrlo važnu prisutnost i u jugoistočnoj Europi, pogotovo u Bosni i Hercegovini. Međutim, uz sve te konsideracije, geostrateške, energetske, trgovinske doista je važno također upozoriti na pitanje poštivanja ljudskih prava.

Maloprije smo raspravljali o iskorijenjivanju mučenja u svijetu, a nažalost Saudijska Arabija još uvijek koristi mučenje i određene diskriminirajuće prakse. Dakle, kad pogledamo statistiku, ona se mijenja iz godine u godinu, ali ta praksa je još ovdje i zbog toga mi je drago da Europska unija otvori i taj dijalog o ljudskim pravima sa Saudijskom Arabijom i da to isto tako bude u središtu naših odnosa.

1-228-000

(Konec pytań z sali)

1-229-000

Tonio Borg, *Member of the Commission*. - Mr President, I would like to thank the European Parliament for its draft report on Saudi Arabia, and also for the role played by the rapporteur, Ms Gomes, and the Chair of the Subcommittee on Human Rights in the European Parliament, Ms Lochbihler, for their work. This report – and also the fact that several members of this Parliament, including Ms De Martini, have recently visited Saudi Arabia – is a testimony to the importance the EU gives to its relationship with Saudi Arabia at this juncture.

In the face of regional challenges, and in the aftermath of the breakthrough on the interim agreement on Iran, the High Representative/Vice-President, Baroness Ashton, visited Saudi Arabia and other Gulf countries in January [nbsp]2014. She came back from her meetings in the region with a clear sense that our Gulf partners have a key role to play in fostering stability – both political and economic – in the region, and that the EU should engage more with them. This is one of the key messages of the draft report. We agree that, beyond Saudi Arabia's human rights record, it is essential to look at the contribution that Saudi Arabia can bring to our joint efforts to bring peace, stability and security in the region.

Turning now to the details of the draft report, we can only concur that the human rights situation in Saudi Arabia remains preoccupying, as exemplified by the long list of recommendations presented by UN members in the context of the UN Universal Periodic Review (UPR). The EU Member States have actively and constructively contributed to this exercise under the coordinating role of the European Union.

The draft report rightly points to numerous areas where progress is urgently needed, and these largely coincide with the areas that we too have identified. The Union will continue to address these issues in encounters with the authorities and with civil society representatives. At the same time, we ought to maintain a balance in order to bring effective support to those courageous individuals defending human rights and to women taking action to gain recognition of basic rights and needs, such as the right – which has been mentioned by some Members – to be issued with driving licences.

Our reading of the human rights situation in Saudi Arabia is that some positive, if only gradual, steps have been taken as of late, but we agree that much more work remains to be done. Not only should further steps be taken in a number of fields, but we also look forward to the implementation of the proposed steps that have been announced by the king, such as a reform of the judicial system and the decision to allow women to vote and stand for office in the elections of 2015.

We too were disturbed by the conditions under which a large number of irregular foreign workers have been expelled since November [nbsp] 2013. While the EEAS welcomes efforts to introduce legislation protecting foreign workers, it deplores the fact that abuses remain frequent in the context of the sponsorship system. The sponsorship system should be reviewed.

We shall continue to advocate, in our contact with our Saudi partners, for the need to make decisive progress in the areas of freedom of expression and freedom of speech, although we welcome the fact that the space given to media freedom has recently been widened. The EEAS concurs that freedom of association requires urgent reforms to allow NGOs to register and operate.

Undoubtedly, the EU pays great attention to women's rights. We have seen positive moves, with the appointment of 30 women to the Shura Council, greater access given to education for women, and the recent adoption of a law against domestic violence. At the same time, the de facto driving ban for women and the male guardianship system keep curtailing women's rights.

Finally, our principled position on the death penalty remains that a moratorium should be applied as a first step toward the abolition of the death penalty. In the case of Saudi Arabia, UN minimum standards should be applied to limit the scope of application of the death penalty. Public executions are unacceptable practices that should come to an end.

In a spirit of constructive dialogue, we have invited Saudi Arabia to seize the opportunity of the UN Universal Periodic Review to address the EU's concerns and to engage in an open and mutual exchange with us on human rights. Such steps would be a welcome follow-up to the positive signal sent last January when, for the first time, EU diplomats were able to attend the trial of a Saudi citizen – as consistently advocated by the EU Delegation in Riyadh – by the Saudi authorities.

Saudi Arabia has the capacity to decisively contribute to political stability and economic recovery beyond its borders. Therefore, we look forward to Saudi Arabia making the best use of its role and influence to help reach a political solution in Syria and stability in Lebanon and to support ongoing negotiations on the Middle East Peace Process. We also renew our call to support efforts aimed at a long-term comprehensive solution with Iran, in order to obtain a durable settlement of the concerns about Iran's nuclear activities. Improving relations between Gulf countries and Iran is crucial for regional stability, and we encourage the resumption of interactions to build mutual trust. The High Representative is determined to continue her sustained exchanges with our Saudi partners on all these issues.

To conclude, we believe it is time for the EU to strengthen its ties with Saudi Arabia, as with our other Gulf partners, on all fronts – and notably on human rights – through dialogue. We must be able to voice our differences openly, in a spirit of mutual respect, and with the objective of enhancing our concentration on all matters of common interest.

The EU services will continue to work hard to keep our communication channels active and, wherever there is a will and convergent objectives, to broaden them.

1-230-000

President. - The debate is closed.

The vote will take place on Tuesday, 11 [nbsp] March [nbsp] 2014.

22. Priorytety w stosunkach UE z państwami Partnerstwa Wschodniego (krótka prezentacja)

1-232-000

Przewodniczący. - Kolejnym punktem porządku dnia jest sprawozdanie Pawła Roberta Kowala w imieniu Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych w sprawie oceny i wyznaczenia priorytetów w stosunkach UE z państwami Partnerstwa Wschodniego 2013/2149 (INI) (A7-0157/2014).

1-233-000

Paweł Robert Kowal, sprawozdawca . - Panie Przewodniczący! Wyobrażaliśmy sobie, że debata ta będzie podsumowaniem, że będziemy mogli powiedzieć, co się udało w [Partnerstwie Wschodnim, co się nie udało podczas ostatnich pięciu lat, i że powiemy wspólnie, jakie zostawiamy przesłanie na przyszłość. To sprawozdanie było w [listocie pomyślane jako przesłanie (nie chciałbym powiedzieć, że jest to testament tej kadencji Parlamentu). Mieliliśmy popatrzeć sobie [oczy z [komisarzem Füle i pomyśleć o [tym, co zrobimy my, a co zrobią już ci, którzy przyjdą po nas.

Stało się inaczej. Historia zapisała nieco inaczej tę kartę po wydarzeniach na Ukrainie. Myślę, że tematy, które podejmujemy, nie są abstrakcją na przyszłość, nie są życzeniem polityków, nie są naszym marzeniem, ale są koniecznością działania. [to sprawa, że sprawozdanie, które miało pokazać tylko ogólne kierunki, jest bardzo konkretną odpowiedzią na to, co się dzieje dzisiaj.

Pierwsza rzecz, która rzuca się w oczy – nasze działanie w [sferze prawnej wobec naszych partnerów na Wschodzie zadecyduje o tym, czy im się uda.

Nasza zdolność do podpisania umowy stowarzyszeniowej nie tylko z [Ukrainą, ale także do podpisania tej umowy z [Gruzją i [z [Mołdawią, zadecydują o tym, czy to hasło, sformułowanie „Partnerstwo Wschodnie”, zapisze się w historii pozytywnie czy negatywnie.

Nie pozostało nam już dużo czasu, widzimy, co się dzieje na Krymie, wiemy, że podobne działania od dłuższego czasu podejmowane były przez naszego wielkiego sąsiada także w [Mołdawii i [w [Gruzji. Wiemy, jak duża może być cena zaniechania. Dlatego mówimy: trzeba podpisać umowę teraz, to sprawozdanie do tego nawołuje, ponieważ nasi partnerzy na Wschodzie muszą dostać podstawę prawną do rozwijania współpracy z [nami, do przyjmowania pomocy finansowej, do podejmowania współpracy finansowej, do walki z korupcją.

Dzisiaj można obrać za przykład premiera Jaceniuka: może się on okazać Balcerowiczem dla Ukrainy, może być tym człowiekiem, któremu pomożemy i [zmieni Ukrainę. Ale pamiętamy, że w 1917 roku była rewolucja lutowa i [po niej przyszedł świetny liberalny polityk książę Lwow. Jeżeli my nie pomożemy Jaceniukowi, jeżeli nie pomożemy dzisiaj rządowi Gruzji i [Mołdawii, może ich czekać los księcia Lwowa: ludzie nie będą ufali ani im, ani nam. My możemy dać im tę wiarygodność.

Druga sprawa fundamentalna: zbudowanie elity na przyszłość. To powinno być naszym przesłaniem, stąd pomysł uniwersytetu Partnerstwa Wschodniego, stąd pomysł specjalnego kolegium, które kształciłoby we wspólnym oddziaływaniu profesorów i [studentów z [dzisiejszych krajów Unii Europejskiej i [z [tej drugiej części Europy,

która nie jest w Unii Europejskiej: Gruzji, Armenii, Białorusi, Ukrainy, Mołdawii, ludzi, którzy czytali by te same książki, którzy rozmawiali by na [] te same tematy i [] którzy byliby przyszłością, kiedy Unia Europejska będzie obejmowała już nie tylko pół kontynentu, ale całość. Naszą polityczną perspektywą jest powiedzenie ludziom na Wschodzie: tak, Wasze miejsce jako obywateli, jako ludzi cieszących się wszystkimi prawami jest tam, gdzie my dzisiaj jesteśmy. Nie możemy tego zrobić dzisiaj, ale możemy się do tego dobrze przygotować. [] dlatego potrzebujemy wykształcić sieć ludzi, którzy podobnie myślą, którzy potrafią ze sobą rozmawiać i [] współdziałać i [] rozumieć się niezależnie od tego, czy Pan Bóg pozwolił im się urodzić na wschodzie, czy na zachodzie Europy.

Kolejną sprawą jest energia. Dzisiaj nasi partnerzy na Wschodzie znajdują się w [] kleszczach zobowiązań i porozumień sprzed lat. My, oddziałując na dywersyfikację źródeł energii, na dostawy energii, możemy dać im wolność konieczną do działania.

Panie Komisarzu, pewnie nie będzie już wielu okazji do debaty, więc dodam, że myślę, że był to dobry czas naszej współpracy. Omawiane sprawozdanie w [] jakimś stopniu ją zamyka. Myślę, że rozstajemy się w [] poczuciu, że trzeba zrobić podczas tej sesji i podczas kolejnych wszystko, co w naszej mocy, żeby tym, którzy stali na Majdanie, którzy czekają w [] Tbilisi, w [] Kiszyniowie i [] wielu miejscach na Wschodzie, dać nadzieję, że kiedyś będziemy razem w Unii Europejskiej, a teraz musimy odrobić nasze zadanie.

Dziękuję bardzo.

1-234-000

Pytania z sali

1-235-000

Dubravka Šuica (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, nadam se da će ovo biti samo jedno od izvješća, budući da ćemo ovaj tjedan još govoriti o Ukrajini i stvarno, kao što je rekao gospodin izvjestitelj, razvoj situacije u Ukrajini nas je malo demantirao i izazvao drugačiji tijek ovog izvješća.

Uzastopna proširenja u Europskoj uniji su dovela do situacije da se sigurnost, stabilnost i blagostanje zemalja istočnog partnerstva javljaju kao sve važniji čimbenik u Uniji. Partnerstvo koje nudi Unija temelji se na njihovoj vlastitoj političkoj volji, ali se ipak pokazalo kao nedovoljan pokretač promjena i reformi, usprkos jasnim europskim težnjama naroda zemalja istočnog partnerstva.

Smatram da treba jačati multilateralnu dimenziju istočnog partnerstva, zbog samog partnerstva, zbog poticanja klime suradnje, prijateljstva i dobrosusjedskih odnosa, dakle trebaju se podupirati ciljevi političkog pridruživanja, a posebno gospodarske integracije i treba uspostaviti međuljudske kontakte, voditi računa o demokratskim reformama, ali uz pomoć bogatog iskustva koje imaju europske države i koje smo i mi prošli u postupku uspostavljanja demokratskih sistema.

1-236-000

Ruža Tomašić (ECR). - Gospodine predsjedniče, podržavam sve strategije i politike koje imaju za cilj jačanje demokratskih kapaciteta i stabilizaciju zemalja iz našeg susjedstva. Zemlje Istočnoga partnerstva važne su za Europsku uniju i njihov nam je napredak od

непроценјиве vrijednosti. Približavanje Uniji je težak i mukotrpan proces, naročito za države s komunističkom, totalitarnom prošlošću.

Kao zastupnica iz Hrvatske jako dobro znam s koliko se izazova suočava društvo, impregniranom komunističkom ostavštinom u procesu usvajanja onih vrijednosti koje danas nazivamo zapadnima i na kojima se ova Zajednica temelji. Unija neće pomoći zemljama Istočnoga partnerstva tako što će ih staviti u službu svoje vanjske politike i odmjeravanja snaga s Rusijom u toj regiji. Pomoći će im prije svega ako principijelno nastavi braniti njihov suverenitet i teritorijalni integritet. Paralelno s tim potrebno ih je poticati na jačanje unutarnjeg kapaciteta i ispunjavanje strogih i objektivnih uvjeta, kako bi jednog dana te države bile potpuno spremne za pridruživanje Uniji.

1-237-000

Davor Ivo Stier (PPE). - Gospodine predsjedniče, pozdravljam izvjestitelja, pozdravljam i povjerenika koji u ovim kasnim satima zastupa poglede Europske komisije. Ja bih se složio s kolegom Kowalom da su promijenjene okolnosti doista promijenile i svrhu ovoga izvješća. Ja ću biti vrlo kratak.

Naravno da je politika prema Istočnome partnerstvu prvenstveno bila namijenjena da bi se zemlje iz Istočnoga partnerstva politički i gospodarski tješnje vezale za Europsku uniju. Mislim da nam svi ovi događaji u Ukrajini prvenstveno pokazuju da je i ubuduće potrebno staviti naglasak naravno i na te mehanizme, ali isto tako i na obveze Europske unije u političkoj i gospodarskoj potpori zemljama Istočnoga partnerstva. Zato bih se složio s izvjestiteljem, sada je vrijeme ne toliko za riječi nego i za konkretne mjere.

1-238-000

Маруся Любчева (S&D). - Г-н Председател, с приемането на този доклад трябва да покажем зрелостта на хора, които умеят да учат уроците от ситуациите, през които преминават. Източното партньорство е поставено на изпитание, защото само някои от страните са негови ясни привърженици и при тях не сме свидетели на никаква неудовлетвореност или колебание.

Това са европейски страни. Съвсем естествено е да се стремят към общите европейски ценности. Проблемът е в това дали и доколко Европейският съюз ще съумее да използва потенциала за интеграция в икономически, социален, морален за гражданите на тези страни аспект, при запазване на тяхното етническо, езиково, културно разнообразие и суверенитет. Без революционен ентузиазъм.

С източното партньорство имаме шанс да преодолеем поне част от проблемите, които успяхме да генерираме в отношенията с Украйна. Нека потърсим по-дълбоко сътрудничество в областта на образованието и гражданското сътрудничество. Именно изпитанията, пред които ни поставиха отношенията с Украйна, трябва да направят нашите послания по-ясни, по-конкретни, по-точни към страните от Източното партньорство, което трябва да се превърне в партньорство от взаимен интерес.

1-239-000

(Koniec pytań z sali)

1-240-000

Štefan Füle, *Member of the Commission*. - Mr President, thank you very much for giving me the floor. Dear Paweł, I actually came here to reinforce the messages in your report. I agree with you that a different chapter has been written on Ukraine – or is being written. At the same time, I am on your side in saying that the messages which are reflected in your report are important and relevant, and – if I may – I will reinforce some of them and add those that I also consider important. I would like to do so in three parts.

The first part I would like to address is the Eastern Partnership in general. Here I would like to make the following points. Firstly, it is important that we remind you all that the goal of this special partnership is to try to help our partners to deliver on their own ambitions. Ownership of reforms matters. Secondly, it is important to remind our partners, and also ourselves from time to time, that the most important thing is to make the best use of all the instruments, of which there are many.

Your report actually lists them all: from the bilateral to the multilateral dimension, sectoral cooperation, the means of interaction – both formal and informal. This is the kind of unique partnership where we have summits on one side and informal ministerial meetings combined with sectoral cooperation on the other.

The third point – and here I also agree with you, because your report has quite rightly stressed this point – is that we need to combine inclusivity with differentiation. This means that we need to make an effort so that all of our partners are engaged, and that we find a framework within the broad Eastern Partnership for all of them.

The last point would be stating the obvious: the Eastern Partnership is not a straitjacket, and the only non-negotiable issue is that of the values and principles underpinning our partnership. But we also have, among our Eastern Partners, countries which have committed to much deeper reforms, which have asked for a closer relationship, and which have agreed with our reactions to those calls for a political association and economic integration. I am talking about Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia, and also about an association agreement including a deep and comprehensive free trade area.

Let me make seven short remarks. At this time, all of us are often ready to look back to the past and to make judgements on what was right and on what went wrong. I think that this element of objectivity, which I also appreciated very much in your report, is important.

Point number one is that the association agreement – and whenever I say association agreement, I also mean the DCFTA – has strengthened the capacity of our partners to make sovereign decisions. I think this should actually be our primary goal.

Point number two is that it respects the traditional relations which our partners have with their neighbours. I would make the argument that it helps to promote such relations rather than the other way round.

Point number three is that we offer not only a blueprint for reforms but also a comprehensive and genuine partnership. It is combination of political association and economic integration, and it is accompanied by the rule of law, the fundamental freedoms, and other value-based elements which are so important for any reforms to be fully implemented.

Point number four is that we are proposing what has already worked before: the Eastern Partnership and the association agreements are not a laboratory; we are not testing; we are

not experimenting. I recall one clear example which you will probably like: Poland and Ukraine in the 1990s. If I look at the GDP per capita, it was more or less the same, but then Poland concluded a free trade agreement of the same type which we offered to our partners. A couple of years after that, Poland's GDP per capita grew by a factor of four. It doubled in the case of Poland and halved in the case of Ukraine. This is what we offer, and this is important to recall.

Point number five is that we work not only with authorities but also with others – particularly with civil society – and that this makes reforms more viable. Point number six is that when our partners become victims of undue external pressures, we stand firmly on the side of our partners and mobilise all instruments of solidarity if needed.

Point number seven: let me make the point emphatically that our policies are contributing, in the long run, to the creation of a free trade zone stretching from Lisbon to Vladivostok. To say the opposite – to say that what we offer is actually a choice between Brussels and Moscow, between the West and the East – is propaganda. It comes from those who, while ignoring our previous invitation for dialogue on these issues, have imposed military measures on their neighbours. It is ironic that it is this week that we will have the first bilateral group with the Russian Federation to address what one might call their difficulties with the overall concept, trying to make it clear that they have nothing to fear.

But let me end with a point on Ukraine. You have said that there are indeed going to be many discussions on this issue this week here in Strasbourg. Let me just briefly recall what has been underlined by the Member States in the past week, namely that we have strongly condemned Russia's unprovoked violation of Ukraine's sovereignty and territorial integrity. Other steps to destabilise the situation in Ukraine would lead to additional and far-reaching consequences for our relations on a broad range of issues, and we hope that things will not reach that stage.

We firmly believe that the problem should be solved through dialogue. That brings me to the last point. Some of our partners have clearly-defined European aspirations. We have been looking for too long for a way to reflect on this and to respond to it. The last ordinary Foreign Affairs Council that debated Ukraine decided that the association agreement was not the final goal of cooperation with Ukraine. This is an important development, because it is only within the spirit of Article 49 of the Lisbon Treaty that we will be able to take full advantage of the association agreement.

I thank you very much for this debate, and I thank you even more for this important report.

1-241-000

Przewodniczący. - Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w środę 12 marca 2014 r. o godz. 12.00.

23. Porządek obrad następnego posiedzenia: Patrz protokół

24. Zamknięcie posiedzenia

1-244-000

(Posiedzenie zostało zamknięte o godz. 23.00)

25. Zamknięcie sesji rocznej