

СРЯДА 18 ФЕВРУАРИ 2009 Г.
MIÉRCOLES 18 DE FEBRERO DE 2009
STŘEDA, 18. ÚNORA 2009
ONSDAG DEN 18. FEBRUAR 2009
MITTWOCH, 18. FEBRUAR 2009
KOLMAPÄEV, 18. VEEBRUAR 2009
TETARTH 18 ΦΕΒΡΟΥΑΡΙΟΥ 2009
WEDNESDAY, 18 FEBRUARY 2009
MERCREDI 18 FÉVRIER 2009
MERCOLEDI' 18 FEBBRAIO 2009
TREŠDIENA, 2009. GADA 18. FEBRUĀRIS
2009 M. VASARIO 18 D., TREČIADIENIS
2009. FEBRUÁR 18., SZERDA
L-ERBGHA, 18 TA' FRAR 2009
WOENSDAG 18 FEBRUARI 2009
ŚRODA, 18 LUTEGO 2009
QUARTA-FEIRA, 18 DE FEVEREIRO DE 2009
MIERCURI 18 FEBRUARIE 2009
STREDA 18. FEBRUÁRA 2009
SREDA, 18. FEBRUAR 2009
KESKIVIIKKO 18. HELMIKUUTA 2009
ONSDAGEN DEN 18 FEBRUARI 2009

VORSITZ: HANS-GERT PÖTTERING
Präsident

(Die Sitzung wird um 15.00 Uhr eröffnet.)

1 - Wiederaufnahme der Sitzungsperiode

Der Präsident. – Hiermit erkläre ich die am Donnerstag, 5. Februar 2008, unterbrochene Sitzungsperiode für wiederaufgenommen.

2 - Erklärungen des Präsidenten

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Vor zwei Wochen wurde ein polnischer Ingenieur, Piotr Stańczak, der seit letzten September von Terroristen in Pakistan als Geisel gehalten wurde, von seinen Geiselnehmern ermordet. Im Namen des Europäischen Parlaments möchte ich meine Empörung über diesen abscheulichen Mord an einem unschuldigen Menschen, polnischen Staatsbürger und Bürger der Europäischen Union zum Ausdruck bringen. Das Europäische Parlament verurteilt dieses Verbrechen aufs Schärfste. Wir möchten der Familie des Verstorbenen und allen seinen Verwandten unser tief empfundenes Beileid und Mitgefühl bekunden.

Terrorismus ist ein direkter Anschlag auf Freiheit, Menschenrechte und Demokratie. Terrorismus ist der Versuch, durch blinde Gewalt Fakten zu schaffen und unsere gemeinsamen Werte zu zerstören. Er stellt eine der größten Gefahren für die Sicherheit und Stabilität der internationalen Gemeinschaft dar. Terrorismus ist ein Verbrechen, das keine Milde kennen darf.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, ich möchte in der Muttersprache des ermordeten Ingenieurs sagen: Niech spoczywa w wiecznym pokoju.

In Erinnerung an Piotr Stańczak darf ich Sie bitten, sich von Ihren Plätzen zu erheben und seiner zu gedenken.

(Das Parlament erhebt sich zu einer Schweigeminute.)

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Die Waldbrände in Australien haben in den letzten Tagen zu tragischen Verlusten von Menschenleben geführt. Bei diesen schlimmsten Buschbränden in der Geschichte Australiens haben viele Menschen auf schreckliche Weise ihr Leben verloren. Wir alle waren entsetzt von der Gewalt dieser Naturkatastrophe und ihren entsetzlichen Auswirkungen. Ich habe dem australischen Premierminister schriftlich das tiefe Mitgefühl des Europäischen Parlaments bekundet. Im Namen des Europäischen Parlaments möchte ich anlässlich der heutigen Plenartagung nochmals unsere Solidarität mit Australien, seinen Menschen und seinen Behörden in dieser Zeit der Trauer bekunden.

Nächste Woche wird eine Delegation unseres Parlaments nach Australien reisen und das Beileid des Europäischen Parlaments persönlich übermitteln. Doch bereits zum heutigen Zeitpunkt möchte ich in unser aller Namen den Familien aller Verstorbenen mein tief empfundenes Beileid und Mitgefühl aussprechen. Wir sind in Gedanken bei ihnen.

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir erhalten in diesen Tagen erneut Besorgnis erregende Meldungen aus der Islamischen Republik von Iran. Sieben Führungsmitglieder der Religionsgemeinschaft der Bahá'í sind seit Mai 2008 inhaftiert. In diesen acht Monaten wurde ihnen jede Möglichkeit eines Rechtsbeistands verweigert. Jetzt sollen die sieben Würdenträger der Religionsgemeinschaft der Bahá'í in dieser Woche in einem Gerichtsverfahren verurteilt werden, das nicht einmal den grundlegendsten Anforderungen der Rechtsstaatlichkeit entspricht. Die Nobelpreisträgerin und iranische Rechtsanwältin Shirin Ebadi, die bereit war, die Verteidigung der verhafteten Führungsmitglieder zu übernehmen, hat selbst Morddrohungen erhalten.

Das Europäische Parlament fordert die iranischen Behörden erneut eindringlich auf, die Menschenrechte und die Rechte religiöser Minderheiten zu respektieren und ihre Anzeige gegen die sieben Führungsmitglieder der Bahá'í – Fariba Kamalabadi, Jamaloddin Khanjani, Afif Naeimi, Saeid Rasaie, Mahvash Sabet, Behrouz Tavakkoli und Vahid Tizfahm – zu überdenken. Diese Menschen wurden ausschließlich wegen ihres Glaubens inhaftiert und sollten unverzüglich freigelassen werden.

(Beifall)

Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Am vorigen Freitag, dem 13. Februar 2009, wurde in der venezolanischen Hauptstadt Caracas unser spanischer Kollege Luis Herrero aufgrund von Äußerungen gegenüber den Medien von der venezolanischen Regierung festgenommen und anschließend des Landes verwiesen. Luis Herrero hielt sich im Land als offizielles Mitglied einer EVP-ED-Delegation auf, die anlässlich des Verfassungsreferendums von einer Oppositionspartei eingeladen wurde. Bei seiner Festnahme drang die Polizei in sein Hotelzimmer ein und setzte ihn dann ohne offizielle Erklärung und ohne Möglichkeit, seine persönlichen Gegenstände mitzunehmen, in einen Linienflug nach Brasilien. Dies ist für uns inakzeptabel!

Im Namen des Europäischen Parlaments protestiere ich aufs Schärfste gegen diese Vorgangsweise. Ich verurteile ausdrücklich diesen Vorfall, der gegen die Menschenwürde verstößt und die demokratische Institution des Europäischen Parlaments missachtet.

(Beifall)

3-007

Giles Chichester (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I rise as Chair of Parliament's Delegation for relations with Australia and New Zealand to strongly identify myself with the statement you have just made and to thank you for it. I look forward to delivering that message next week in Australia.

3-008

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Chichester.

3-009

3 - Genehmigung des Protokolls der vorangegangenen Sitzung: siehe Protokoll

3-010

4 - Weiterbehandlung eines Antrags auf Schutz der Immunität: siehe Protokoll

3-011

5 - Prüfung von Mandaten: siehe Protokoll

3-012

6 - Auslegung der Geschäftsordnung: siehe Protokoll

3-013

7 - Berichtigung (Artikel 204a der Geschäftsordnung): siehe Protokoll

3-014

8 - Hinfällige schriftliche Erklärungen: siehe Protokoll

3-015

9 - Vorlage von Dokumenten: siehe Protokoll

3-016

10 - Anfragen zur mündlichen Beantwortung und schriftliche Erklärungen (Vorlage): siehe Protokoll

3-017

11 - Übermittlung von Abkommenstexten durch den Rat: siehe Protokoll

3-018

12 - Weiterbehandlung der Standpunkte und Entschließungen des Parlaments: siehe Protokoll

3-019

13 - Arbeitsplan

3-020

Der Präsident. – Der endgültige Entwurf der Tagesordnung dieser Tagung, wie er von der Konferenz der Präsidenten in ihrer Sitzung vom Donnerstag, dem 5. Februar 2009, gemäß Artikel 130 und 131 der Geschäftsordnung festgelegt wurde, ist verteilt worden. Zu diesem Entwurf wurden folgende Änderungen beantragt:

Mittwoch:

Die EVP-ED-Fraktion hat beantragt, den Bericht des Kollegen Herbert Reul über Lösungsansätze für die Herausforderungen im Zusammenhang mit der Ölversorgung auf die nächste Tagung zu verschieben.

3-021

Herbert Reul, im Namen der PPE-DE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Wir haben im Ausschuss über diesen Antrag lange debattiert, wir haben mit großer Mehrheit eine Entscheidung getroffen, aber es hat gestern und heute eine Fülle von Hinweisen und Anregungen gegeben, die sich vor allem auch deshalb ergeben haben, weil andere Ausschüsse noch Beratungsgegenstände hinzugefügt haben.

Es scheint mir sinnvoll zu sein, nicht heute zu entscheiden, sondern noch einmal die Gelegenheit zu haben, eine Lösung zu finden, die dann auch das Parlament tragen kann. Deshalb bitte ich darum, die Verschiebung heute zu beschließen. Danke.

3-022

Hannes Swoboda, im Namen der PSE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Wir haben zwei Anträge vorliegen, die beide mit höchster Wahrscheinlichkeit keine breite Mehrheit in diesem Haus finden werden. Deshalb möchte ich diesen Antrag unterstützen.

Herr Präsident, wenn Sie einverstanden sind, beantragen wir auch, den Bericht Thijs Berman zu verschieben. Wenn dieser Antrag nicht angenommen wird, weil er zu spät gekommen ist, dann möchte ich jetzt mitteilen, dass wir morgen beantragen werden, die Abstimmung über diesen Bericht zu verschieben. Danke.

3-023

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Herr Kollege Swoboda.

Möchte jemand gegen den Antrag sprechen?

3-024

Claude Turmes, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Wir Grünen haben eine Entschließung auf den Weg gebracht, die die Zustimmung der Liberalen und auch von weiten Kreisen der Sozialisten hat. Von daher denke ich, dass Herr Reul eine Verschiebung will, weil er Angst hat, dass seine Position minoritär ist.

Ich finde es ein bisschen komisch, dass wir hier so lange diskutiert haben, und jetzt soll wieder verschoben werden. Wir sind also gegen eine Verschiebung.

3-025

Der Präsident. – Liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Sie haben die politischen Zusammenhänge gehört. Sie haben auch gehört, was Kollege Swoboda gesagt hat. Dazu gibt es dann morgen die Entscheidung.

(Das Parlament nimmt den Antrag von der PPE-DE-Fraktion an.)

Über den Antrag von Herrn Swoboda werden wir morgen abstimmen. Ich bitte darum, dass man sich dann dabei an die heutige Abstimmung erinnert.

(Der Arbeitsplan ist somit angenommen.)¹

3-026

14 - Rolle der Europäischen Union im Nahen Osten (Aussprache)

3-027

Der Präsident. – Als nächster Punkt folgen die Erklärungen des Hohen Vertreters für die Gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik und der Kommission über die Rolle der Europäischen Union im Nahen Osten. Ich darf in unserer Mitte sehr herzlich den Hohen Beauftragten, Javier Solana, begrüßen und ihn bitten, zu uns zu sprechen.

.

3-028

Javier Solana, High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy. – Mr President, this is the first time that I have appeared before you this year, 2009. It is a great pleasure to be here and I hope that the good cooperation we have had in the past will continue this year.

The war in Gaza ended a month ago, on 18 January, and I think you would agree with me that it feels like yesterday. The scale of the suffering and destruction was immense and it has left us all with a bitter taste in our mouths. The humanitarian situation today remains heart-breaking. We need to find urgent solutions to get aid in and to reduce the level of suffering of the people.

At the same time, we need to do all we can to end the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians and between Israel and the Arab world. In fact, the parameters of the solution are well known, and have been known for some time. What matters now is the political will to implement it among Israelis and Palestinians, among Arabs and the wider international community.

The European vocation for peace in the Middle East remains as strong as ever. Our commitment to the creation of a viable and independent Palestinian state, living side by side with Israel, is total. It is at the heart of our Middle East policy. All our actions have this strategic objective in mind. We will give our firm backing to all who want a peaceful solution to the many challenges across the Middle East region.

This House – Parliament – knows just how difficult and how intractable the situation may seem. Too often the region has been plagued by cycles of violence, rising extremism and economic hardship. At the same time, the conditions for Europeans and Americans to work together in the search for peace in the Middle East are probably better than ever. I have just returned from Washington where I had good discussions with everybody there in the Obama administration. I think I have the assurance from them that the strong commitment that has been expressed is a reality. We are willing and ready to work with them towards achieving success in this conflict.

I think the appointment of Senator Mitchell as US envoy has given the people in the Middle East and his friends renewed hope. We know him. We have worked with him. I had the privilege of working with him in 2001 on the famous report and just recently, I have had the opportunity to work with him in the region.

I hope very much that these changes will lead to a new approach, one that provides the parties with a greater say in how they manage their affairs. We know that solutions and proposals should be locally inspired. But, at the same time, deeper international engagement remains essential.

¹ Weitere Änderungen des Arbeitsplans: siehe Protokoll.

This is why the Arab Peace Initiative is so crucial. This initiative is the collective expression of the Arab world on how they could help to end their conflict with Israel. It is their response to the issue that has held back their development and their integration into our global world. It remains, and should remain, on the table.

We have just had important elections in Israel. Of course, it is for the Israeli people, their political leaders, to decide on the composition of their new government. From our side, we hope that the new prime minister and government will be solid interlocutors for peace talks.

Needless to say, the same applies to the Palestinians. They, too, have to get their house in order, including through reconciliation. As everybody knows, we strongly encourage intra-Palestinian reconciliation behind President Abbas and all the efforts by Egypt and the Arab League in that direction. This will be a key to peace, stability and development.

As I said, I know that this Parliament has been deeply preoccupied with the crisis in Gaza, and so have we all. Let me use this occasion to highlight some of the most important international efforts, which focused on trying to end the violence and easing the plight of all civilian populations.

Egypt's role in resolving the situation in Gaza, and indeed with the Palestinians themselves, remains crucial. We hope their efforts will soon lead to a durable and sustainable ceasefire, to the opening of the crossings for all goods and persons, and some sort of intra-Palestinian agreement. Without this, it will be difficult – not to say impossible – to rebuild Gaza.

We are looking forward to welcoming positive announcements on the ceasefire. The day before yesterday there were good meetings, and let us hope that they will continue today and in the future so that a ceasefire may be called, without delay. As you know, Egypt will also host an important conference on reconstruction on 2 March and we expect all the international community to make a commitment there. The European Union, too, played its role. We immediately expressed our willingness to contribute in concrete ways to a durable ceasefire. We also stated our readiness to re-dispatch our monitors to the Rafah crossing-point, in accordance with the agreement that we signed in 2005. We are ready to operate at Rafah, or at any other crossing-points where help is needed or requested.

Several European countries also expressed their readiness to help the interdiction of illegal trafficking, in particular arms smuggling, into Gaza. The activities of the European Parliament in response to the crisis have been significant and are part and parcel of the European Union's overall reaction to the crisis.

As far as the United Nations is concerned, we can warmly commend UNRWA for its work and perseverance and underline that the European Union will continue to support all its efforts.

But it is clear that no single country or organisation can tackle the conflicts in the Middle East alone. The very nature of the difficulties demands multilateral solutions. The Quartet will have a crucial role to play in the months ahead. The new US Administration, in cooperation with us, has confirmed its intention to make full use of the Quartet.

The terrible events in Gaza should also force us to take a more strategic and long-term look at Gaza. The Gaza Strip constitutes an integral part of the Palestinian territory occupied in 1967 and, without any doubt, will be part of a Palestinian state. Gaza needs to become economically and politically viable. Gaza needs to become part of a political solution.

The immediate priority remains to secure a durable and fully respected ceasefire and to allow for the unimpeded delivery of humanitarian aid. We need to see the opening of the crossings for humanitarian assistance, for commercial goods and for people, on a regular and predictable basis.

As you know, the diplomatic fall-out of the Gaza conflict in the wider region has been very significant: indirect talks between Syria and Israel have been suspended; Mauritania and Qatar have suspended ties with Israel; a withdrawal of the Arab Peace Initiative was threatened.

Arab divisions, as you know, have deepened. Without Arab unity it will be very difficult to make progress in Gaza and in the wider Middle East peace process. Peace in the Middle East requires a united Arab world. The upcoming Arab League summit will be crucial to restore Arab unity, in particular behind the Arab Peace Initiative.

In the coming months, we will also have elections in Iran and in Lebanon. On 12 June, the Iranians will vote for a new President. We have repeatedly stated our deep respect for Iran and our desire to forge a completely different kind of relationship with this country. This is clearly in everyone's interests. But to achieve that, we need trust and that trust must be restored.

Let me conclude by saying that 2009 will be critical for the Middle East. We are possibly at a threshold. We can choose to pursue the same policies in the same manner, knowing that they will lead to the same results – the results that we know

today. On the other hand, we can try to work with energy, with determination, to adjust our policies, to adjust the way we set about achieving results.

We have to work on both crisis management and conflict resolution – there is no doubt about that. However, the time has come to focus decisively on conflict resolution. It is the only way to end this endless sequence of death and destruction.

(Applause)

3-029

Der Präsident. – Herzlichen Dank, Herr Hoher Beauftragter Javier Solana. Ich darf Sie, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen, darüber informieren, dass ich am kommenden Sonntag in meiner Eigenschaft als Präsident der Euromediterranen Parlamentarischen Versammlung für zweieinhalb Tage mit einer Delegation, die ich führe, nach Gaza, Ramallah, Sderot und Jerusalem reisen werde. Es sind unter anderem Gespräche in Jerusalem mit Staatspräsident Peres und mit Premierminister Olmert und in Ramallah mit dem Präsidenten der Palästinensischen Behörde Mahmoud Abbas und mit Ministerpräsident Fayyad vorgesehen. In Gaza wird der Besuch von den Vereinten Nationen vorbereitet und durchgeführt.

3-030

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, we are at a moment of transition in the Middle East. Soon, most probably, there will be a new Israeli government. There is already a new US administration, currently defining its foreign policy priorities. And we may soon face transition in the occupied Palestinian territory. So changing dynamics can create opportunities for new engagement.

But there is no denying that the recent conflict resulted in enormous human suffering and destruction. It has left the Middle East peace process – we have to confess – in a particularly fragile state. This House knows that only too well, and I refer to the discussions and debates that we have already had here.

This is clearly not where we wanted to be at the beginning of 2009. But if there is, some day, to be peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians, the only way forward is to do all we can to get the talks back on track. This human tragedy in Gaza has had a huge impact on the region. I returned only last night from a trip to Syria and Lebanon, and I will certainly also say something about that. But in particular, let me say that what we need to do is to make clear to all Israeli leaders that the EU expects sustained commitment to the peace process and to the two-state solution.

We also need to reinforce the message to the Palestinians that a strong Palestinian Authority with effective leadership over the entire occupied Palestinian territory is essential both for the reunification of the West Bank and Gaza and to get the peace process back on track. That is why the European Union is supporting the efforts of Egypt, Turkey and others to achieve this.

With the new US administration, we need to agree a joint way forward. I spoke on the phone to Secretary Clinton to that end only last week. She agreed on the need for a lasting ceasefire and a return to the peace process, which is absolutely crucial. We also agreed that the Quartet should consult closely on these matters before the end of the month. I am glad that the American administration sees the Quartet as a very important institution for going forward on peace.

Finally, we need to step up our own engagement with the Arab League countries. The consensus for peace is weakening, not only in Israel and within the occupied Palestinian territory, but also within the Arab League, where worrying divisions are appearing.

To that end, as I just said, I have just returned from Syria and Lebanon, where I met President Assad in Syria, President Sleiman in Lebanon, and other key partners. The recent conflict has badly damaged negotiations not only on the Palestinian, but also on the Syrian, track. We therefore exchanged views on the peace process at length. I reiterated the very strong support of the European Union for the Arab peace initiative, and I urged partners to maintain their commitment to it, because it offers a serious framework for regional peace talks.

I also stressed the milestone decision taken by Syria and Lebanon to establish diplomatic relations, and pushed for completion of all steps in this process. In both countries we discussed practical ways in which the European Union could support the process of reform. In Lebanon I reiterated our readiness in principle to deploy an EU election observation mission, and I have already decided that an exploratory mission should go there immediately.

The European Union as a whole has been extremely active in recent weeks both on the political and practical fronts. On the political front, since I last reported to you in January, we have all pursued our intensive diplomatic activity. We have been at the forefront of calls for a ceasefire and have worked with Egypt and others to make a lasting ceasefire possible.

The Council conclusions in January indicated that the EU is developing a 'work plan' for a lasting ceasefire. This document identifies six areas for action including humanitarian response, the prevention of smuggling to Gaza, the re-

opening of the Gaza crossing points, reconstruction, intra-Palestinian reconciliation and the resumption of the peace process.

Much very delicate work is going on. To give but a flavour of the pace of activity we have all been involved in: for instance, I was at a working dinner of the Paris Co-Chairs on 15 January, the Summit meetings in Sharm El Sheikh and Jerusalem on 18 January, and EU ministerial meetings with Israel on 21 January and with a group composed of Egypt, the Palestinian Authority, Jordan and Turkey on 25 January. In addition, Commissioner Louis Michel, who is responsible for humanitarian aid, visited Gaza on 24 and 25 January.

We are in regular contact with Quartet colleagues. We had important meetings as a troika in Moscow. I had this telephone conversation with Clinton; Javier Solana was there in Washington, and we are agreed on the need to renew the peace process. We continue our road map monitoring work, and we also deploy state-building assistance, including in sensitive areas such as the rule of law and border management.

The EU's action strategy for the Middle East also foresees EU support for specific final status issues, for instance for Jerusalem, refugees and security arrangements.

In practical terms, the EU has prioritised delivery of humanitarian assistance to the people of Gaza. The Commission has already mobilised EUR 10 million practically overnight, and another EUR 32 million has now been committed for the coming period.

In early March, the Egyptian Government is organising an international conference in Sharm El Sheikh in support of the Palestinian economy for the reconstruction of Gaza. We, as the Commission, will be a co-sponsor of this event. I am delighted that I had the opportunity to discuss the pledge that the Commission intends to make with the Chairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Budgets at an early stage here in Parliament on 2 February. Thank you again for your support.

The problem at the moment is not only funding, but access, particularly to Gaza. We have been very vocal, both in public and in private, about the unacceptable closure of the Gaza crossings. This House will wish to join me today in calling, once again, for the crossings to be fully opened.

(Applause)

When access does improve – as I have no doubt it will – we may then have to review our financial forecast. At that point I may need to come back to discuss this with you. I hope I will again be able to count on your support.

Honourable Members, you can count on the commitment of the Commission – and also on my personal commitment – to do everything in our power to help bring peace as swiftly as possible to one of the most troubled parts of the world. We will certainly continue to work very closely with this House.

(Applause)

3-031

Joseph Daul, *au nom du groupe PPE-DE*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Président en exercice, Haut représentant, M. Solana, Madame la commissaire Ferrero-Waldner, chers collègues, à Gaza, la situation empire chaque jour un peu plus. La population souffre énormément. Elle manque de tout.

L'embargo imposé à Gaza donne à chaque livraison d'aide humanitaire des allures de parcours du combattant. Même livrée, l'aide humanitaire est insuffisante pour répondre aux besoins sur le terrain. Les hôpitaux ne peuvent plus fonctionner correctement. La population ne peut plus être prise en charge. Ce qui se trame actuellement à Gaza est une catastrophe humanitaire de grande ampleur.

L'Union européenne joue déjà un grand rôle dans la région. Le soutien financier qu'elle a apporté et qu'elle apporte toujours aux Palestiniens est considérable. Elle a beaucoup fait en amont pour prévenir le désastre humanitaire auquel nous assistons aujourd'hui. Malgré les obstacles, elle continue d'apporter aide humanitaire et assistance à la population de la bande de Gaza. Aujourd'hui même, l'Union européenne a accordé 41 millions d'euros d'aide à l'Agence des Nations unies pour les réfugiés palestiniens. Ce n'est donc pas maintenant que nous allons commencer à nous taire.

Pour moi, le message des Européens doit être clair. Nous ne pouvons tolérer que l'aide et l'assistance humanitaires soient prises en otage dans ce conflit. Il est primordial que cette aide puisse circuler librement et sans restriction, et que, dès lors, les points de contrôle soient ouverts.

Nous avertissons aussi, par ailleurs, le Hamas. Les incidents du mois dernier, lors desquels le Hamas a confisqué l'aide humanitaire distribuée par l'Agence des Nations unies dans la région et ne l'a pas restituée, sont scandaleux, intolérables et ne doivent plus se reproduire. Tous les acteurs concernés doivent anticiper sur la phase de reconstruction et la préparer activement en évaluant les dégâts sur place et en préparant un plan pour la réhabilitation financière, économique et sociale de la bande de Gaza. Cette réhabilitation est essentielle pour la stabilité de la région. C'est l'objectif de la conférence des donateurs qui se réunira à Charm-el-Cheikh le 2 mars prochain.

Mais soyons clairs. Aucune reconstruction – une de plus – ne pourra avoir lieu tant qu'un cessez-le-feu durable n'aura été prononcé. Le cessez-le-feu et la cessation des opérations militaires, également de la part d'Israël, sont la condition préalable absolue pour rétablir la paix dans la région. Cela commence aussi, de la part du Hamas – et je le dis avec la plus grande fermeté – par l'arrêt définitif des envois de roquettes sur Israël depuis Gaza.

Toutes les mesures doivent être également prises pour lutter contre le trafic d'armes et de munitions par le biais des tunnels reliant Gaza à l'Égypte. La restauration du dialogue entre toutes les composantes de la société palestinienne et la relance du processus actuel de négociation sont essentielles. L'Égypte, qui a une responsabilité particulière en raison de sa situation frontalière avec Gaza, doit être activement associée à ce processus de négociation. Tous nos efforts diplomatiques futurs doivent prendre ce rôle particulier de l'Égypte en considération.

Nous ne pouvons espérer trouver une solution au conflit qu'en gardant ouverte la voie diplomatique. J'appelle toutes les parties concernées, y compris le Quartet, la Ligue arabe et les diplomates des États membres, à continuer à s'engager avec fermeté et détermination dans les négociations.

3-032

Martin Schulz, im Namen der PSE-Fraktion. – Vielen Dank, Herr Präsident, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Die Botschaft unserer Debatte kann nur eine sein: Es gibt keine gewaltsame Lösung im Nahen Osten! Es gibt keine militärische Lösung! Es gibt keine Lösung über terroristische Gewalt!

Es kann sein, dass man kurzfristig einen militärischen Vorteil erzielt, es kann sein, dass ein terroristischer Akt große Verwirrung stiftet, aber jede Gewalt erzeugt erfahrungsgemäß mehr Gewalt und dreht die Gewaltspirale weiter. Deshalb ist der entscheidende Punkt der Dialog. Und der Dialog ist im Nahen Osten extrem schwierig, gerade in einer Zeit der Unsicherheit und teilweise der Ungleichzeitigkeit.

Wir haben es auf der anderen Seite mit einer Hoffnung in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika zu tun. Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton und ihre Mannschaft haben ein konsens- und dialogorientiertes Konzept und damit ein völlig anderes als die Gott sei Dank abgewählte Vorgängerregierung. Hoffnung also in Washington. Aber was ist mit Jerusalem? Sicher ist das, was Benjamin Netanjahu im Wahlkampf gesagt hat, ein Risiko für den Friedensprozess, und sicher ist Avigdor Lieberman eine Gefahr für den Friedensprozess im Nahen Osten. Diese Ungleichzeitigkeit birgt ein Risiko.

Was geschieht im Libanon? Welchen Einfluss hat zukünftig die Hisbollah? Inwieweit ist sie im Libanon zu einem konstruktiven Dialog vor und nach der Wahl bereit? Was ist mit der westlich orientierten Mehrheit? Ist sie in der Lage, das Land nach einem Wahlsieg mit Integration der Hisbollah zu regieren? Ist die Hisbollah bereit, sich integrieren zu lassen? Das hängt in einem entscheidenden Maße davon ab, wer in Teheran regieren wird. Die Frage des Wahlausgangs im Iran ist von zentraler Bedeutung. Übrigens auch für die Haltung der Hamas.

Die Frage, ob wir einen radikalen Präsidenten haben, der das Existenzrecht Israels bestreitet – wie es der amtierende Präsident tut –, oder ob es eine Regierung geben wird, die zum Dialog bereit ist und diese Dialogbereitschaft von Teheran nach Beirut, nach Rafah übergreift, ist eine entscheidende Frage für die Stabilisierung der gesamten Region. Wir sind für eine Regierung der Einheit der Palästinenser. Ohne eine Regierung der palästinensischen Einheit ist der Friedensprozess nicht zu bewältigen. Es ist deshalb an der Hamas, jetzt zu zeigen, ob sie bereit und in der Lage ist, zu einer solchen Regierungsform zu kommen.

Die Grundvoraussetzung dafür ist aber, dass man mit der Hamas redet, dass diejenigen, die im palästinensischen Volk mit der Hamas reden wollen, unterstützt werden und dass sie nicht durch eine Regierung in Jerusalem, die nur eine Politik der Fortsetzung der Siedlungen kennt, in die Defensive gedrängt werden. Nebenbei bemerkt: Wenn es stimmt, dass 163 Hektar jetzt wieder für den Siedlungsbau freigegeben werden, dann ist das ein destabilisierendes Element, und das muss man unseren Freunden in Israel in aller Klarheit sagen.

Alles hängt im Nahen Osten mit allem zusammen. Man kann keine Einzelteile herausnehmen und glauben, man könne ein einzelnes Problem mit militärischen Maßnahmen lösen. Deshalb ist die Grundvoraussetzung für alles die Bereitschaft zum Dialog. Der Plan der Arabischen Liga, der Friedensplan Saudi-Arabiens, sieht Gewaltverzicht unter Anerkennung des Existenzrechts Israels vor – welch ambitionierter und mutiger Plan! Darüber muss gesprochen werden! Es ist doch ein Fortschritt, dass es Leute in der Arabischen Liga, im arabischen Lager gibt, die bereit sind, eine solche Debatte zu führen. Die muss man stärken. Die stärkt man nicht durch Bomber. Man stärkt übrigens auch nicht die Arbeit der Europäischen

Union, indem das, was wir aufbauen, aus irgendwelchen militärischen Erwägungen wieder zerstört wird. Deshalb kann unsere Botschaft nur lauten: Der Dialog ist die Grundvoraussetzung.

Herr Hoher Beauftragter Javier Solana, sie haben gesagt, dass Sie in diesem Jahr zum ersten Mal hier sind, Sie sind vielleicht in dieser Wahlperiode zum letzten Mal hier. Gerade weil der Dialog *conditio sine qua non* für den Erfolg ist, will ich Ihnen im Namen unserer Fraktion sagen, Sie sind sozusagen der personifizierte Dialog. Ihre Arbeit verdient mehr als Respekt, sie verdient in einem großen Maße Bewunderung, vor allen Dingen für das ständige Eintreten für den Dialog. Dafür unsere große Anerkennung.

(Beifall)

3-033

Der Präsident. – Vielen Dank, Kollege Schulz! Wir hoffen natürlich – dem Dank schließen sich alle an –, dass Javier Solana bis zum Ende der Wahlperiode noch einige Male zu uns kommt.

3-034

Graham Watson, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, it is with heavy hearts that we debate once again what our Union can do to ease the pain in the Middle East.

Looking at the recent conflict in Gaza, all the old familiar phrases apply: blame on both sides; provocation by Hamas; disproportionate response by Israel. But in the face of the recurring violence, we have recycled those tired phrases so often that they have lost whatever impact they once had. We cannot go on like this. Of course, it is our moral duty to assist in the reconstruction of Gaza. Of course, it makes sense to seek safeguards from Israel. It is bad enough to see the airport, schools and sewerage systems blown up; it is worse to rebuild them with European money knowing that they will likely be destroyed once again.

Is it possible, is it credible, to imagine that Israel can assure us that this will not happen? In any event, reconstruction and humanitarian aid from the European Union will not prevent future conflict. We need a new and positive approach, jointly with the United States, if possible, but without them if not.

Last month's violence and the outcome of this month's election have changed the terms of the debate. Hamas is stronger politically, it is intact militarily, it is holding out against recognising Israel, and the expected coalition in Israel will be more hard-line than ever and broadly resistant to seeing a separate Palestinian state. Meanwhile, the gulf between the West Bank and Gaza grows ever wider, with the threat of a permanent division.

The Council and the Commission have not really said what their response will be to this turn of events, and the Czech Presidency appears to want the matter off the agenda. But we can afford to wait no longer. With the situation in flux and neither Hamas nor the Israelis talking to one another, we must set achievable terms on which we can talk to both. Isolation has led only to despair.

The time has come for diplomacy, delicate but determined. In which forum? In the Quartet, Mr Solana? Well, perhaps, but let us first acknowledge that the policy failures, the dashed hopes and the creeping extremism of the past seven years have taken place under the Quartet's watch. Its envoy Tony Blair has never even been to Gaza. If he went there, he could visit the site of the industrial area, which is one of his pet projects, designed to generate jobs, but levelled last month.

(Applause)

The Quartet has to open its mind to a new approach and, if our partners within it cannot take that step, then we should explore ways in which it might.

Lastly, we can only prepare for the future if we acknowledge honestly what has happened in the past. There should be a free and fair international investigation into alleged war crimes in the Gaza conflict. The UNRWA and our own parliamentary committee have both reported alarming evidence of war crimes, and the allegations are serious indeed. If Israel is wrongly accused, its name should be cleared, but if it has committed those crimes, it must face up to its responsibilities. Our aim must be to forge an agreement for a peaceful and prosperous future on both sides of the divide, where enemies can once again become partners. But the failure of our approach to date is written in spilled blood on the ground. Mr Solana, we must pioneer a new path to peace, and the European Union, if necessary, must take the lead.

(Applause)

3-035

Brian Crowley, thar ceann an Ghrúpa UEN. – A Uachtaráin, a Ardionadaí agus a Choimisinéir Ferrero-Waldner, cuirim fáilte mhór roimh an socrú do chúnamh daonnachta do Stráice Gaza a deineadh inniu. Is céim sa treo ceart í seo do Pharlaimint na hEorpa.

Tá cúrsaí daonnachta go dona i nGaza faoi láthair, agus tá dualgas ar an Aontas Eorpach cabhrú léi.

3-036

Many words have been spoken with regard to the need for peace, dialogue, understanding, temperance – if one would wish to use that word – with regard to the reactions and the counter-reactions to different events. But three things jump out at us immediately when we speak about the Middle East.

Firstly, it is not a negotiation of equals. There is strength on one side, weakness and division on the other side. Secondly, it is not an equal participation of outside influences and outside media coverage. One side gets more positive protection from international media and countries; the other side suffers under the derogatory terms of ‘terrorism’ or ‘reactionary’.

Thirdly, and most importantly of all, despite all the political disagreements, geographical disagreements and historical disputes, it is the same people who continue to suffer day after day after day: women, children, innocent civilians, people who have no truck with political groups, political organisations or with paramilitary groups or terrorist organisations. These are the poor innocents caught in the middle of the rocket fire, of the bombing and the so-called – and I laugh when I hear these words being used – ‘targeted intelligent bombing’. There is no such thing as an ‘intelligent’ or ‘safe’ bomb. When it lands, it blows up – it kills people.

We have ample evidence to show that not only the Hamas rockets going into Israel killed innocent people but that, a hundred times more, the bombs and the bullets from the Israeli forces have killed thousands and injured thousands of people within Gaza and within the Occupied Territories. Indeed we have evidence from an Irishman, John King, who works for UNWRA in Gaza, to show that, when they informed the Israeli authorities that their bombs were landing close to a UN compound in Gaza that was storing fuel and food and was also acting as a refuge to children whose school had been bombed earlier in the day, the bombs came closer; and when they had to phone them a second time the bombs landed on the fuel dump within the UN compound.

Perhaps it is negligence, misinformation or deliberate targeting, but one way or the other it is an act – maybe not quite a war crime in some people’s minds – but it is an act of attack on the institutions of peace, humanity and freedom. At times of war there are rules of engagement, there are certain things which cannot be done.

Of course we must get aid and assistance to the Palestinian people for the rebuilding of their areas; of course we must ensure and insist that talks take place and that peace can be allowed to flourish, but that requires us to take brave moves within Europe as well. Like Martin Schulz, I congratulate Javier Solana on walking that long lonely path of speaking to people that nobody else would speak to, of opening the doors of dialogue, because ultimately only through dialogue between enemies can you make peace, and only through peace can you build the foundations of a solid two-state solution that will guarantee peace, equity, security and justice within the Middle East.

3-037

Jill Evans, *on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group*. – Mr President, I was a member of the European Parliament delegation that travelled to Gaza last week to see the devastation, and the focus of Parliament’s resolution today is humanitarian action, which is desperately needed.

This is a real humanitarian crisis, and how are we going to address that urgently? Ninety per cent of people in Gaza are dependent on UN aid. This is not linked to any negotiations. We have to ensure that that aid gets through, and the key to that is the lifting of the siege and the opening of the crossing-points. How can a densely populated area of 1.5 million people that has been bombed for 22 days and in which over 1 000 people were killed even begin to recover when only 15 categories of humanitarian items are being allowed in: food, some medicines and mattresses? You cannot rebuild homes and offices without cement and glass, which are banned. You cannot teach children in schools that have no paper because it is banned. You cannot feed people when there is not enough food being allowed in. It is not that the aid is not there, but it is not being allowed through. We have to put pressure on the Israeli Government to end the blockade and open the crossings.

Any assessment of the damage caused in Gaza must draw attention to the deliberate targeting to destroy the infrastructure and the economy. We saw schools, factories, homes and a hospital deliberately attacked. Once again, we have witnessed the destruction by Israel of projects funded by the European Union and, rather than take action on this, we are talking about upgrading trade relations when conditions on human rights are currently being breached under the current agreements.

Mr Solana talked about how pursuing the same policies can bring us back to the same place. Well, I agree. In 2006, the European Union refused to recognise the Palestinian Unity Government, which included members of Hamas, and yet we are ready to recognise a new Israeli Government, which may include members who reject a two-state solution, who do not support a Palestinian state.

What is crucial now is that the EU must be prepared to work with and recognise an interim Palestinian national government of consensus that should emerge from the Cairo talks in the next few weeks, and we must give out clear signals of our intentions to the international community. We have to support the reconciliation process in Palestine as part of achieving a long-term solution, and that means ensuring that we do not repeat the mistakes of the past.

(Applause)

3-038

Francis Wurtz, *au nom du groupe GUE/NGL*. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Haut représentant, Madame la Commissaire, en écoutant, il y a près d'un mois, les enfants de Gaza raconter, au milieu des décombres de leur maison, comment ils ont tremblé sous les bombes, ou leurs parents décrire l'enfer de ces 22 jours et nuits qui marqueront à jamais leur vie et la mémoire des générations futures, je n'étais pas fier de l'Europe.

J'ai pensé à un certain nombre de dirigeants de nos États, à tous ceux qui portent devant l'Histoire la responsabilité de leur manque de courage politique, des occasions manquées, de leur absence de vision. Je me suis posé la question: jusqu'à quelles extrémités les dirigeants israéliens doivent-ils pousser leur inhumanité à l'égard des Palestiniens et leur mépris du droit comme des valeurs les plus essentielles pour que les principaux responsables politiques européens osent lever plus que leur petit doigt et dire enfin "Trop c'est trop"?

Que ceux qui se disent amis d'Israël pour justifier l'impunité et la complaisance sans limites à l'égard de son actuelle classe dirigeante méditent ces paroles du grand écrivain israélien David Grossmann, que je veux citer: "À l'heure où Israël est gagné par la surenchère nationaliste, nous ferions bien de garder à l'esprit que la dernière opération militaire à Gaza n'est, somme toute, qu'une nouvelle étape sur une route de feu, de violence et de haine. Une route jalonnée tantôt de victoires, tantôt de défaites, mais qui nous conduit inmanquablement à la ruine".

Ou bien qu'ils s'interrogent avec Shlomo Sand, historien israélien de renom, que je cite également: "Nous avons semé la désolation. Nous avons fait la preuve que nous n'avons aucune retenue morale. Avons-nous renforcé le camp de la paix chez les Palestiniens?" Et il poursuit: "Israël pousse les Palestiniens au désespoir."

Depuis vingt ans, Arafat et l'Autorité palestinienne ont reconnu l'État d'Israël sans rien avoir gagné en échange. Israël a refusé l'offre de la Ligue arabe de 2002, chers collègues! On parle tous de la Ligue arabe, du projet de paix de la Ligue arabe. Cela fait sept ans qu'il existe! Qu'a fait l'Europe pour se saisir de cette occasion?

Je reviens donc à Shlomo Sand: "Israël a refusé l'offre de la Ligue arabe, en 2002, d'une pleine reconnaissance d'Israël dans les frontières d'avant 1967." L'historien israélien conclut ainsi: "Israël ne fera la paix que si on fait pression sur sa politique".

D'où une question, Monsieur le Haut représentant, puisque vous n'avez rien dit au sujet du droit international. Quelles pressions l'Union est-elle prête à exercer sur Israël en ce qui concerne tant Gaza que la Cisjordanie, y compris Jérusalem, pour rappeler à ses dirigeants actuels et futurs que l'appartenance à la communauté internationale en général, et le partenariat privilégié avec l'Union européenne en particulier, ont un prix, qu'ils ne s'accommodent ni de l'occupation militaire, ni des crimes de guerre, ni d'une politique qui pousse chaque jour un peu plus au divorce entre l'Europe et le monde arabo-musulman?

Je voudrais ne pas avoir, comme Européen, à reporter l'espoir d'un changement de politique au Proche-Orient sur le seul locataire de la Maison blanche. Je voudrais encore croire à un sursaut de l'Europe.

(Applaudissements)

3-039

Kathy Sinnott, *(IND/DEM)*. – Mr President, today we are debating a resolution about humanitarian aid. Before making my contribution, I would like to stress that I am not speaking on behalf of the IND/DEM Group as it has no position on this topic. Instead, I am speaking as an MEP on behalf of myself and of my people.

The vast majority of the people of Gaza must rely on humanitarian aid for their very survival – food, water, shelter, clothes and, especially, medicine. This is a population that has been under siege for a very long time. All crossing points have been closed for 18 months and now, with the terrible recent aggression visited on the people of Gaza, they are even more desperate. Because the siege has still not been lifted and crossings are still closed, it is very difficult to get essentials to the people.

I note in recital E of this resolution that we Europeans give ourselves a nice pat on the back for our humanitarian aid efforts. You, Commissioner, talked of the political efforts that you are making, but do we deserve this praise? Israel-EU trade is worth EUR 27 billion annually. If we really wanted action on Gaza we would use the power that this trade gives us by imposing economic sanctions. Our refusal to do this, even at the height of the bombing in January, indicated that we

prefer the status quo of business as usual, with our contribution of humanitarian aid possibly being a salve to our conscience. Not only are we unwilling to risk upsetting a good business market for the sake of bringing injustice in Gaza to an end, but we are also unwilling so far to dissolve or even just suspend the EU-Israel agreement.

I have a great love of the Jewish people. In college I took the opportunity to study several courses of their history and literature under a rabbi. However, friendship does not mean blindness but the willingness to be honest. Actually, judging by demonstrations that took place in the major cities of Israel, there are many Israeli citizens who publicly oppose their Government's action.

To return to the urgency of the humanitarian aid: rebuilding physical infrastructure is important, but it is understandable that agencies may be hesitant to rebuild when it looks as though an even more threatening regime is taking over in Israel. Rebuilding human infrastructure, however, cannot wait. We must get supplies in. I would especially point out that the particularly vicious weaponry used in January has left many people with missing limbs and terrible burns. I myself know what it is like to have a healthy child become disabled.

We must get intervention – medical and educational – to all those thousands of people, especially children, who since the New Year have become disabled for life. As we help them we must record their stories, to begin the process of gathering evidence for targeted attacks and possible war crimes.

3-040

Jean-Marie Le Pen (NI). – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames, Messieurs, ce n'est certainement pas l'Europe, encore moins son Haut représentant pour la politique étrangère, Javier Solana, ancien Secrétaire général de l'OTAN, qui peuvent jouer le rôle de médiateur entre Israël et la Palestine. Tout au plus sont-ils appelés à financer la reconstruction de la Bande de Gaza, comme ils le font aujourd'hui pour le Kosovo, le Liban ou l'Afghanistan.

Les Américains et les Israéliens bombardent, les Européens financent la reconstruction. Telle est la répartition des tâches entre alliés. Or, il faudrait que ce soit les casseurs qui paient. L'Égypte est au centre des pourparlers de paix qui portent sur un cessez-le-feu prolongé avec le Hamas. Mais le défi à relever est redoutable, dans la mesure où le nouveau gouvernement israélien, sous la pression du troisième homme, Liebermann, chef d'une extrême-droite qu'on accepte là-bas démocratiquement, risque de voir sa tâche singulièrement compliquée dans cette négociation. En effet, Netanyahu, qu'on présente comme le futur premier ministre, s'est toujours opposé à une trêve avec le Hamas.

Autre difficulté, l'autorité palestinienne de Mahmoud Abbas est devenue, en Cisjordanie, une sorte de protectorat international dont la légitimité a fortement diminué auprès de la population.

Dernier élément dont il faut tenir compte: l'expansion des colonies israéliennes, qui n'a jamais cessé depuis 1967, rend la création d'un État palestinien en Cisjordanie particulièrement délicate. Aujourd'hui, la balle est dans le camp israélien, mais les faucons des deux camps acceptent-ils cette trêve de Dieu que les deux parties réclament sans s'en donner les moyens?

Permettez-moi d'ajouter une réflexion sur la réintégration de la France dans la structure militaire intégrée de l'OTAN, qui va être débattue dans le cadre du rapport Vatanen. Cette réintégration entraînera pour la France des obligations sévères. En effet, nous réintégrons l'OTAN alors que la guerre froide est terminée depuis 1990. Sarkozy semble avoir oublié la chute du Mur de Berlin et le retour de la Russie dans les rangs des nations libres. Faut-il renforcer la logique des blocs, à l'heure de la multipolarisation et de la montée en puissance des pays émergents, y compris sur le plan militaire?

En outre, l'adhésion de la France à la structure intégrée l'obligera à renforcer son contingent en Afghanistan alors qu'elle a déjà 3 300 hommes sur le terrain. Avec quels fonds va-t-elle financer cette opération alors que son budget de la défense va passer sous les 2 % du PIB et que plus de 30 régiments vont être supprimés?

Paradoxalement, nous allons augmenter notre participation budgétaire pour réintégrer l'OTAN et réduire, dans le même temps, notre présence militaire en Afrique. La défense européenne, chère au Président Sarkozy, sera donc un pilier de l'Alliance atlantique. Il suffisait de lire le traité de Lisbonne et ses protocoles additionnels pour s'en convaincre.

Que ce soit en matière de politique étrangère ou de sécurité commune, la voie européenne est une impasse qui ne conduira qu'à un alignement sur les Américains et leurs alliés. C'est cette logique d'effacement que nous récusons au nom de la souveraineté et de l'indépendance nationales, qui reposent en particulier sur notre force de dissuasion nucléaire autonome.

3-041

Der Präsident. – Die anderen Kolleginnen und Kollegen haben auch ein bisschen überzogen, und man muss dann allen das gleiche Recht geben.

3-042

Javier Solana, *Alto Representante de la PESC*. – Señor Presidente, en el poco tiempo que me ofrece el reloj no podré contestar uno a uno a todos los portavoces que han intervenido en esta sesión de control. Permítanme que les diga que agradezco de todo corazón las palabras que han expresado sobre mi persona y sobre lo que yo hago. Sólo les quisiera decir que tengan la seguridad de que seguiré trabajando con el mismo empeño y, si cabe, con más, porque la situación se vuelve cada día más difícil.

Creo que hay cinco temas de los cuales se podría extraer un consenso entre todos los que me han precedido en el uso de la palabra.

El primero son los temas humanitarios. Sin duda ninguna, el tema más agudo, el tema más importante es el tema humanitario. La violencia de estos días, de estas semanas, ha puesto de manifiesto unas necesidades enormes para paliar el sufrimiento entre las poblaciones, en particular entre los ciudadanos de Gaza. Por tanto, todo lo que se pueda hacer por nuestra parte para paliar las grandes durezas de la vida cotidiana en Gaza lo haremos. Lo hará la Comisión, sin ningún género de dudas, lo harán los Estados miembros del Consejo, lo hará la comunidad internacional en su conjunto.

Segundo tema: para ello es absolutamente fundamental que se abran los puntos de cruce entre Gaza e Israel y entre Gaza y Egipto. Y se tienen que abrir de una manera inmediata y rápida, desde nuestro punto de vista; se proporcionará toda la ayuda allá donde seamos llamados, y en particular en el asunto de Rafah estaremos dispuestos a desplegarlos a la mayor brevedad posible. Los observadores de la Unión Europea se encuentran ya allí, disponibles, para que en el momento en que se abra el cruce de Raffa estemos en disposición de desplegarlos.

Tercer tema: el tema, muy importante, de la unidad palestina. Señorías, yo creo que está claro que en estos momentos no habrá solución si no hay un principio de reconciliación intrapalestina. Por lo tanto, la Unión Europea, como se dijo en la resolución del último Consejo de Asuntos Generales, apoya y apoyará los esfuerzos que se están haciendo, ya sean los del Presidente Abbás, ya sean los del Presidente Mubarak, para avanzar en una reconciliación intrapalestina.

Muchos intervinientes han mencionado las obligaciones que podemos contraer en función de un nuevo gobierno de consenso palestino. A mí me parece, Señorías —y hablo a título personal—, que si hay un gobierno de consenso intrapalestino, un gobierno que tenga como objetivo los dos Estados, un gobierno que tenga como objetivo construir esos dos Estados por la vía pacífica, un gobierno que tenga un programa de reconstrucción en Gaza y un gobierno que trate de construir un proceso electoral en el año 2009, creo que es un gobierno que la Unión Europea debería apoyar.

Cuarto tema: sobre la cuestión de Israel; dos cosas importantes después de las elecciones. En primer lugar: el gobierno que ha surgido de las elecciones o que surgirá de la mayoría que ha salido de las elecciones, tiene la obligación, desde nuestro punto de vista, de continuar un proceso de paz, y en esa línea vamos a trabajar, a hacer todo lo posible para que, sea cual sea el gobierno que surja de estas elecciones en Israel, sea un gobierno que se consolide, trabaje, contribuya a continuar un proceso de paz y haga todo lo posible para que éste culmine, a poder ser, durante el año 2009.

Quinto tema: para nosotros es absolutamente fundamental la cuestión de los asentamientos. Los últimos datos que han sido publicados por el propio gobierno de Israel en relación con el estado de los asentamientos en el año 2008, creo que nos deben llamar a todos a un sentido de la responsabilidad.

Les quisiera decir que el año 2001 trabajé con el entonces senador Mitchell en el famoso informe que lleva su nombre; fui una de las cuatro personas que trabajaron en ese programa. Me gustaría, Señorías, que tuvieran ustedes la buena voluntad de volver a leer ese informe: en ese informe, del año 2001, se decían cosas que, desgraciadamente, todavía tienen que decirse hoy, por ejemplo en el tema de los asentamientos. Si no somos capaces, en la Unión Europea, de tratar de cambiar la forma en que se siguen desarrollando los asentamientos, difícilmente será creíble cualquier inicio de proceso de paz. Por lo tanto, seriedad en ese tema, hablar seriamente con nuestros amigos de Israel para que el tema de los asentamientos sea tratado de forma radicalmente diferente.

Por último, Señorías, señor Presidente: la Liga Árabe. Es imprescindible la unidad entre los países árabes. Es imprescindible que cooperemos con todos los países de la Liga Árabe para que siga estando vigente la iniciativa de paz firmada por la Liga Árabe. Es fundamental que este proceso de paz acabe con una reconciliación entre palestinos e israelíes, pero también con una reconciliación entre los árabes e Israel. Por tanto, todo nuestro apoyo a aquellos que están trabajando para que la iniciativa de paz se pueda hacer una realidad.

Vemos divisiones profundas en el ámbito de la Liga Árabe; tendremos que hacer todo lo que podamos diplomáticamente para evitar que esas diferencias se profundicen y, al contrario, para que vuelva a recuperarse un proceso de armonía y de cooperación en el seno de la gran familia árabe.

Señor Presidente, Señorías, el año 2009, como he dicho, va a ser un año enormemente importante. Tendremos que seguir haciendo gestión de crisis, llevar ayuda humanitaria, hacer todo lo posible para que haya un alto el fuego, hacer todo lo posible para que los tránsitos entre Israel y Gaza y entre Egipto y Gaza se hagan; pero, Señorías, si no cambiamos nuestra

mentalidad, desde una posición de gestión de crisis hacia una posición profunda de resolución del conflicto, estaremos en la misma situación que desgraciadamente hemos vuelto al inicio del año 2009.

Que el año 2009, al final, señor Presidente, con la cooperación de todos, pueda ser un año en el que podamos realmente resolver este enorme conflicto que pesa sobre nuestras espaldas, desgraciadamente, desde hace demasiado tiempo.

3-043

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I just wanted to say again that last year we clearly said that failure is not an option. We were all hopeful for the Annapolis process and we were hopeful for a peace process. Unfortunately, the military incursion into Gaza after the rockets launched from Gaza into Israel have changed the equation. Now we all know that there is a series of elements that is absolutely necessary so that we can come back to peace agreements. But in any case, one thing is sure: a military solution is no solution; on this I agree with all of you. Therefore, whatever the cost, we will all have to work in order to bring about peace.

Many actors are there: in the European Union, in the international community – be it the United States of America, the UN or Russia – but there are also many Arab friends and colleagues. I can only hope that, when a new Israeli Government is in place, all those actors will want to come together for peace. Our rationale is clear, but whether the emotions will then bring us to the right path, we will have to see. Be assured that we will work for that.

(Applause)

3-044

Der Präsident. – Zum Abschluss der Aussprache wurden gemäß Artikel 103 Absatz 2 der Geschäftsordnung ein Entschließungsantrag² eingereicht.

Die Aussprache ist geschlossen.

Die Abstimmung findet heute statt.

Schriftliche Erklärungen (Artikel 142)

3-045

Bairbre de Brún (GUE/NGL), *i scríbhinn*. – Tá an cás daonnúil i nGaza do-ghlactha. Tá cabhair bia de dhíth ar ochtó a hocht faoin chéad den daonra, tá easpa soláthairtí éigeantacha míochaine sna hospidéal, agus ní féidir na mílte tonna de chabhair a thabhairt isteach i nGaza mar nach ligtear dóthain trucaíl isteach ann.

Cuireadh uafás ar dhaoine ar fud an domhain faoina laghad de fhreagairt idirnáisiúnta a bhí ann nuair a maraíodh breis agus 1 000 Palaistíneach ar na mallaibh le linn ionsaí Iosrael i nGaza – breis agus 300 páiste san áireamh.

Caithfidh straitéis fhorghníomhach fhadtéarmach ón Eoraip agus ó rialtas nua SAM cearta na bPalaistíneach chun stáit inmharthana – bunaithe ar theorainneacha roimh 1967 – a chur san áireamh; stop a chur le gníomhaíocht lonnaíochta sna Críocha faoi Fhorghabháil; agus balla na cinedheighilte a scartáil.

Is gá slándáil d'Iosrael agus stát saor don Phalaistín a bhaint amach, ach ní mór deireadh a chur leis an chás go bhfuil Iosrael ag úsáid na slándála mar leithscéal chun slad a dhéanamh ar Phalaistínigh neamhurchóideacha. Caithfear tús a chur le fíorphróiseas caibidlíochta.

Is gá don AE an Comhaontú Comhlachais idir an tAontas Eorpach agus Iosrael a chur ar ceal fad agus nach gcomhlíonann Iosrael an dlí idirnáisiúnta agus an dlí daonnúil.

3-046

Pedro Guerreiro (GUE/NGL), *por escrito*. – Qual deveria ser (e não é) o "papel da UE no Médio Oriente"? Quais os princípios pelos quais se deveria pautar?

Exigência do fim da agressão e do desumano bloqueio imposto à população da Faixa de Gaza e assegurar o premente socorro humanitário à população palestina.

Condenação da brutal agressão, dos crimes, das violações dos mais elementares direitos humanos, do terrorismo de estado perpetrado por Israel contra o povo palestino, que nada pode justificar.

Inequívoca denúncia de que na Palestina há um colonizador e um colonizado, um agressor e uma vítima, um opressor e um oprimido, um explorador e um explorado.

² Siehe Protokoll.

Suspensão do Acordo de Associação e de qualquer reforço das relações bilaterais com Israel, como os que foram decididos no Conselho de Assuntos Exteriores da UE, de 8 e 9 de Dezembro.

Exigência do respeito do direito internacional e do cumprimento das resoluções da ONU por parte de Israel, do fim da ocupação, dos colonatos, do muro de segregação, dos assassinatos, das detenções, das inúmeras humilhações infligidas ao povo palestino.

Exigir e pugnar pelo respeito do inalienável direito do povo palestino a um Estado independente e soberano, com as fronteiras de 1967 e capital em Jerusalém Leste!

No fundo, deixar de ser cúmplice da impunidade do colonialismo israelita.

3-047

Alexandru Nazare (PPE-DE), în scris. – Recentele alegeri din Israel și noua administrație a SUA oferă oportunitatea unui nou început în procesul de pace din Orientul Mijlociu. Cred că UE trebuie să transmită un mesaj clar de susținere a noului cabinet de la Tel Aviv și, totodată, să-și articuleze clar așteptările de la partenerii israelieni, în sensul continuării unor măsuri care să faciliteze o pace durabilă – inclusiv închiderea coloniilor din Cisiordania și suportul ferm pentru soluția bistatală – și evitarea exceselor militare cu repercusiuni umanitare grave.

Abordarea UE față de Orientul Mijlociu trebuie să fie bazată pe câteva principii ferme. În primul rând, o colaborare strânsă cu SUA, fără de care nu putem obține o soluție de durată în regiune. În al doilea rând, abordarea noastră trebuie să vizeze evitarea pe cât posibil a violențelor de ambele părți, condamnarea extremismului palestinian, dar și a măsurilor excesive luate de Israel, și sprijinirea unor soluții de guvernare moderate de ambele părți, în măsură să faciliteze procesul de pace.

Doresc să-mi exprim susținerea față de rezoluția Parlamentului European votată astăzi, care confirmă angajamentul UE față de procesul de reconstrucție din Gaza și pune bazele discuțiilor ce vor avea loc în martie la Cairo cu prilejul conferinței donatorilor internaționali.

3-047-500

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (PSE), în scris. – Democrația, pacea și respectarea drepturilor omului sunt valori primordiale ale Uniunii Europene, iar aceasta are rolul și obligația de a le apăra și promova atât în interiorul său, cât și în relația sa cu celelalte state.

Situația populației din Gaza este dramatică și trebuie rezolvată neîntârziat. Încălcarea flagrantă a drepturilor și libertăților omului în această regiune constituie motiv de îngrijorare pentru Uniunea Europeană, atât din perspectiva relațiilor sale cu Israelul, cât și din cea a securității și stabilității în Orientul Mijlociu.

Uniunea Europeană trebuie să ia măsuri urgente de acordare de asistență umanitară populației din regiunea Gaza, iar pe termen mediu și lung trebuie să gândească acțiuni menite să promoveze pacea, securitatea și stabilitatea în zonă.

În acest sens, Uniunea trebuie să depună eforturi diplomatice sporite pentru aplanarea conflictelor și stimularea dialogului și reconcilierii în regiune și, în același timp, să sancționeze ferm și fără echivoc orice atitudine anti-democratică sau de încălcare a drepturilor și libertăților omului.

3-048

Czesław Adam Siekierski (PPE-DE) na piśmie. – Aby doszło do porozumienia UE- Bliski Wschód, na dzień dzisiejszy priorytetem powinna pozostać próba przywrócenia stabilizacji oraz pomoc w realizacji programu pokojowego w Strefie Gazy.

Unia Europejska powinna zrobić wszystko, aby także przyczynić się do zakończenia sporu, w którym życie tracą niewinni obywatele. Ponadto starania powinny się skupić na pomocy ludności, zagwarantowaniu podstawowych środków do życia. Dzielne zapotrzebowanie żywnościowe ludności Strefy Gazy zaspokajane jest tylko w 60%, przez co jeszcze bardziej narażona jest ona na choroby i trudne warunki. Brak wody pitnej stwarza nie mniejsze zagrożenie dla zdrowia niż brak pożywienia. Nie muszę chyba wspominać o braku opieki medycznej czy zniszczonych budynkach szkół i instytucji państwowych, co w znacznym stopniu utrudnia zaprowadzenie porządku i powrót do normalności.

Pamiętajmy, że dopiero rozwiązanie wielu podstawowych problemów dnia codziennego pozwoli nam skupić się na rozwoju gospodarczym Bliskiego Wschodu i bliskiej współpracy handlowej z tym regionem. Unia Europejska ma szanse pomóc światu arabskiemu, wszystkim krajom Bliskiego Wschodu, w staniu się regionem, w którym panuje dobrobyt, co z kolei stworzy ramy dla bliższej współpracy między Bliskim Wschodem a Unią.

3-049

15 - Abstimmungsstunde

3-050

15.1 - Rolle der Europäischen Union im Nahen Osten (Abstimmung)

3-051

– *Vor der Abstimmung über Ziffer 5*

3-052

Pasqualina Napoletano (PSE). – Signor Presidente, al paragrafo 5, all'inizio, dopo la parola "believes", bisognerebbe aggiungere:

3-053

‘inter alia with a view to the International Conference in support of the Palestinian Economy for the Reconstruction of Gaza to be held in Sharm el-Sheikh on 2 March 2009’.

3-054

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

– *Vor der Abstimmung über Erwägung F*

3-055

Pasqualina Napoletano (PSE). – Signor Presidente, l'emendamento è lo stesso. Si fa riferimento alla Conferenza internazionale a supporto dell'economia palestinese, sempre il 2 marzo, a Sharm el-Sheikh. Bisognerebbe aggiungerlo anche nel considerando.

3-056

(Der mündliche Änderungsantrag wird übernommen.)

3-057

16 - Begrüßung

3-058

Der Präsident. – Ich bin gebeten worden, eine Besuchergruppe aus der Region Piemont auf der Tribüne zu begrüßen. Normalerweise begrüßen wir nur Delegationen aus Staaten, aber ausnahmsweise – da wir die Regionen stärken wollen – auch einen herzlichen Gruß an die Delegation aus Piemont!

3-059

17 - Stimmerklärungen

3-060

Schriftliche Stimmerklärungen

3-061

- Entschließungsantrag B6-0100/2009 (Rolle der EU im Nahen Osten)

3-061-250

Nicodim Bulzesc (PPE-DE), în scris. – Am votat favorabil Rezoluția Parlamentului European referitoare la rolul Uniunii Europene în Orientul Mijlociu deoarece sunt de acord că trebuie să sprijinim planurile de reconstrucție a Fâșiei Gaza.

Această rezoluție solicită acordarea imediată a unui ajutor umanitar sporit și nerestricționat, măsură ce constituie o datorie morală, și care trebuie să fie furnizat fără nicio condiție sau restricție. Autoritățile israeliene sunt rugate să permită un flux continuu și adecvat de ajutor umanitar, inclusiv toate materialele necesare pentru ca agențiile ONU, precum UNRWA (United Nations Relief and Works Agency) și organizațiile internaționale să-și poată desfășura activitățile și să acopere nevoile populației.

3-061-500

Κωνσταντίνος Δρούτσας (GUE/NGL), γραπτώς. – Η ΕΕ με το ψήφισμα του ΕΚ για ανθρωπιστική βοήθεια στη Γάζα, διαποτισμένο από τη λογική των ίσων αποστάσεων ανάμεσα στους Ισραηλινούς που σφάζουν και τους Παλαιστίνιους που αντιστέκονται, προσπαθεί να συγκαλύψει τις τεράστιες ευθύνες της για τη σφαγή του παλαιστινιακού λαού από την δολοφονική ισραηλινή εισβολή στη Λωρίδα της Γάζας που προκάλεσε πάνω από 1300 νεκρούς, στη πλειοψηφία τους παιδιά, γυναίκες και ηλικιωμένοι, και περισσότερους από 5.000 τραυματίες. Η ολοκληρωτική καταστροφή χιλιάδων κατοικιών και κάθε κοινωνικής υποδομής σε συνδυασμό με τον παντελή οικονομικό αποκλεισμό που επιβάλλει το Ισραήλ έχει σαν αποτέλεσμα ο παλαιστινιακός πληθυσμός να ζει κάτω από δραματικές και απάνθρωπες συνθήκες.

Η αποφυγή οποιασδήποτε αναφοράς και καταδίκης στο Ισραήλ και στις αιτίες του δράματος του παλαιστινιακού λαού επιβεβαιώνει για άλλη μια φορά τη στήριξη της ΕΕ στην εγκληματική δράση του Ισραήλ, και την προσπάθεια της να αναβαθμίσει το ρόλο της στους οξυμένους ενδοιμπεριαλιστικούς ανταγωνισμούς στη περιοχή της Μ. Ανατολής.

Αυτό που πάνω από όλα έχει ανάγκη ο ηρωικός Παλαιστινιακός λαός δεν είναι η φιλανθρωπία των ιμπεριαλιστών, αλλά την ίδρυση ανεξάρτητου και κυρίαρχου Παλαιστινιακού κράτους, με πρωτεύουσα την Ανατολική Ιερουσαλήμ, σύμφωνα με τις αποφάσεις του ΟΗΕ στα εδάφη του 1967 και την αμέριστη αλληλεγγύη των λαών στον αγώνα του.

3-062

Hélène Goudin och Nils Lundgren (IND/DEM), skriftlig. – Situationen på Gazaremsan är mycket allvarlig, eftersom den civila befolkningen saknar livsmedel, mediciner och bränsle till följd av den konflikt som pågår. Läget är så pass allvarligt att det krävs omedelbar och extern hjälp. Därför har vi röstat ja till resolutionen.

Vi tycker emellertid att det är mycket beklagligt - men dessvärre inte särskilt förvånande - att Europaparlamentet på nytt använder en katastrof för att sakta men säkert flytta fram sina positioner.

3-062-500

Pedro Guerreiro (GUE/NGL), por escrito. – Após mais de 18 meses de desumano bloqueio, os 22 dias de brutal agressão israelita ao povo palestino na Faixa de Gaza causaram a morte de pelo menos 1 324 pessoas e mais de cinco mil feridos, grande parte dos quais são crianças. Mais de 100 000 pessoas foram deslocadas e mais de 15 000 habitações foram destruídas. Infra-estruturas básicas e serviços públicos essenciais foram destruídos ou desmantelados, colocando em causa a resposta às necessidades mais elementares da população palestina.

Face a este hediondo crime, o Parlamento Europeu não tem uma palavra de condenação de Israel.

Sem dúvida que é urgente a ajuda à população palestina. Sem dúvida que é necessário reconhecer o sofrimento da população palestina. No entanto é impreterível denunciar e responsabilizar o agressor. Pelo contrário, a resolução insiste no branqueamento da agressão israelita à Faixa de Gaza, escondendo-a no que designa por "conflito". Uma agressão que se insere na estratégia de esmagamento da legítima resistência do povo palestino à ocupação e de inviabilização das condições necessárias para a criação de um Estado palestino.

A UE, sempre tão expedita a invocar os direitos humanos, logo os "esquece" relativamente a Israel, que coloniza há mais de 40 anos os territórios palestinos da Cisjordânia, Faixa de Gaza e Jerusalém Leste.

3-063

Flaviu Călin Rus (PPE-DE), în scris. – Am votat Rezoluția Parlamentului European din 18 februarie 2009 referitoare la ajutorul umanitar acordat Fâșiei Gaza (B6-0100/2009), deoarece populația civilă are mare nevoie de ajutor, din cauza situației create în această zonă.

Consider că trebuie realizată o evaluare a necesităților populației din Fâșia Gaza, precum și demararea unor planuri de reconstrucție a zonei.

3-064

18 - Berichtigungen des Stimmverhaltens und beabsichtigtes Stimmverhalten: siehe Protokoll

3-065

PRÉSIDENCE DE M. GÉRARD ONESTA
Vice-président

3-066

19 - Rapport annuel 2007 sur les principaux aspects et les choix fondamentaux de la PESC - Stratégie européenne de sécurité et PESD - Le rôle de l'OTAN dans l'architecture de sécurité de l'UE (débat)

3-067

Le Président. – L'ordre du jour appelle la discussion commune sur:

- le rapport de Jacek Saryusz-Wolski, au nom de la commission des affaires étrangères, sur le rapport annuel 2007 sur les principaux aspects et les choix fondamentaux de la politique étrangère et de sécurité commune (PESC), présenté au Parlement européen en application du point 43 (section G) de l'accord intersinstitutionnel du 17 mai 2006 (2008/2241(INI)) (A6-0019/2009),

- le rapport de Karl von Wogau, au nom de la commission des affaires étrangères, sur la stratégie européenne de sécurité et la politique européenne de sécurité et de défense (PESD) (2008/2202(INI)) (A6-0032/2009), et

- le rapport de Ari Vatanen, au nom de la commission des affaires étrangères, sur le rôle de l'OTAN dans l'architecture de sécurité de l'UE (2008/2197(INI)) (A6-0033/2009).

Chers collègues, si vous n'êtes pas intéressés par la suite de nos débats, notre rapporteur vous demande, avec raison, pour la dignité de nos travaux, de bien vouloir vous retirer de cet hémicycle en silence.

3-068

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski, rapporteur. – Monsieur le Président, je vous remercie. Je pense en effet que la politique étrangère de l'Union mérite un peu d'attention.

3-069

Mr President, we have a special debate today on three major reports on foreign policy, on security and defence, and on EU-NATO relations.

Our annual report on the common foreign and security policy (CFSP) has become a main vehicle through which Parliament expresses its strategic view on EU foreign policy. In this year's report we have decided to focus on policy-making and policy-shaping. We have focused on the need to establish a true dialogue with the Council on the main objectives of the EU's common foreign and security policy. We have recognised that it is in progress, namely that for the first time the Council's report systematically refers to the resolutions adopted by the European Parliament. We are grateful: this is a real achievement. However, we have expressed also our regret that the Council does not engage in a full dialogue with the views advanced by Parliament, nor does it refer to those resolutions in operational documents as joint actions or common positions.

We expect that the Council's annual report will provide opportunities to establish a dialogue with Parliament aimed at developing a more strategic approach to the common foreign and security policy. We have reiterated the most important principles in our report which should underscore our foreign policy. In our view the CFSP must be underpinned and guided by the values which the European Union and its Member States cherish, notably democracy, the rule of law, respect for the dignity of the human person, for human rights and for fundamental freedoms, and the promotion of peace and effective multilateralism.

We believe that the European Union can make an impact, but only if it speaks with one voice and if it is equipped with appropriate instruments like those stemming from the Lisbon Treaty and a more generous budget. We can undertake effective action only when it is legitimised by both the European and national parliaments acting at their respective levels and in accordance with their own mandates.

In order to be credible and to respond to the expectations of EU citizens – and I say this on the eve of new parliamentary elections coming soon – the CFSP must be allocated resources commensurate with the objectives and specific targets. We regret, therefore, that as in previous years the CFSP budget is seriously under-funded.

We address horizontal and geographical issues in our report. On horizontal issues let me just enumerate the most important ones we touched upon: first, upholding human rights and promoting peace and security in Europe's neighbourhood and at global level; second, support for effective multilateralism and respect for international law; third, the fight against terrorism; fourth, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and disarmament; fifth, climate change, energy security and issues like cyber security.

In this report we are intentionally selective. We concentrate, therefore, on some strategic and geographical priority areas such as the Western Balkans, the Middle East and the broader Middle East, South Caucasus, Africa and Asia and obviously relations with our strategic partner, the USA, as well as relations with Russia.

This report should be seen in conjunction with and complementary to Parliament's more detailed reports. It should not be trying to duplicate them.

I want to thank my colleagues in the House from the different political groups for their understanding and excellent cooperation. We have tried to take most of the concerns on board, and I hope that the report will be endorsed by a handsome majority of our House.

Finally, to our partners from the Council and the Commission, I would like to say that we hope that this occasion can help us to develop a deeper strategic dialogue between Parliament, the Council and the Commission, which will bring more democratic legitimacy to the hard work you are doing, Mr Solana and Mrs Ferrero-Waldner, in order to have more cooperation in our triangle.

I hope that you will treat this as a possibility for developing more synergy, a possibility for strengthening our common voice – the voice of all three actors – and give more democratic and parliamentary legitimacy to our common goal which is: foreign policy; one voice; European Union.

3-070

Karl von Wogau, *Berichterstatter*. – Herr Präsident, Herr Hoher Beauftragter, verehrte Frau Ferrero-Waldner! Dieser Bericht sollte Anlass sein, darüber nachzudenken, wie weit wir mit der Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik der Europäischen Union gekommen sind, wo wir stehen und welchen Beitrag das Europäische Parlament dazu leistet.

Dabei müssen wir feststellen, dass es bisher 22 Einsätze im Rahmen der Europäischen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik gegeben hat, 16 davon waren zivile Einsätze und nur 6 waren militärische Einsätze. Das heißt, dass hier ein sehr starkes Gewicht auf der zivilen Seite liegt. Auf dieser zivilen Seite gibt es ja auch eine funktionierende demokratische Kontrolle, denn die zivilen Operationen im Rahmen der ESVP werden über den europäischen Haushalt finanziert und unterliegen deswegen auch der Kontrolle des Europäischen Parlaments. Aus dem Haushalt der Europäischen Union werden weitere Dinge finanziert, die unmittelbar mit der Sicherheitspolitik zusammenhängen. Als Beispiele seien genannt: die Sicherheitsforschung – 1,3 Mrd. Euro auf 7 Jahre; Galileo, von dem wir sagen, dass es auch Sicherheitsaspekte hat – 3,4 Mrd. Euro; oder GMES/Kopernikus, ein Projekt, für das ebenfalls 1 Mrd. Euro zur Verfügung stehen. Wir haben auch, und das ist neu, eine Gesetzgebung im Europäischen Parlament im Bereich von Sicherheit und Verteidigung. Wir haben eine Richtlinie des Europäischen Parlaments und des Rates zur innergemeinschaftlichen Verbringung von Rüstungsgütern und zu Ausschreibungen im Bereich von Sicherheit und Verteidigung beschlossen. Das ist ein erster, wichtiger Schritt auf diesem Weg.

Besonders wichtig ist aber die Information für das Europäische Parlament. Hier ist unser Spezialausschuss, der auch zu Geheiminformationen Zugang hat, von besonderer Wichtigkeit, sowie die regelmäßigen Gespräche, die wir mit dem Hohen Beauftragten in diesem Ausschuss zu diesen Themen führen. Ich möchte bei dieser Gelegenheit dem Hohen Beauftragten und seinen Mitarbeitern für die gute Zusammenarbeit danken, die sich hier entwickelt hat.

Nun zu den einzelnen Punkten in diesem Bericht. In diesem Bericht wird gefordert, dass die Europäische Union klarer ihre eigenen Sicherheitsinteressen definiert. Wir sprechen immer wieder von Sicherheitsinteressen der einzelnen Nationen, aber wir haben gemeinsame europäische Sicherheitsinteressen. Der Schutz der Bürger nach innen und nach außen, Friede in unserer Nachbarschaft, der Schutz der Außengrenzen, der Schutz der kritischen Infrastrukturen, die sichere Energieversorgung, die Sicherheit unserer Handelswege, die Sicherheit unserer *assets* im Weltraum und viele andere Dinge, die tatsächlich eigene Sicherheitsinteressen und gemeinsame Sicherheitsinteressen der Europäischen Union sind.

Wir müssen uns auch überlegen, was denn eigentlich die Ambitionen der Europäischen Union im Bereich Sicherheit und Verteidigung sind. Der Berichtsentwurf sagt sehr klar, dass wir nicht die Ambition haben, eine Supermacht zu werden wie die Vereinigten Staaten. Außerdem heißt es dazu, dass wir uns ganz klar auf das geographische Umfeld der Europäischen Union konzentrieren müssen. Priorität genießen der Balkan – das sind Hausaufgaben der Europäischen Union –, der Norden Afrikas, die eingefrorenen Konflikte im Osten, und unser Beitrag zur Lösung des Konflikts in Palästina. Hier müssen wir hier ganz klar unsere Akzente setzen.

Ich muss feststellen, dass sich der Rat am Ende der französischen Präsidentschaft sehr ehrgeizige Ziele gesetzt hat: Man will dazu in der Lage sein, bestimmte Operationen parallel durchzuführen. Wenn wir das wollen, müssen wir uns dazu aber auch die Mittel geben. Dazu gehört, dass wir ein autonomes und permanentes Hauptquartier in Brüssel einrichten. Das ist eine erste sehr klare Forderung des Europäischen Parlaments. Dafür gab es eine sehr breite Mehrheit im Ausschuss. Zweitens müssen wir bedenken, dass die 27 Mitgliedsländer 2 Millionen Soldaten zu ihrer Verfügung haben. Davon sollten 3 % der Europäischen Union permanent zur Verfügung gestellt werden. Das wären 60 000 Soldaten. Deswegen auch die Forderung, dass man das Eurocorps permanent der Europäischen Union unterstellt. Dieser Appell richtet sich an die sechs Mitgliedsländer, die das Eurocorps tragen.

Dann machen wir klare Aussagen zu den Fähigkeiten, die wir entwickeln müssen. Die 27 Mitgliedsländer der Europäischen Union geben 200 Mrd. Euro pro Jahr für Verteidigung aus, und diese 200 Mrd. müssen besser ausgegeben werden, als das in der Vergangenheit der Fall gewesen ist. Wir können uns nicht leisten, das Rad 27 Mal neu zu erfinden, und darum appellieren wir heute an Sie, dass in Zukunft die Gelder der Europäischen Union und des Steuerzahlers für Verteidigung gemeinsam besser ausgegeben werden, als das in der Vergangenheit der Fall gewesen ist. Vielen Dank.

3-071

Ari Vatanen, *rapporteur*. – Mr President, 70 years ago Mr Chamberlain came back from Munich waving a piece of paper and saying 'peace for our time'. Well, we know how wrong he was, and we also know that wishful thinking is a deadly substitute for realism. Today, on this issue, we have to be brutally honest. The EU has been incredibly successful in peace-making. The events of the Second World War gave birth to the EU.

I am very happy that Mr Solana is here today because finally we have this phone number for the EU. Mr Solana has this number, which Mr Kissinger asked for years ago.

But what kinds of means are we – Member States and politicians – giving to Mr Solana? That is the question.

We have a financial crisis now, which did not fall on us from the sky. It was very much self-inflicted. We are talking about the toxic assets of banks and how we have to clear them. Perhaps this is also the time to ask: what are the toxic assets and what are the obstacles to our peace-making, our *raison d'être*?

We have to move on – the EU has to move on in its peace-building. The world is changing so fast around us. The biggest obstacle is that we simply do not have a vision. We are day-to-day politicians who are short-sighted. Immobility is our big problem. The world is changing around us, faster than we can react. What is the result of inefficient and failing security policies? Human suffering, dead bodies, mutilated people and atrocities. Even if those people do not vote for us, we have to care for them because they are our brothers and sisters in the human family.

On 2 April 1917, President Wilson said, 'a steadfast concert of peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations'. President Wilson was awarded a Nobel Prize – which he deserved much more than Al Gore.

We in the EU do not realise what kinds of tools we have in our mosaic composition of 27 countries. That gives us a unique tool in peace-making. Perhaps some people do not like the French, others do not like the Germans, and perhaps some people do not like the Finns, even – but I think everybody likes the Finns! – but, when we are together, 27 countries, nobody can say that they hate the EU. Therefore, the unique ability we have enables us to go to any crisis spot and be a doctor or a referee. But without the military capacity, without military credibility, we are like a dog whose bark is worse than its bite. We have idealism but we do not equip ourselves with the means to reach those targets.

Now is the time to strike while the iron is hot: *Il faut battre le fer tant qu'il est chaud*, as the French say. Now, Mr Obama is the new President of the United States and he values Europe – he says that we are important allies. What do we have to do? We have to get our act together.

Already, 94% of the European population is in NATO, and only 6% are outside. Why do we not use it more efficiently? We owe that to the people, because it is our duty to alleviate human suffering; it is our ethical duty and it is in our long-term interest. Only by following in the footsteps of our forefathers can we be faithful to the EU's inheritance and make the inevitable inconceivable – and that is what peace-making means.

3-072

Javier Solana, *High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy*. – Mr President, thank you for inviting me once again to this important debate on the CFSP. I think that it is becoming a tradition once a year to hold this debate and I am very happy to participate. I would like to thank the three rapporteurs, Mr Saryusz-Wolski, Mr von Wogau and Mr Vatanen, for their reports. I found in them a lot of things that resonate with what we are thinking and doing. I have taken note of many of the things said in the reports and I hope very much that they will play a part in updating our thinking, with your cooperation.

Speaking today, at the beginning of 2009, at the European Parliament, reminds me of where we were 10 years ago, in 1999. That was really when we began working on ESDP. And when I look at where we are today and compare this to where we were on the day that we began to work on ESDP, a lot of progress has really been made. Nobody can fail to see what has been achieved.

As has been mentioned, more than 20 civilian and military operations are or have been deployed on just about every continent, from Europe to Asia, from the Middle East to Africa. Thousands of European men and women are engaged in these operations, ranging from military to police, from border guards to monitors, from judges to prosecutors, a good range of people doing good for the stability of the world.

I think this is the European way of doing things. A comprehensive approach to crisis prevention and to crisis management; a large and diversified tool box where we can take whatever is necessary; a rapid response capability; trying to be what we deserve to be, a global actor, as is asked of us by third countries. Obviously, if the Lisbon Treaty were to be ratified, and I hope it will be, we would, without any doubt, be much more effective.

I should like to thank Parliament for the support we have obtained over the last years, for the good cooperation that I have always enjoyed from you, the representatives of the citizens of the European Union. Without the engagement, without the understanding, without the support, not only of the Members of this distinguished House but also of the citizens of the European Union through other mechanisms – their own parliaments – it would be very difficult to play the role that we try to play with the number of operations that we have and with the number of citizens of the European Union who are engaged in them.

The CFSP is more than an instrument. The CFSP relates to our values, to your values, to the values of our people. I really feel attached to these values that are represented in the core of all the 27 Member States of the European Union: human rights, the rule of law, international law and effective multilateralism; all those words and concepts are probably a constructive representation of what we are. But the CFSP also helps shape our internal cooperation among the Member

States of the European Union. By working together, by acting together, we define who we are. And so the CFSP is also a way in which the European Union keeps on, every day, defining itself.

I think that what I have said will resonate with the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This really is what we do and what we are about: values and action and, at the same time, construction of the European Union. We act because of who we are, and who we are is shaped by our actions. I think this is an important concept to keep in mind.

The Security Strategy of 2003 was a basic document that allowed us to map the way ahead. The three reports make reference to that document. As you know, we have updated it in cooperation with the Commission and Parliament in 2008. That document does not replace the 2003 document but it certainly reinforces it and brings it up to date, incorporating the threats and challenges that we face in the world in which we are living today, from climate change to terrorism, from energy security to piracy.

Let me say a word about piracy because that relates to our youngest operation, Atalanta. I would like to underline that this is the first time that the ESDP has engaged in a maritime operation. It is quite a step forward, quite a step in the right direction to have this type of operation. This maritime operation against piracy is conducted from a European operational headquarters in the United Kingdom; it involves a significant number of countries and a significant number of third countries want to join it. I had lunch today with the Swiss Foreign Minister and they want to participate in this operation because they share our concerns on piracy. This is very important. You probably think, and I agree with you, that this offshore operation is very important but that the problems onshore need to be solved as well as the problems offshore.

Let me say a word about structures – internal structures relating to ESDP. As you know, during the last month of the French Presidency, we were working on a document to reorganise and set up something very dear to me. I tried to do it from the very beginning and we have the support to do it now, namely to develop a strategic planning capability which is at the same time both civilian and military. This is the modern approach to crisis management. I think that we are relatively new to these actions and because of this we can be even more efficient, more flexible, and more able to adapt to new realities than others. And so I think that what we are doing, in having military and civilian cooperation at the strategic planning level, is very important.

I have to say, and I hope you will agree with me, that military action alone cannot solve the conflicts of today. Civilian action is not possible without a secure environment. This is the equilibrium we have to find and this is what we are seeing everywhere – in the Middle East, in Afghanistan, wherever you look. It is a very important concept of symbiosis between political, civilian and security aspects of our lives.

As has been said very eloquently by the three rapporteurs, we need capabilities. Without capabilities we only have documents and with documents alone we do not solve conflicts.

That was stressed very much at the December European Council and I would like to thank the three rapporteurs for having made this point clearly. We have problems sometimes with force generation and this is something that is very important for you to know. Without more rapid force generation, be it police, prosecutors, or military, it will be very difficult to act at the rhythm, at the speed, that is required in crisis management.

Let me say a word about NATO-European Union relations because they are covered in the report by Mr Vatanen. As you know, we have a framework for cooperation that we call Berlin Plus. But not all the operations that we conduct on behalf of the European Union fall within this framework, for cooperation with the North Atlantic Alliance. We still have problems, as you know, because this relationship has not been able to overcome some of the difficulties we have in really cooperating in operations with NATO that fall outside the framework of Berlin Plus. We have problems in Kosovo that have still not been resolved and we have problems in Afghanistan. I hope very much that in the run-up to the NATO summit we will be able to resolve these problems.

Let me say a word on Afghanistan. Without any doubt this is going to be one of the most important issues facing us in 2009. You have seen the position, of President Obama on this theatre – Afghanistan-Pakistan – and the appointment of a special representative. We have to deliver and to deliver in a sensible manner. More engagement will be needed. This does not necessarily mean military engagement but we have to engage in a more efficient manner and in a more coordinated manner amongst ourselves and with others – the United States, the international community at large, the United Nations. I have had the opportunity to meet Richard Holbrooke already a couple of times, and General Petraeus. We are going to re-examine this concept in the coming weeks and it will be very good if by that time we are ready to respond in a constructive manner to a very important problem on which we are engaged, the European Union is engaged, the Member States are engaged, and I think we should maintain this engagement.

We could talk for hours about many other issues – energy, non-proliferation, you name it, but I think the important thing is that we have this fundamental agreement in the three reports that have been presented today on what we have been doing over the last period of time. I would like to finish and say thank you very much for your cooperation. My thanks to those

who work with me more intensively on some of the specific dossiers in which we are engaged. I think, as I said, how we act in the international arena on behalf of the European Union will also define who we are. At this point it is very important that we do better because we want to be better.

3-073

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I appreciate this opportunity to participate once again in this comprehensive debate on foreign and security policy matters.

Let me thank the authors of the three reports, which are the basis of today's debate. I would like to say that Javier Solana's services and my own worked very well together on the report on the European security strategy (ESS), and I believe that this shows in the result. The report reflects well the new security challenges the EU faces and gives a broad definition of security.

Let me first say a few words on the common foreign and security policy (CFSP). The reports before us today, and the European security strategy report, all conclude that the European Union can make a difference if everyone works together to ensure that we have a fully coherent policy, one which embraces the CFSP, the Community dimension and, of course, actions by Member States. Not only do we need to speak with one voice, but we also need to act together in a coherent and coordinated way.

This requires bringing together the best mix of EU policy instruments, from ESDP operations to conflict prevention and crisis response measures through the Instrument for Stability, development assistance, humanitarian aid, or democracy and human rights tools. Let me give you a few examples: Afghanistan, Georgia, Kosovo and Chad could show how we do this in practice.

In Afghanistan, we have given a prominent place to security sector reform and governance within our overall assistance strategy. Since 2007 the Commission has embarked on a new programme reforming the justice sector. On policing, the EUPOL mission of the Council is doing the mentoring and training on the ground, whilst the Commission supports the Afghan national police through the Law and Order Trust Fund (LOTFA). The Commission is also the main paymaster for the running costs of the Afghan police – over EUR 200 million to date since 2002.

In Georgia, additional EU post-conflict financial support is being provided. Up to now, a total of EUR 120 million – out of a EUR 500 million package from 2008 to 2010 – has been provided to the Government. This exceptional EC assistance has contributed to preventing a major humanitarian crisis.

In Kosovo, the Commission has played its role in getting the EULEX Kosovo mission staffed and equipped in time. In addition to ongoing assistance, we will this year prepare a study, which should identify means to advance Kosovo's political and socioeconomic development, and its progress towards integration with the European Union.

In Chad, we have committed a total of EUR 311 million under the 10th European Development Fund. There, our goal is to contribute to the reduction of poverty and facilitate economic development. Our priorities are good governance, including the judiciary and police, infrastructure and rural development. Furthermore, we are supporting the training of 850 Chadian police by the UN mission MINURCAT through the Instrument for Stability with EUR 10 million. We are also facilitating the voluntary return of Chadian IDPs and refugees and providing EUR 30 million in humanitarian assistance.

I think this is the right approach, and it needs to be pursued systematically each time the EU is faced with a new crisis.

This flexibility in our policy mix is emphasised in the report on the European security strategy of last December and referred to in all three reports that we have before us. In the ESS report it is rightly said that the links between internal and external EU policies have become more pronounced, which is clearly essential when we are considering issues such as energy security and climate change, or the focus on the security and development nexus and recognition of the importance of long-term poverty reduction as a means to reducing security threats.

The report recognises the need to communicate better with our citizens on all the aspects of security which are of particular concern to them so that we can maintain support for our global engagement, and emphasises that everything the EU has done in the field of security is based on our values and principles and has been linked to UN objectives. We must continue to bring this message to the people, also on issues such as terrorism, and we have to say that it is firmly founded on respect for human rights and international law.

We also recognise the role of civil society and NGOs and of women in building peace, so reflecting a truly European approach.

I was pleased to note that the EP report on the ESS stressed the need to further implement UN Security Council resolutions 1325 and 1820 on women and conflict.

Turning to energy, the gas crisis affecting the EU this year was unprecedented in its effect. With regard to energy security, it is clear that we have lessons to draw. For instance, the need for a functioning EU internal energy market, for interconnection and infrastructure projects, for the development of mechanisms to handle supply crises and for the EU to have a strong external energy policy is now clear, and we support this broad approach.

The report calls for a greater role for the European Union in its neighbourhood, but I shall not talk about that now.

Our relations with Russia, which have been tested lately, play an important role and have a great security impact.

The transatlantic link remains fundamental to our common security, and here we will soon be working with President Obama on issues that are of high priority.

Let me conclude with a few words on a particular element of the Commission's contribution to the EU crisis response, namely the Instrument for Stability. The first two years of the new instrument have been successful, both in terms of budget implementation, operational quality and political coordination with Council and Parliament. So far, EUR 220 million have been committed for 59 actions worldwide in 2007 and 2008, with the main share in Africa, followed by Asia and the Middle East, plus Kosovo and Georgia. Our priorities for 2009 will, as Javier Solana has already said, certainly include Afghanistan, Pakistan and the Middle East.

Let me say that we, through the Instrument for Stability and in close cooperation with the Council secretariat, are engaged in a number of activities and are playing an increasingly important role in providing training for mission staff on procurement and financial administration and on ESDP-related training for civilian response teams. We have trained 600 police experts on civilian crisis management in line with UN training standards, so that the robustness, the flexibility and the interoperability of the EU police elements have been improved.

I would like to add – and I think it is a very important point, for instance on Afghanistan – that we also need to ensure that the terms and conditions of service for seconded staff from Member States and contracted staff are sufficiently attractive to bring forward qualified candidates in sufficient numbers to staff our missions. I think we will have to work in that direction. That means that our input into crisis management is increasingly in demand, and expectations of what the EU can deliver are high. But we will try to go and do what these expectations require from us.

3-074

Valdis Dombrovskis, *Budžeta komitejas atzinuma sagatavotājs*. – Priekšsēdētāja kungs, godātie kolēģi! Attiecībā uz 2007. gada ziņojumu par kopējās ārpolitikas un drošības politikas svarīgākajiem aspektiem un pamatvirzieniem vēlējos uzsvērt vairākus no Budžeta komitejas viedokļa svarīgus jautājumus. Pirmkārt, par kopējās ārpolitikas un drošības politikas budžeta izdevumu caurspīdīgumu. Zināmas bažas izraisa Eiropas Komisijas īstenotā prakse pārnest uz nākošo gadu neizmantotās kopējās ārpolitikas un drošības politikas sadaļas apropriācijas, ko Eiropas Komisija uzskata par piešķirtajiem ieņēmumiem. Budžeta komiteja ir pieprasījusi Komisijai sniegt informāciju par šo finanšu praksi un ierosina šo jautājumu izskatīt kādā no regulārajām kopējās ārpolitikas un drošības politikas apsīdēm. Otrkārt, attiecībā uz apropriāciju pārvietošanu starp kopējās ārpolitikas un drošības politikas budžeta sadaļas pozīcijām. Protams, šeit ir jānodrošina elastīgums, lai varētu ātri reaģēt uz krīzes situācijām trešajās valstīs. Tomēr Komisija varētu uzlabot pārredzamību un līdz ar to demokrātisko kontroli kopējās ārpolitikas un drošības politikas jomā, laikus informējot Parlamentu par iekšējiem pārvietojumiem. Tas ir īpaši svarīgi tāpēc, ka lielākā daļa kopējās ārpolitikas un drošības politikas misiju, starp kurām var izcelt Eiropas Savienības monitoringa misiju Gruzijā vai *EULEX* Kosovā, ir politiski jūtīgas. Treškārt, attiecībā uz regulārajām kopējās ārpolitikas un drošības politikas apsīdēm atbilstoši 2006. gada 17. maija iestāžu nolīgumam par budžeta disciplīnu un pareizu finanšu pārvaldību — Budžeta komiteja uzskata, ka šīs apsīdes var daudz efektīvāk izmantot, izvērtējot paredzētos pasākumus kopējās ārpolitikas un drošības politikas jomā un vidēju termiņu un ilgtermiņa Eiropas Savienības stratēģijas trešajās valstīs, kā arī sagatavojot budžeta lēmējinstiūciju pozīcijas pirms saskaņošanas sanāksmēm. Paldies par uzmanību!

3-075

José Ignacio Salafranca Sánchez-Neyra, *en nombre del Grupo del PPE-DE*. – Señor Presidente, quisiera agradecer a los tres ponentes del Parlamento Europeo —el señor Saryusz-Wolski, el señor von Wogau y el señor Vatanen— sus informes y subrayar, como han hecho la Comisaria y el Alto Representante, que son una contribución notable del Parlamento a la tarea de desarrollar una política exterior de seguridad y de defensa que sea fuerte, que sea visible, que sea eficaz, que garantice la defensa de nuestros intereses en el mundo, que proteja y dé seguridad a nuestros ciudadanos, que contribuya a poner en marcha una Unión Europea que preste su contribución a un multilateralismo eficaz y, sobre todo, señor Presidente, que pueda contribuir a que el respeto a los derechos humanos y los valores democráticos se enseñoreen de todas las partes del planeta.

Creo que el Tratado de Lisboa y las noticias que nos llegan hoy de la República de Irlanda —donde los sondeos se manifiestan en un 60 % favorables al Tratado de Lisboa— y de la República Checa —con la ratificación por el Parlamento del Tratado de Lisboa— deben suponer el paso a la edad adulta de la Unión Europea en lo que se refiere a su política

exterior y de seguridad. Y, sobre todo, deben contribuir a acelerar el reflejo europeo de nuestros gobiernos a la hora de afrontar las crisis.

Yo creo que la Unión Europea tiene que desarrollar sus propias consideraciones estratégicas —es evidente, y eso responde en la nueva estrategia de seguridad—, pero sin olvidar que el vínculo transatlántico está inscrito en el código genético de la Unión Europea y que los Estados Unidos, a través de la Organización del Tratado del Atlántico Norte, han venido garantizando la seguridad en Europa y, hoy por hoy, no hay alternativa todavía a ese vínculo.

Yo creo que la Europa «potencia» sólo podrá constituirse si lo hace afirmándose no frente a los Estados Unidos, sino junto a los Estados Unidos, como dos socios que comparten una misma visión del mundo y que se respetan mutuamente. Esto no quiere decir, naturalmente, que la Unión Europea tenga que dar un cheque en blanco; nosotros tendremos que defender nuestras consideraciones y nuestros valores cuando lo consideremos oportuno y los Estados Unidos tendrán también que aprender a respetar las posiciones de la Unión Europea, porque, tal como supone la acción de la señora Ferrero-Waldner y del señor Solana, somos una institución capaz de ser respetada internacionalmente y con una notable capacidad de interlocución en todas las regiones del planeta.

3-076

Helmut Kuhne, im Namen der PSE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Für den Rat gilt das nicht, aber wir als Parlament – und im Gefolge auch die Kommission – kommen hier so langsam auf die Zielgerade dieser Wahlperiode. Deshalb ist es, glaube ich, sinnvoll, nicht nur als Buchhalter an die Bilanz der Entwicklung der Europäischen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik heranzugehen, sondern etwas grundsätzlicher.

Ich gestehe, dass ich hin und her gerissen bin zwischen zwei Betrachtungsweisen. Ich raufe mir die Haare, wenn es um die tagtäglichen Notwendigkeiten geht, wenn eine Mission am Fehlen von sechs Hubschraubern zu scheitern droht, wenn kein politischer Wille in den Hauptstädten vorhanden ist oder wenn es bei Technologieprojekten Zersplitterungen gibt.

Wenn ich es aus einer etwas historischen Perspektive betrachte, sieht das Ganze anders aus, und hier gebührt in der Tat auch Herrn Solana großes Lob. Die Europäische Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik gibt es ja erst seit ungefähr zehn Jahren, das Dokument über die Sicherheitsstrategie erst seit 2003. Gemessen daran sind die Fortschritte aus historischer Perspektive sicherlich sehr groß. Als historischer Optimist entscheide ich mich im Zweifelsfalle auch für diese Perspektive.

Der zweite Punkt, auf den ich als Sozialdemokrat eingehen möchte, betrifft etwas, für das weder die Europäische Union noch die NATO verantwortlich ist, was uns aber als Europäer alle betrifft. Er betrifft die Entwicklungen im Zusammenhang mit dem Raketenabwehrsystem in Polen und der Tschechischen Republik. Wir als Sozialdemokraten nehmen mit großer Freude zur Kenntnis, dass Dinge, die wir vorgetragen haben, jetzt im Zusammenhang mit den Veränderungen in den Vereinigten Staaten umgesetzt werden.

Wir haben immer gesagt, dass eine übereilte Stationierungsentscheidung unsinnig ist, weil es zum jetzigen Zeitpunkt keine Bedrohung beispielsweise aus dem Iran gibt. Hillary Clinton hat letzte Woche erklärt, dass weitere Entscheidungen der amerikanischen Seite in Abhängigkeit von der Entwicklung im Iran getroffen werden. Joe Biden hat dies in Abhängigkeit von technischen Fähigkeiten und finanziellen Gesichtspunkten gesetzt. Das sind Dinge, die wir begrüßen. Wir werden jedenfalls nicht der letzte verlorene Haufen sein, der mit der Flagge dieses Raketenabwehrsystems wedelt.

3-077

Annemie Neyts-Uyttebroeck, namens de ALDE-Fractie. – Het debat van vandaag op basis van de drie verslagen bewijst dat, in tegenstelling tot wat vele europessimisten en eurosceptici beweren, het Europees veiligheids- en defensiebeleid en het Europees buitenlands beleid inderdaad hoe langer hoe meer gestalte en consistentie krijgt. Dat is overvloedig aangetoond door de sprekers voor mij.

Ik wil eerst en vooral de drie rapporteurs bedanken voor de wijze waarop zij bij het schrijven van hun verslag ook rekening hebben gehouden met de standpunten van de liberale schaduwrapporteurs. Wij vinden vele van onze standpunten terug en zijn daar blij om. Ik vind het een klein beetje jammer dat er voor het NAVO-verslag van collega Vatanen, die nochtans - zoals men in het Engels zegt - *out of his way* is gegaan om met zoveel mogelijk standpunten en benaderingen rekening te houden, op het allerlaatste moment nog aparte PPE- en PSE-amendementen zijn ingediend, alsof de stempel van die twee fracties nog eens extra op het verslag moest worden gedrukt.

Wij zullen het niettemin goedkeuren omdat wij vinden - en ik ga dan verder op dat verslag in - dat net de goede accenten worden gelegd en dat het verslag ook getuigt van voldoende realisme. Er wordt bij voorbeeld, weliswaar op elegante manier, erkend dat er wel degelijk competitie bestaat tussen de Europese Unie en de NAVO. Zoiets wordt meestal straal genegeerd, ook al is het de realiteit.

Ten tweede is het amendement aanvaard van collega Duff en van mijzelf, waarin wij duidelijk uitleggen waarin de moeilijkheden bestaan die veroorzaakt worden door de respectieve houding van Turkije, Griekenland en Cyprus in de NAVO en de Europese Unie. Meestal beperkt men zich namelijk tot elegante allusies.

Tenslotte wordt er gepleit voor complementariteit tussen de strategie van de Europese Unie en van de NAVO inzake defensie en veiligheid. En dat, collega's, is absoluut essentieel.

3-078

Konrad Szymański, w imieniu grupy UEN. – Panie Przewodniczący! Liberalny koniec historii przepowiadany w latach dziewięćdziesiątych okazał się mrzonką. Mamy prawo czuć się coraz bardziej osamotnieni. Dlatego nie ma alternatywy dla współpracy między Unią Europejską i NATO. Nie ma alternatywy dla większego zaangażowania Europy i USA w sprawy bezpieczeństwa międzynarodowego. Inaczej zasady ładu międzynarodowego będą *de facto* wyznaczane przez Koreę, Iran lub terrorystów z Hamasu.

Szczególnej uwagi wymaga energia, surowce, piractwo, bezpieczeństwo cyberprzestrzeni. Ostatnio w Polsce przekonaaliśmy się jak wielkim problemem jest także lepsza koordynacja akcji ratowania zakładników. Wspólny charakter decyzji nie przesądza jednak o ich jakości. Dlatego nie przeceniałbym roli traktatu lizbońskiego. Ograniczenia naszej efektywności leżą w europejskich stolicach. To tam należy szukać politycznej woli prowadzenia wspólnej polityki światowej, a nie w procedurach.

3-079

Angelika Beer, im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident, liebe Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Es stimmt, dass es in den letzten Jahren eine rasante Entwicklung in der Europäischen Sicherheits- und Außenpolitik gegeben hat. Aber wir müssen auch genauso sehen, dass es eine rasante Entwicklung und Veränderung in der Frage der Bedrohung und der Krisen unterschiedlichster Arten gibt.

Meine Fraktion ist dagegen, die eigene Arbeit schönzureden. Deswegen bin ich auch nicht bereit, die vorliegenden Berichte schönzureden. Der Kollege Saryusz-Wolski hat einen guten Bericht vorgelegt, dem wir auch zustimmen werden. Gleichwohl wird das strategische Dilemma deutlich. Ich gebe Ihnen, Herr Solana, durchaus Recht. Sie haben gerade gesagt: „Die europäische Zusammenarbeit auf strategischer Ebene muss verstärkt werden“. Was aber vor allen Dingen gesucht und gefunden werden muss, ist eine gemeinsame europäische Strategie in der Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, die es bislang eben noch nicht gibt.

Ich sage das, weil wir in einer historischen Situation sind. Diese hier vorliegenden Berichte – gerade der Bericht Vatanen – zur NATO hinken ja selbst der neuen US-Regierung hinterher. Herr Vatanen hat es abgelehnt, die Frage der nuklearen Abrüstung, die wir morgen wieder zur Abstimmung stellen werden, in seinem Bericht aufzugreifen. Ja, worüber reden wir denn?

Ich komme zu dem Bericht von Herrn von Wogau. Es wird da von einem neuen Konzept geredet: SAFE. Das ist ein schönes Wortspiel – Synchronisierung der Armeen in Europa –, aber ein solches Konzept gibt es überhaupt nicht. Und wir sehen nicht ein, warum wir jetzt zustimmen sollen, wenn dieses Konzept überhaupt nicht auf dem Tisch liegt. Herr von Wogau hat es abgelehnt, in seinem Bericht über *Human Security* zu sprechen. Meine Fraktion beharrt darauf, dass wir diese Zielsetzung in der internationalen Politik als Europäische Union klar benennen. Er hat abgelehnt, dass wir über die *Peace Building Partnership* sprechen oder die Weiterentwicklung eines zivilen Friedenskorpas. Deswegen sage ich, dass dieser Bericht absolut unzureichend ist, wenn wir davon ausgehen, dass Europa jetzt, in den nächsten Monaten, ab heute – und das ist auf der Sicherheitskonferenz in München deutlich geworden – handeln muss.

Es gibt ein Zeitfenster seit der Wahl in den USA. Ich weiß nicht, wie lange es offen bleibt. Wir müssen als Europäer unsere strategischen Interessen jetzt formulieren und in das Bündnis, in die NATO, einbringen, und auch unsere Definitionen der Sicherheit, wie Frau Ferrero-Waldner ausgeführt hat, im Hinblick auf Russland jetzt festlegen. Denn sonst wird es passieren, dass in wenigen Monaten die US-Regierung fortschrittlicher ist als wir Europäische Union, und in bilateralen Absprachen mit Russland über entscheidende sicherheitsstrategische Positionen entschieden wird, ohne dass die europäische Stärke – die politische Stärke, die Stärke der Konfliktprävention – überhaupt in diese neue Stabilisierung der transatlantischen Sicherheitspolitik einfließen kann.

Deswegen ist mein Appell, nicht nur an uns, wirklich die alten Kategorien von Kaltem Krieg und einseitigen Positionierungen hinter uns zu lassen, nach vorne zu gehen. Denn Europa hat die Verpflichtung gegenüber seinen Bürgern, jetzt eine Sicherheitspartnerschaft mit zu formulieren, die Frieden bringt und nicht das Gegenteil.

3-080

Tobias Pflüger, im Namen der GUE/NGL-Fraktion. – Herr Präsident! Die Berichte von Wogau und Vatanen sind klar und deutlich und treiben die Militarisierung der Europäischen Union weiter voran. Die Berichte fordern *de facto*, dass die EU eine Militärmacht werden soll. Im Bericht von Wogau zur Europäischen Sicherheitsstrategie wird eine "integrierte

europäische Streitmacht" gefordert. Das halten wir für falsch. Dazu werden z.B. ein EU-Hauptquartier und ein gemeinsamer Rüstungsmarkt befürwortet.

Im Bericht von Wogau wird ausgerechnet das völlig überbeuerte Eurofighter-Programm nachträglich unterstützt. Zentral sei, so die Berichte, der Vertrag von Lissabon, der "wichtige Neuerungen im Bereich der ESVP bringen wird". Das ist ein wesentlicher Grund, warum wir gegen den Vertrag von Lissabon sind.

Der Bericht Vatanen fordert dauerhafte Strukturen der Zusammenarbeit zwischen der EU und der NATO. Das halten wir für falsch. Immer neue EU-Militärmissionen sind problematisch. Die NATO ist kein Friedensbündnis, nein, die NATO führt Kriege. Damals gegen Jugoslawien, heute in Afghanistan. Welche werden die nächsten Kriege sein? Die NATO steht für Kriegspolitik. Im Bericht wird die NATO als kerneuropäische Sicherheit bezeichnet. Nein, sie steht für Unsicherheit! Eine Vermischung von EU und NATO ist hochproblematisch, insbesondere wenn es um die beiden Strategien geht.

Wir als GUE/NGL-Fraktion treten für eine zivile Europäische Union ein und wir sind gegen die NATO. Notwendig ist die Auflösung der NATO. Die NATO will in Straßburg, Baden-Baden und Kehl ihr sechzigjähriges Bestehen feiern. Ich rufe von hier aus zu Protesten gegen dieses NATO-Gipfeltreffen auf. 60 Jahre NATO sind 60 Jahre zu viel.

Wir haben als Fraktion Minderheitenvoten zu den Berichten von Wogau und Vatanen eingebracht, und meine Kollegen werden noch darauf hinweisen, was konkret bezüglich Russland problematisch ist. Wir lehnen das Raketen-System nach wie vor ab, und wir lehnen die Formulierungen ab, die bezüglich Zypern in diesem Bericht sind. Deshalb werden wir gegen diese Berichte stimmen.

3-081

Bastiaan Belder, namens de IND/DEM-Fractie. – Nog geen jaar geleden maakte ik met een EP-delegatie persoonlijk kennis met de activiteiten van de EU-politiemissie op Westelijke Jordaanoever en in mij gloorde toen de hoop van een Palestijnse autoriteit die haar gezag reëel handhaafde door een effectief politie- en veiligheidsapparaat. Paragraaf 25 van het voorliggende verslag Saryusz-Wolski verwelkomt dan ook de verlenging van het mandaat van de EU-politiemissie in de Palestijnse gebieden.

Inmiddels heb ik zeer recent enkele zeer ongunstige meldingen onder ogen gekregen over de openbare veiligheid op de Westoever, bijvoorbeeld afpersingspraktijken door leden van het Palestijnse veiligheidsapparaat die 's nachts als maffialeiders opereren of zelfs de namen van leden van terreurgroepen die op de loonlijst staan van de Palestijnse Autoriteit.

Raad en Commissie, kloppen deze meldingen? Is het fictie? Kortom, hoe verloopt momenteel eigenlijk de EU-politiemissie in de Palestijnse gebieden? Want dat is toch essentieel. Als ze streven naar een levensvatbare Palestijnse staat, dan zou er allereerst op de Westelijke Jordaanoever *law and order* moeten zijn.

3-082

Luca Romagnoli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, ritengo che l'Alleanza atlantica sia uno strumento di difesa obsoleto e che in alcuni casi, anche recenti, non ha affatto aiutato nei rapporti, ad esempio con la Russia, con la quale i rapporti stessi dovrebbero essere a mio giudizio implementati e prefigurare un partenariato privilegiato.

Proprio per quanto sostenuto dalla signora Commissario Ferrero ritengo che le politiche di sicurezza comune non dovrebbero trascurare come in alcune vicende recenti non sia stata la NATO lo strumento più utile alla dissuasione o alla pacificazione.

Credo che l'Europa abbia ormai la maturità e la necessità politica per delineare una strategia di sicurezza indipendente. Questo non significa essere in contrapposizione. Si può essere accanto – come qualche collega ha sostenuto – ma non continuare ad essere soggiacenti ad interessi che spesso non sono europei. Per questo non posso sostenere le relazioni proposte.

3-083

Javier Solana, Alto Representante de la PESC. – Señor Presidente, con la máxima brevedad, puesto que las contribuciones de los distintos intervinientes han ido, en términos generales, en la misma dirección, permítanme que les mencione tres o cuatro cuestiones que me vienen a la mente después de haber oído las intervenciones.

La primera, sobre recursos y medios. Los ponentes de los distintos informes han dicho que es verdad que tenemos problemas de recursos y problemas de medios, y que una mejor utilización de los recursos nacionales podría ser una buena dirección en la cual debíamos avanzar. Pero quisiera decirles también que tenemos a nuestro alcance algunos medios que no utilizamos en su totalidad y me gustaría ponerlo de manifiesto aquí, ante sus Señorías.

Creo que el hecho de que tengamos la Agencia Europea de Defensa, sin necesidad de haber aplicado o aprobado el Tratado de Lisboa, por un acuerdo del Consejo Europeo, fue una buena idea. Creo que la Agencia puede hacer un gran trabajo en la

coordinación de las políticas nacionales, de forma tal que el valor añadido de todas las políticas que se hagan pueda ser mayor.

Alguien ha hablado de helicópteros. El helicóptero se necesita para todas las misiones —misiones civiles, misiones militares, para todo tipo de misiones, para el transporte—, el helicóptero se ha convertido hoy en instrumento fundamental de trabajo para las gestiones de crisis.

Coordinar mejor lo que tenemos, no solamente en *hardware*, sino hacer una mejor utilización del *software* para los helicópteros, nos permitiría utilizarlos mejor y tener, de hecho, más de los que tenemos en uso en el día a día.

También me gustaría decir que, en las últimas semanas, se ha avanzado mucho en nuestra relación estratégica con Estados Unidos y en nuestra relación estratégica con Rusia.

La diputada Angelika Beer hablaba de la conferencia de Múnich; fue un importante lugar donde se avanzó, creo, no de forma establecida, porque no era un foro político para tomar decisiones, pero sí un foro de reflexión importantísimo. Creo que tanto nuestras relaciones con los Estados Unidos, desde la posición estratégica de los años futuros, como con Rusia, tanto en Múnich como después con la Comisaria, cuando hemos estado en Moscú hablando y discutiendo con los líderes de Rusia sobre el tema fundamental de las nuevas ideas sobre la seguridad europea, tema que va a estar sobre el tapete, sobre la mesa, en los años y meses venideros.

Europa no quiere ser una potencia militar. Yo creo que Europa, la Unión Europea, es una potencia civil con medios militares, que es muy distinto de una potencia militar, y creo que eso debe seguir siendo así. Ese trabajo y todos los documentos que producimos y que produce tanto el Parlamento como la Comisión, o yo mismo, son trabajos que van en esa dirección.

Unas palabras sobre la policía en territorios palestinos, tema del que hemos tratado en la sesión anterior. EUPOL es uno de los *assets* más importantes que tenemos en cuanto a credibilidad y trabajo en el campo de la seguridad con los palestinos y en los territorios ocupados, y seguirá siendo un importante *asset* de la Comunidad Europea, reconocido por todos: por los palestinos, por los israelíes, por los países de la región. Por lo tanto, lo que podamos hacer para seguir trabajando en esa dirección tengan la seguridad de que lo haremos.

3-084

Elmar Brok (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, Hoher Beauftragter, Frau Kommissarin! Ich möchte mich bei den drei Berichterstattern bedanken und nur zu einigen Teilaspekten Anmerkungen machen. Insbesondere möchte ich aber sagen, dass 60 Jahre NATO für meine Generation 60 Jahre Frieden und Freiheit bedeuten. Das sollte festgehalten werden.

Wenn es uns jetzt gelingt, in einer Zeit, in der wir wieder zu mehr Multilateralismus kommen, die Europäische Union in der Außen-, Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik zu stärken – der Hohe Beauftragte Javier Solana hat das gerade zum Ausdruck gebracht –, das heißt, wenn wir in einem solchen Umfeld des Multilateralismus unsere Vorstellungen von präventiven Maßnahmen und Soft power stärker in eine gemeinsame transatlantische Strategie einbringen können, dann haben wir eine gute Zukunft vor uns.

Wenn ich gleichzeitig sehe, dass Frankreich der militärischen Integration wieder beiträgt, dann wird damit die europäische Position gestärkt. Die Sicherheitskonferenz von München hat gezeigt, dass nach den Darlegungen von Ministerpräsident Tusk, Bundeskanzlerin Merkel und Staatspräsident Sarkozy – in Anwesenheit des amerikanischen Vizepräsidenten Biden – einem europäischen Corps in der NATO praktisch nicht widersprochen worden ist. Es war für mich jedenfalls eine sensationelle Entdeckung, dass es dabei keinen Aufschrei der Amerikaner gegeben hat. Im transatlantischen Verhältnis können wir auch im militärischen Bereich stärker gemeinsame Positionen entwickeln, um diese dann im Rahmen der NATO glaubwürdig darzustellen. Aus diesem Grunde sollten wir unsere Vorstellungen von militärischen Fähigkeiten mit dem Schwerpunkt Soft power und Prävention nutzen, um eine neue Agenda, die in München deutlich geworden ist, aber eigentlich schon vorher bestand, in Angriff zu nehmen. Denn mit der Politik von Präsident Obama wird es möglich, dass wir in eine neue Ära der Abrüstungsverhandlungen kommen. Hier können wir Europäer eine Rolle spielen mit START, mit dem NPT, der neu verhandelt werden muss, vor allem aber mit dem KSE-Vertrag, was gerade in Europa von großer Wichtigkeit ist, da hier auch bestimmte Probleme mit Russland bestehen.

Wenn dies alles, einschließlich des Raketenschields, einbezogen wird, haben wir neue bessere Chancen, eine gemeinsame transatlantische Politik zu betreiben, mit Amerika als Alliierten und Russland als strategischem Partner, eine Politik im europäischen Interesse für den Frieden. Diese Chance können wir nur wahrnehmen, wenn wir selbst stärker und einflussreicher werden, und deswegen ist die Richtung dieser Politik richtig.

3-085

Ioan Mircea Pașcu (PSE). – Mr President, the report on NATO's role in the EU's security architecture reflected different approaches in the European Parliament between, on the one hand, opinions which continue to look at NATO as the organisation offering the strongest security guarantee to its members, and opinions which, on the contrary, see less and less

need for NATO in a world in which apparently there are no major threats – at least not comparable to the former Soviet one.

However, until now there was no member in both organisations willing to give up the NATO security guarantee, even if the EU is putting weight behind its defence and security effort and has introduced its equivalent of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty: the solidarity clause in the Lisbon Treaty.

To my mind, the relationship between NATO and the EU – the most important component of the larger transatlantic relationship – should be one that is naturally complementary and mutually advantageous to two partners who are compelled to work together in responding to today's multiplying and increasingly complex challenges. To that effect, existing mechanisms – see the Berlin Plus agreements – could be improved; new ones – see the proposal for an EU operational headquarters – should be contemplated; obstacles – see the negative impact of the Cyprus problem – should be overcome; and, most important, mutual perceptions should be definitely improved. Thus, on the one hand, one should stop considering NATO as an adversary and, on the other, the EU as an appendix to NATO.

As mentioned, the truth is that in practice the two partners could very well cooperate with each other, mutually complementing one another. For that, the report has been amended and hopefully the end result has become acceptable to many of us.

3-086

Andrew Duff (ALDE). – Mr President, several speakers are putting a brave face on things this afternoon. The fact is that not all of the ESDP missions are proving to be a success: several failed to have clarity of purpose, several are poorly funded and it is possible that we could still fail in the Afghan campaign. So it is a good thing that Parliament is putting forward a strong contribution to defining common security, and we need now to establish far clearer criteria for the ESDP missions.

On the question of the integration of our forces, progress is feeble, and I cannot think that colliding French and British submarines is quite what we had expected!

3-087

Ryszard Czarnecki (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! Gdy prezydentów jest zbyt dużo, to – tak na prawdę – nie ma ich wcale. Trzeba mówić bardzo jasno i precyzyjnie o tym, co jest rzeczą najpilniejszą i najistotniejszą, gdy chodzi o kwestie bezpieczeństwa. To, co stało się w zeszłym roku na Kaukazie, w najbliższym sąsiedztwie Unii Europejskiej, pokazuje, że z całą pewnością musimy położyć nacisk na politykę wschodnią, traktując to jako swoistą inwestycję w nasze europejskie, unijne bezpieczeństwo. Stąd też partnerstwo wschodnie jest, jak sądzę, rzeczą absolutnie fundamentalną i ciesząc się, że ono istnieje, martwię się jednocześnie, że o blisko trzy razy zmniejszono budżet przeznaczony na realizację tego wschodniego partnerstwa. Myślę, że jest to kwestia absolutnie podstawowa i wierzę, że będzie ona swoistym sztandarem Unii Europejskiej nie tylko dla najbliższych sąsiadów, ale także dla krajów położonych daleko od Białorusi, Ukrainy czy Gruzji.

3-088

Satu Hassi (Verts/ALE). – Arvoisa puhemies, arvoisat kollegat, kiitoksia kolmelle mietinnön esittelijälle. Valitettavasti minun on kuitenkin todettava, etten jaa kritiikitöntä suhtautumista Natoon, jota etenkin Vatasen mietintö edustaa.

Nato ei tietenkään ole sama kuin kylmän sodan aikana, eikä myöskään Eurooppa, ja Naton ja EU:n välinen yhteistyö on erittäin hyvä asia. En kuitenkaan jaa näkemystä, että se olisi ongelma, että kaikki EU:n jäsenvaltiot eivät ole Naton jäseniä.

On tunnustettava se tosiasia, että jotkut ovat pystyneet antamaan arvokkaan panoksen rauhan rakentamiseen nimenomaan sen ansiosta, että ne ovat pysyneet sotilasliittojen ulkopuolella, kuten kotimaani Suomi. Koska Suomi ei kuulu sotilasliittoihin, juuri missään ei koeta sitä viholliseksi tai vihollisen puolestapuhujaksi. Tämä on auttanut monia suomalaisia toimimaan rauhanrakentajina, esimerkiksi entistä pääministeriä Holkeriä Pohjois-Irlannissa, entistä presidenttiä Ahtisaarta Namibiassa, Indonesiassa, Acehissa ja Kosovossa sekä entistä ministeriä Haavistoa Sudanissa.

Vaikka valtaosa EU:n kansalaisista asuukin Naton jäsenmaissa, on silti tunnustettava myös se, että puolueettomien maiden olemassaolo on rauhan rakentamisen kannalta arvokas resurssi, jota ei saa hylätä jonkinlaisen EU:n sisäisen sotilaspoliittisen standardoinnin tavoitteen nimissä.

3-089

Vladimír Remek (GUE/NGL). – Původně jsem se chtěl věnovat nebezpečí militarizace vesmíru, protože si myslím, že k tomu mám jako kosmonaut blízko. Ale v předložených dokumentech se zdůrazňuje mimo jiné potřeba využít bezpečnostní politiku v zájmu občanů Unie. Přitom absolutně pomíjíme např. jejich názor na plánované budování nových cizích základů na území Evropské unie. Konkrétně v Polsku a v České republice pokračují přípravy na umístění prvků systému americké protiraketové obrany. A konkrétně v mé vlasti, to jest v Čechách, se přitom absolutně přehlíží zájmy a názory veřejnosti. Odtud z Evropské unie nezazněl jediný oficiální hlas na podporu zájmu občanů, pro které tu snad Evropská unie existuje. Přitom dvě třetiny lidí v České republice dlouhodobě odmítají cizí základnu. A to i přes mnohaměsíční –

více než dvouletou – vysvětlovací a přesvědčovací kampaň. Podle mne je v EU něco špatně, když se zájmy lidí neodrážejí v našich dokumentech, když jejich názory nemohou být v zájmu demokracie brány v úvahu. Nedivme se pak, že se lidé od politiky Unie odvracejí, neberou ji za svou anebo ji rovnou odmítají.

3-090

Bernard Wojciechowski (IND/DEM). – Mr President, the citizens of Europe need a strong Union with a competitive foreign, security and defence policy. This will not happen if our Union keeps idle in one place. China and India are growing not only in economic power but also in military might.

Europe's competitive advantage should be based on knowledge and innovation. This should be nurtured and supported by all of us. In an effective security strategy, our European forces should have access to equipment and resources of the highest quality. While the United States spends trillions of dollars on security, we in Europe are slow or idle in developing our own strategy. In a time of crisis, we are closing firearms factories, like the factory in Radom, Poland. We should instead be investing in advanced technologies, such as the recoilless technologies being developed in Poland as we speak. Innovation creates new business and jobs. We cannot build European capabilities by shutting down our own factories.

3-091

Roberto Fiore (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, in linea di principio sono certamente a favore dell'idea di un esercito europeo, ma va definito che tipo di esercito e con che confini.

Infatti, è altamente contraddittorio che abbiamo due eserciti l'un contro l'altro armati, quello turco e quello greco, che fanno parte della stessa alleanza. Io sono sicuro che il Consiglio ha visitato Cipro Nord e ha potuto apprezzare qual è il danno che hanno fatto i militari turchi e l'occupazione turca ad un'isola sicuramente europea.

Va detto anche che l'alleanza con l'America è un'alleanza sicuramente che spesso e volentieri porta dei grossi problemi. L'America ci ha trascinato in alcune guerre, in alcuni conflitti – ricordo quello con la Serbia, ricordo quello con l'Iraq e con l'Afghanistan – che avevano al cuore gli interessi non certamente dell'Europa.

Piuttosto noi ci dovremmo alleare con la Russia e la Bielorussia, che sono effettivamente storicamente, religiosamente, militarmente e geopoliticamente europee. Questo è il futuro dell'esercito europeo. Quindi un esercito certamente non in guerra con l'America, ma con una rispettosa distanza, senza la Turchia, perché la Turchia fino a prova contraria è parte dell'Asia e purtroppo nell'ambito del Mediterraneo si trova in conflitto con un paese europeo, e con alleato e strettamente legata la Russia e la Bielorussia.

3-092

Geoffrey Van Orden (PPE-DE). – Mr President, you will not be surprised if I express concern about the thrust of the reports relating to ESDP, in particular Mr von Wogau's report, which is full of false assumptions concerning the nature of the European Union and the ambition to create a European army under EU control. It sees, and I quote this expression, 'Synchronised Armed Forces Europe' as a step on the way to 'an integrated European Armed Force'. Surely, in other words, a European army. As we all know, ESDP produces no military added value. It is a political tool in the advancement of an integrated Europe. It should be seen for what it is.

For a long time I have argued that the European Union could play a useful role in providing civil instruments for crisis management and post-conflict reconstruction. This would actually be helpful. By the way, no military officers that I know imagine that conflicts such as Afghanistan can be tackled by military means alone. There is nothing new in what is now fashionably called 'the comprehensive approach'. We used to call it 'hearts and minds'. So it is quite wrong – a deceit in fact – for the EU to try and justify its involvement in military matters by claiming the comprehensive approach somehow rather for itself – some sort of EU-unique selling point. For the EU, the honest and sensible approach would be to drop the defence ambition from ESDP and to concentrate on its civil contribution. Then, perhaps, Europe and her allies would be able to focus on their military contributions to NATO, revitalising the transatlantic alliance for the difficult years ahead, without being distracted by the EU's duplicative agenda.

The immediate problem is that the EU's ambitions are now beginning to contaminate NATO, and I am seriously concerned that this will affect the way the 60th anniversary goes. Meanwhile, back in the UK, we have government ministers in a state of denial that any of this is happening.

3-093

Martí Grau i Segú (PSE). – Estimados colegas, señora Ferrero-Waldner, señor Solana, quisiera, en primer lugar, dar las gracias a los tres ponentes por su trabajo y, en tanto que ponente alternativo del informe sobre la PESC, me referiré a este informe en concreto, empezando por felicitar al señor Saryusz-Wolski por el resultado de su trabajo y por la colaboración que ha ofrecido a los demás grupos para conseguir un resultado consensuado.

De la misma manera que este Parlamento ha reclamado en numerosas ocasiones que la Unión Europea se dote de los instrumentos necesarios para hablar con una sola voz en el mundo, también la propia Cámara sabe mostrarse cohesionada en torno a la evaluación y el impulso de las grandes prioridades en política exterior y de seguridad común.

El empeño de nuestro grupo —el Grupo Socialista— ha ido en una doble dirección: por un lado, introducir o reforzar grandes cuestiones que para nosotros son clave, de manera transversal a toda la política exterior, tales como la lucha contra el cambio climático, el fomento de la paz en todo el planeta o una apuesta por el desarrollo humano; por otro lado, proponer elementos de reequilibrio entre las prioridades geográficas de la PESC respecto a como aparecían originalmente en el texto, si es que aparecían, o introducirlas como elemento nuevo, si estaban ausentes.

De esta manera hemos abogado, por ejemplo, por una mayor clarificación de las acciones entre los marcos institucionales y de cooperación implicados en la dimensión oriental, definida recientemente. Hemos defendido una mayor diversificación y una mayor relevancia de las relaciones con África, un continente del que a menudo sólo nos acordamos cuando se producen guerras de especial virulencia, y muchas veces ni siquiera así.

Con relación a América Latina, hemos querido que queden reflejados los actuales procesos de negociación de acuerdos de asociación, los primeros de naturaleza birregional que concluirá la Unión Europea en toda su historia.

En cuanto al Mediterráneo, nos hemos opuesto a una aproximación reduccionista que sólo hable de seguridad, para incluir, en cambio, todo el rico acervo político, económico y sociocultural contenido en el Proceso de Barcelona.

En cuanto a las enmiendas para el Pleno, nuestro grupo no ha presentado ninguna, creyendo que, de alguna manera, se refuerza así el equilibrio logrado con los compromisos y, por lo tanto, nos vamos a oponer a la mayoría de las enmiendas para no debilitar el compromiso alcanzado en la Comisión de Asuntos Exteriores.

3-094

Janusz Onyszkiewicz (ALDE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Jak powiedział kiedyś Tony Blair, Unia Europejska - choć nie powinna być superpaństwem - to powinna jednak być supermocarstwem. Można dodać, że supermocarstwem nie tylko gospodarczym, bo tym już jest dziś, ale ważnym graczem na scenie światowej, bo tego wymaga interes, także gospodarczy, wszystkich krajów członkowskich.

Swego czasu Henry Kissinger miał się spytać o numer telefonu, pod który może zadzwonić, by dowiedzieć się, jakie jest stanowisko Unii Europejskiej w ważnych sprawach polityki międzynarodowej. Dziś jest to numer telefonu Wysokiego Przedstawiciela. Problem polega jednak na tym, że kiedy telefon zadzwoni, to pan Javier Solana powinien wiedzieć, co odpowiedzieć. Konieczne jest więc budowanie wspólnej polityki zagranicznej, w tym także polityki bezpieczeństwa, również energetycznego, a więc także wspólnej polityki wobec Rosji.

Wróćmy do ciągle powtarzanego postulatu dotyczącego o konieczności mówienia w dialogu z Rosją przez wszystkie kraje Unii Europejskiej jednym głosem. Aby tak się stało, należy jak najszybciej wypracować precyzyjnie określoną i wspólną, opartą na solidarności, politykę wobec Rosji, która stworzy jasne ramy nie tylko dla rozmów Unia Europejska-Rosja, ale także dla rozmów dwustronnych poszczególnych krajów członkowskich. W wypracowaniu takiej polityki bardzo ważna rola powinna przyspać Parlamentowi Europejskiemu ze względu na mandat płynący z demokratycznych wyborów, którym się może poszczycić.

3-095

Αδάμος Αδάμου (GUE/NGL). – Η έκθεση για τον ρόλο του NATO στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στάθηκε αφορμή για να παρεισφρήσει ζήτημα συμμετοχής της Κύπρου στον συνεταιρισμό για την ειρήνη και στο NATO. Ο σεβασμός στη θέση της Κυπριακής Δημοκρατίας είναι απαραίτητος. Η παρέμβαση στα εσωτερικά ενός κυρίαρχου κράτους μέλους για μία ένταξη που δεν την υπαγορεύει καμία συνθήκη δεν είναι θεμιτή.

Τη στιγμή που η Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία βρίσκεται στο μέσο διαπραγματεύσεων για επίλυση του κυπριακού ανοίγονται μέτωπα που επηρεάζουν αρνητικότερα τη διαδικασία. Η πλήρης αποστρατικοποίηση μιας κατεχόμενης από την Τουρκία πατρίδας και η διασφάλιση της βιωσιμότητας μιας μελλοντικής λύσης πρέπει να είναι ο μοναδικός στόχος όλων. Αυτή άλλωστε είναι και η θέση του Ευρωπαϊκού Κοινοβουλίου σε άλλες εκθέσεις.

Σας καλούμε να στηρίξετε τις τροπολογίες 22, 23 και 24 και να καταψηφίσετε ειδικά τα σημεία που συνιστούν παρέμβαση στα εσωτερικά ενός κυρίαρχου κράτους. Σας καλούμε να επιβεβαιώσετε ότι η αρχή του σεβασμού των κυριαρχικών δικαιωμάτων των κρατών μελών είναι अपαραβάτη, ανεξάρτητα από τη συνολική άποψή σας, για τον συνεταιρισμό ή το NATO. Δική μας επιλογή είναι η αποστρατικοποίηση και η προσήλωση στις αρχές του διεθνούς δικαίου.

3-096

Γεώργιος Γεωργίου (IND/DEM). – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κατά το διεθνές δίκαιο 'έχω κράτος' σημαίνει: ελέγγω μία συγκεκριμένη εδαφική περιοχή επί της οποίας εγκαθιστώ κυβέρνηση που ασκεί αμυντική και εξωτερική πολιτική. Ερωτώ τώρα για το 'ευαγγελιζόμενο αυτό κράτος της Ευρώπης' - αυτό το οποίο 'ευαγγελίζονται οι διάφοροι' - και διερωτώμαι: πού είναι τα όριά του, ποία είναι η συγκεκριμένη αυτού περιοχή, και πού είναι η άμυνά του όταν η άμυνά του είναι εις χείρας ενός μεγάλου στρατηγού, δυστυχώς όμως Αμερικανού, και πού είναι η εξωτερική του πολιτική όταν έχουμε μία Μέση Ανατολή η οποία φλέγεται, ένα θερμοκήπιο τρομοκρατίας από όπου γίνεται εξαγωγή τρομοκρατίας, οι δε

πρόσφυγες και τα θύματα αυτής δεν πηγαίνουν στην Αλαμπάμα, ούτε στην Αριζόνα, ούτε στο Κεντάκυ αλλά, δυστυχώς, έρχονται στην Ελλάδα, έρχονται στην Κύπρο, έρχονται στη Γερμανία, έρχονται στην Ισπανία!

Γι' αυτόν τον λόγο, κύριε Πρόεδρε, πρέπει να σας πω ότι έχω αρχίσει να αμφιβάλω για τη δυνατότητα να στηρίξω αυτή την ιδέα που βγαίνει από αυτές τις προτάσεις των κυρίων οι οποίοι μας φέρανε τις εκθέσεις τους τις οποίες σκέπτομαι να καταψηφίσω αύριο.

3-097

PRÉSIDENCE DE MME MARTINE ROURE
Vice-présidente

3-098

Jim Allister (NI). – Madam President, those who pretend that an EU superstate is not being built before our eyes have a lot of explaining to do in terms of the contents of these empire-building reports.

Affirmations that a common defence policy – now taken as a given – and what is called the EU's strategic autonomy require an integrated European armed force, and demands for an autonomous and permanent EU operational headquarters – along with demands for equivalence with NATO – leave no room for doubt but that, under our common foreign and security policy, those pushing the European project demand not just political power but also military power, all of which must come from diminishing the powers, the rights and the independence of the Member States. Such super-statehood and a centralised army for Europe I repudiate, as I do the Lisbon Treaty, which would make it all possible.

3-099

Tunne Kelam (PPE-DE). – Madam President, the message of our rapporteurs today could be that a vibrant Euro-Atlantic partnership is the best guarantee for European security and stability.

Indeed, I support adopting a new transatlantic agenda and bringing about a new set of Euro-Atlantic institutions, resulting finally in a comprehensive transatlantic common market.

Ari Vatanen has urged the involvement of all EU and NATO members in closer cooperation, regardless of which organisation they belong to. I think that is a very practical idea, as is his idea of a permanent EU operational headquarters complementing – and, of course, not competing with – NATO's command structures.

Another very important point is that we draw on the same pool of national resources. Jacek Saryusz-Wolski has said that the CFSP is seriously underfinanced, so it is crucial to avoid duplication and to increase efficiency. The question for the Member States is: What are they offering Mr Solana to carry out our common defence policies?

Thirdly, it is time to address new challenges to our security. In fact, future conflicts will be fought and perhaps decided in cyberspace, where every state has to react and defend itself, sometimes in a time-frame that does not exceed a second. The European Parliament, too, needs to take the initiative to contribute to this dramatic challenge of the new century, a challenge that is based on the democratisation of modern technology.

3-100

Hannes Swoboda (PSE). – Frau Präsidentin! Die Nationalisten, die Engstirnigen in diesem Hause, glauben wohl wirklich, dass man allein und nur auf einzelnen Nationen beruhend die Risiken und die Probleme dieser Welt lösen kann.

Herr Allister ist ein typisches Beispiel dafür. Glauben Sie denn wirklich, Sie können den Terrorismus in der Welt bekämpfen, wenn Sie allein auf ihre nationale Verteidigung setzen? Glauben Sie denn wirklich, die Probleme der Energiesicherheit sind zu lösen, wenn jeder für sich allein die Probleme angeht? Das ist doch ein Konzept von vorgestern! Genau der so oft kritisierte Vertrag von Lissabon hätte ja den großen Vorteil, dass wir z.B. in der Frage der Energiepolitik und in der Gemeinsamen Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik ein Stückchen mehr gemeinsam tun können, um den Gefahren und Risiken dieser Welt effektiv begegnen zu können.

Die neue amerikanische Regierung Obama ist froh, dass es diese gemeinsame europäische Politik gibt, weil Amerika so einen Partner hat, um eine Reihe dieser Probleme anzugehen. Und Russland hat – was durch die häufige Anwesenheit russischer Vertreter auch in diesem Haus deutlich wird – inzwischen auch schon begriffen, dass das alte Konzept, immer nur mit einzelnen Ländern zu reden und dann die Länder gegeneinander auszuspielen, einfach nicht mehr funktioniert. Russland hat verstanden, dass es gemeinsam mit der Europäischen Union reden muss, wenn man zu gemeinsamen Lösungen kommen will, etwa in der Frage der Energiesicherheit.

Das ist ja auch im Bericht des Kollegen Saryusz-Wolski immer wieder angeschnitten worden. Wie können wir versuchen, gemeinsam diese Probleme zu lösen, z.B. die Frage der Energiesicherheit? Ich bin sehr froh, dass sich der Hohe Beauftragte in Zukunft zusammen mit einem Mitarbeiter noch stärker darum bemühen wird, weil wir so unseren Bürgerinnen und Bürgern zeigen können, wie die Gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik ihre konkreten Interessen berücksichtigt, und wie wir in Zukunft verhindern wollen, dass erneut Menschen in Europa frieren müssen. Das ist der

Sinn und Zweck, und darum geht es nicht um eine nationalistische Außenpolitik, sondern um eine Gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik.

3-101

Philippe Morillon (ALDE). – Madame la Présidente, je félicite nos trois rapporteurs pour cette synthèse assez remarquable qu'ils ont réalisée de l'état actuel de notre politique extérieure et de sécurité commune.

Monsieur le Haut représentant, vous le savez mieux que tout autre, l'Europe est attendue aujourd'hui sur la scène mondiale pour y prendre la place que lui assignent sa puissance économique et démographique et la richesse de ses valeurs démocratiques et humanistes.

Force est de constater qu'en dépit de la volonté manifestée régulièrement par plus des deux tiers de nos concitoyens européens, vous l'avez dit, des progrès certains ont été effectués, je vous l'accorde, depuis dix ans, mais force est aussi de constater que cette Europe n'existe toujours pas.

S'il en fallait une illustration récente, son effacement dans la solution du nouveau drame au Proche-Orient serait là pour le démontrer. Il y avait, il y a toujours, un besoin de présence européenne dans Gaza pour y jouer un rôle actif, à la fois dans l'aide à la survie des populations et à la reconstruction du pays, et dans la lutte contre la contrebande d'armes, qui avait permis de transformer ce territoire en base de lancement de roquettes de tous calibres.

En dépit des bonnes paroles prodiguées à Charm el Cheikh et à Jérusalem, rien n'a encore été fait à cet égard. Je renouvelle ici une question déjà posée à l'occasion de la crise libanaise: quand pourrions-nous, Monsieur le Haut représentant, espérer le déploiement d'une flotte européenne en Méditerranée comme celle que vous avez mise en place face à la piraterie? Nous en avons les moyens. En aurons-nous un jour la volonté?

3-102

Mirosław Mariusz Piotrowski (UEN). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Unia Europejska musi działać w interesie bezpieczeństwa obywateli wszystkich państw członkowskich. Powinna przede wszystkim przejąć na siebie część odpowiedzialności za walkę z terroryzmem i ostro reagować na jego przejawy.

Ostatnio szerokim echem odbiło się morderstwo polskiego inżyniera – zakładnika w Pakistanie – dokonane przez tamtejszych talibów. Do wcześniejszych negocjacji w sprawie jego uwolnienia tzw. europejska dyplomacja się nie włączyła. Ten bulwersujący przypadek, będący elementem szerszego problemu bezpieczeństwa, powinien stać się przedmiotem osobnej debaty na forum Parlamentu Europejskiego oraz skutkować podjęciem konkretnych kroków, o co apeluję. Priorytetem w tej chwili jest doprowadzenie do przekazania ciała zabitego Polaka oraz pomoc jego rodzinie. Niezbędne doraźne kroki nie mogą jednak zastąpić kompleksowego podejścia do terroryzmu oraz zwiększenia dyplomatycznego nacisku na takie kraje, jak Pakistan.

3-103

Pedro Guerreiro (GUE/NGL). – Portugal rege-se nas relações internacionais pelos princípios da independência nacional, do respeito dos direitos do Homem, dos direitos dos povos, da igualdade entre os Estados, da solução pacífica dos conflitos internacionais, da não ingerência nos assuntos internos dos outros Estados e da cooperação com todos os outros povos para a emancipação e o progresso da Humanidade.

Portugal preconiza a abolição do imperialismo, do colonialismo e de quaisquer outras formas de agressão, de domínio, de exploração nas relações entre os povos, bem como o desarmamento geral simultâneo e controlado, a dissolução dos blocos político-militares e o estabelecimento de um sistema de segurança colectiva com vista à criação de uma ordem internacional capaz de assegurar a paz e a justiça nas relações entre os povos.

Refiro o consagrado no artigo 7.º da Constituição da República Portuguesa para realçar o quão longe e em profunda contradição está a União Europeia com estes princípios – a União Europeia que se assume como pilar europeu da Nato, em parceria com os EUA, para melhor promover a militarização das relações internacionais, a corrida aos armamentos, a ingerência e a agressão visando assegurar o domínio e a partilha de mercado e recursos naturais pelas grandes potências.

3-104

Gerard Batten (IND/DEM). – Madam President, these are own-initiative reports and therefore they might be dismissed as so much hot air. But we know that such reports are sometimes used as a means of introducing the policy aspirations of the EU.

Mr von Wogau was once the Chair of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and was instrumental in bringing about the European single currency. He is now Chair of the Subcommittee on Security and Defence, and, when he writes a report saying that the European Union needed its own armed forces, then we can be confident that that is precisely what the European Union intends to bring about in due course.

These reports call for the EU to develop its own armed forces by means of common weapons procurement, a common communication system and an autonomous common command and control structure. Mr von Wogau advocates an EU standing army of 60 000 soldiers permanently available for deployment. The EU wants its own soldiers, guns, tanks, aeroplanes and bombs in order to 'fulfil its responsibilities in the world'.

What are those responsibilities exactly? To find out, you will have to wait to see if the Lisbon Treaty is fully ratified and brings about 'a common foreign and security policy, leading to a common defence'. No one can say that they were not warned of the EU's military aspirations.

3-105

Bruno Gollnisch (NI). – Madame la Présidente, quelle que soit l'amitié que nous éprouvons pour les rapporteurs Vatanen et von Wogau, il ne nous est pas possible d'approuver leurs rapports.

D'abord parce que l'OTAN, Organisation du traité de l'Atlantique Nord, a été créée en 1949 pour répondre à la terrible menace que faisait peser le communisme sur l'Europe occidentale. Elle a joué un rôle utile, indispensable même. Mais, aujourd'hui, cet épouvantable système communiste s'est effondré, le Pacte de Varsovie a été dissous.

Or, l'OTAN ne cesse de s'étendre. Ses activités s'étendent en dehors de son cadre géographique. L'Afghanistan, que je sache, n'est pas riverain de l'Atlantique Nord. Le Kosovo non plus, où l'on a contribué à l'épuration ethnique des Serbes dans une guerre injuste qui n'a rien résolu. L'OTAN viole donc la Charte des Nations unies.

Mes chers collègues, vous êtes complètement inconséquents. Vous prétendez créer une Europe forte et indépendante et vous absorbez la défense européenne dans un commandement à domination américaine. Comment la Russie et d'autres nations ne verraient-elles pas dans tout cela une attitude agressive?

L'OTAN nous asservit à la politique des États-Unis d'Amérique, dont nous sommes les amis, mais dont nous ne saurions être les vassaux et encore moins les valets. Il faut en finir, il faut en sortir. L'OTAN a fait son temps!

3-106

Hubert Pirker (PPE-DE). – Frau Präsidentin, Frau Kommissarin, Hoher Beauftragter! Die Bedrohungsszenarien – wie wir alle wissen – ändern sich ständig. Was sich auch ändert, ist der Vertrag und damit die Möglichkeiten für die Europäische Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik. Was aber immer gleich bleibt, ist der Wunsch der Bevölkerung nach Sicherheit und Stabilität, der Wunsch nach einer starken Union und auch der Wunsch nach Abrüstung, insbesondere im atomaren Bereich.

Mit diesen drei Berichten, die wir heute diskutieren, setzt das Europäische Parlament ein sehr starkes Signal in die Richtung, wie wir diese Ziele erreichen und Sicherheit gewährleisten wollen: Zum einen mit dem Bericht über die gemeinsame Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik, wo der Fokus auf die Sicherheit auf dem Balkan, auf die Stabilisierung in Afrika und auf den Frieden in Palästina gerichtet ist. Zum zweiten mit dem Bericht über die Zusammenarbeit mit der NATO, wo klar der Schwerpunkt auf eine engere Zusammenarbeit zwischen Union und NATO und eine bessere Koordinierung gesetzt wird. Im Mittelpunkt des dritten Berichts steht die Weiterentwicklung der Europäischen Sicherheits- und Verteidigungspolitik mit dem Ziel, mehr Effizienz und eine bessere Koordination im Zusammenhang mit den Verteidigungsausgaben zu erreichen, sowie mit dem Ziel, strategische Autonomie für die gesamte Union zu erreichen und damit auf der anderen Seite auch unsere Mitgliedstaaten zu entlasten.

Wenn wir uns all diese Ziele vor Augen führen, dann müssen wir das unterstützen, was in diesen Berichten gefordert wird, zum Beispiel gemeinsame Forschung und Entwicklung, die Entwicklung gemeinsamer Normen, gemeinsame Beschaffungssysteme, alles mit dem Ziel der Interoperabilität. Das heißt auch, dass die Militärs zwischen den Staaten optimal kooperieren können, dass Polizei und Militär zusammenarbeiten können oder dass permanente militärische Strukturen geschaffen werden und ein operationelles Hauptquartier oder auch ein Rat der Verteidigungsminister eingerichtet wird.

Ich bin überzeugt, dass wir damit eine ganz entscheidende Chance haben, aus unserer Union eine politische Union zu machen, eine Sicherheitsunion aufzubauen, die den Bürgern das gibt, was sie von der Union erwarten: Sicherheit, Stabilität und Frieden auf Dauer.

3-107

La Présidente. – Mes chers collègues, jusqu'à maintenant les orateurs ont tenu leur temps de parole. Nous avons vraiment des problèmes de temps. Je vous demanderai donc de tenir votre temps de parole s'il vous plaît.

3-108

Jan Marinus Wiersma (PSE). – Madam President, the CFSP has become almost everything, so you can say almost everything in a debate like this. In the past we discussed only security issues and now we even discuss climate change, energy etc. Therefore, I have to be selective and say something about EU-US relations and about the disarmament agenda, which I think we can move forward this year.

The new administration has made a very positive start, also symbolically by the announcement to close down Guantánamo. I think we should work on this issue and try to work together to solve some of the problems with which the Americans are confronted.

The second basic debate this year will be about economic security: are the United States and Europe able together to do things about the crisis or will they try to do it on their own, which will mean a rapid development of protectionist measures?

Afghanistan is also an important issue. Will we be able to match the increased efforts of the Americans or not, and under what conditions? There, the positive sign is that the Americans have said that they are aware that there should be a political solution as this cannot be solved in a military way. This brings the European Union in immediately.

Then on the disarmament agenda: last December, Mr Solana, you gave a very good speech here in Parliament on your ideas and those of the Council and the Union on promoting an agenda that is positive, by starting to support the Americans and the Russians to renegotiate the START Treaty and to work with the Americans on the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. We will also be in favour of the removal of the remaining technical nuclear weapons in Europe and it would be helpful in supporting ideas to bring the fuel cycle under international control in order to make sure that countries that want to develop nuclear energy have peaceful access but will not be able to abuse that militarily.

We would like the European Union to support this kind of agenda, knowing that President Obama has ambitions. In his inaugural speech, when he talked about foreign affairs, he first mentioned Iraq and Afghanistan, but then he mentioned his ambitions to do something about nuclear disarmament.

3-109

Samuli Pohjamo (ALDE). – Arvoisa puhemies, puhun Vatasen mietinnöstä ja haluan ensinnäkin kiittää esittelijä Vatasta mietinnön avoimesta valmistelusta.

Minusta on kuitenkin väärä viesti parlamentilta, jos se vaatii sotilaallisen organisaation vahvistamista ja korostaa Natoon tukeutuvan sotilaallisen voiman merkitystä mietinnössä esitetyllä tavalla. Yhteistyö ja kumppanuus sekä demokratia ja ihmisoikeudet rauhan ja vakauden takeena on toimiva eurooppalainen malli, jolla olisi käyttöä kaikissa maailman kriisipesäkkeissä. Lisäksi meillä on käsillä syvenevä talouskriisi, ympäristöongelmat ja ilmastomuutoksen tuomat haasteet, joita ei pystytä ratkaisemaan sotilaallisella voimalla.

Mielestäni olisi tärkeämpää korostaa EU:n yhteisen ulkopolitiikan merkitystä ja keskittyä konfliktien ehkäisemiseen ja kriisien syiden poistamiseen, kuten esimerkiksi köyhyyden kitkemiseen sekä demokratian, ihmisoikeuksien ja kansalaisyhteiskunnan edistämiseen.

Haluan vielä muistuttaa, että unionissa on jäsenenä Naton ulkopuolella olevia valtioita, joilla on omat perusteensa kyseiselle ratkaisulle. Näiden valtioiden on saatava itse päättää turvallisuuspoliittisista ratkaisuisistaan ilman painostusta. Esimerkiksi Suomi on hoitanut oman puolustuksensa hyvin ja osallistunut vuosikymmenien ajan rauhanturvaamisoperaatioihin eri puolilla maailmaa. Mietintöön on tehty monia muutoksia, jotka parantavat sitä, mutta ne eivät muuta sen perusvirettä.

3-110

Mario Borghesio (UEN). – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, l'Europa ha una sua geopolitica? Non mi sembra! Se fosse vivo Karl Haushofer insegnerebbe a questa Europa poco vertebrata la necessità di avere un approccio marittimo con gli oceani Atlantico, Pacifico, Indiano e con i paesi del nostro settentrione, dove l'oceano Artico ha enormi risorse energetiche quanto mai preziose. Vi si muovono le grandi potenze americana e russa, non l'Europa!

Lotta al terrorismo significa anche lotta a chi veicola strumenti del terrorismo, persone utilizzabili dai terroristi. In questi momenti mentre parliamo, Lampedusa è in fiamme perché qualcuno ha incendiato i centri di trattenimento dei clandestini. L'Europa si dovrebbe preoccupare di essere solidale con il governo italiano che cerca di bloccare l'invasione dei clandestini utile alle mafie e ai terroristi. Ma questo mi pare non stia avvenendo nella maniera forte e concreta in cui dovrebbe avvenire. L'Europa si deve difendere da queste minacce, non con le parole ma con i fatti, come stanno facendo il Ministro Maroni e il governo italiano.

3-111

Rihards Pīks (PPE-DE). – Priekšsēdētājs kundze, komisāres kundze, Solanas kungs! Visi trīs mūsu godājamo kolēģu ziņojumi ir ļoti profesionāli, līdzsvaroti, un, galvenais, sagatavoti īstajā laikā. Bez daudzām precīzām lietām, vērtējumiem, priekšlikumiem, kuri ir ziņojumos, es gribu akcentēt divas lietas. Pirmkārt, ir svarīgi Eiropas drošības stratēģiju pārskatīt ik piecus gadus, jo mēs redzam, ka tieši pēdējos gados ļoti aktuāli kļuvuši tādi drošības jautājumi kā energodrošība, kibernetiskā drošība, klimata drošība, un arī eventuālās konflikta zonas pārvietošanas no viena reģiona uz citu. Otrkārt, Eiropas

Savienībai ir ievērojami jākāpina darbība preventīvai konflikta novēršanai. Domāju, ka tas bija iespējams arī Dienvidkaukāzā, bet, manuprāt, Eiropas Savienības attieksme pirms bruņotā konflikta bija pārāk rezervēta, bet Eiropas Savienībai ir tiesības un pienākums veikt preventīvas darbības un starpnieka misijas, jo Eiropas Savienība ir miera veidošanas projekts un ir to realizējusi piecdesmit gadu garumā. Lai varētu reaģēt uz izaicinājumiem un veikt preventīvus mērus, ir nepieciešami, pirmkārt, politiskā griba, otrkārt — kopējās ārējās un drošības politikas un Eiropas drošības un aizsardzības politikas institucionālo instrumentu veidošana un pilnveidošana. Viens no šādiem instrumentiem ir *S. Wolski* kunga ziņojumā minētā austrumu partnerība, tajā skaitā *EURONEST* Apvienotās parlamentārās asamblejas veidošana. Tas varētu vairojot sapratni un arī demokrātijas attīstību aiz mūsu austrumu robežām. Un nobeidzot es gribu izteikt gandarījumu par 33. panta iekļaušanu *K. von Wogau* kunga ziņojumā, jo manā valstī notikumi Kaukāzā un augošais nacionālisms mūsu kaimiņvalstī izraisa nopietnas bažas. Kā vēsta sena manas tautas gudrība: "Vienmēr jācer uz labāko, bet jāgatavojas ļaunākajam, un Dievs sargā tos, kas paši sevi sargā!" Paldies!

3-112

Ana Maria Gomes (PSE). – Agradeço aos relatores Ari Vatanen e von Wogau o seu trabalho e esforço de consenso, em especial no difícil tema das doutrinas nucleares que é urgente que a União Europeia e a NATO revejam, num tempo em que o Presidente Obama ressuscita o objectivo de libertar o mundo de armas nucleares e dois submarinos nucleares europeus quase provocam uma catástrofe.

Os relatórios Vatanen e von Wogau apontam a necessidade de uma União Europeia política, estratégia e operacionalmente autónoma, através de uma PESD ambiciosa. Precisamos dos instrumentos institucionais, financeiros e operacionais para concretizar estes objectivos. Por isso exigimos estreita colaboração entre a NATO e a UE, baseada no respeito pela autonomia política de cada uma das organizações, que são complementares. Por isso exigimos a criação de um quartel-general permanente da UE em Bruxelas capaz de planear e conduzir autonomamente operações militares da PESD. Por isso exigimos que os Estados-Membros da União intensifiquem esforços para gastar melhor, de forma mais eficiente e mais europeia os orçamentos nacionais da defesa que, isoladamente, pouco podem.

A mensagem deste parlamento é inequívoca e serve de aviso. Sem a Europa da defesa, a defesa na Europa fica posta em causa. Em causa poderão ficar as nossas indústrias de defesa. Em causa poderão ficar as capacidades de que a Europa precisa para exercer a responsabilidade de proteger populações civis e evitar massacres e genocídios. Em causa poderá ficar a Europa como actor global na gestão de crises. A extensão da integração política europeia à segurança e à defesa, como prevista no Tratado de Lisboa, é urgente e precisa de ser acelerada. Não é só no interesse da União Europeia mas também no da NATO, já que ambas as organizações colherão os frutos de uma Europa mais bem equipada para lidar com os crescentes desafios à segurança dos europeus e à segurança global.

3-113

Andrzej Tomasz Zapalowski (UEN). – Pani Przewodnicząca! NATO, jako międzynarodowa organizacja bezpieczeństwa, sprawdziła się w czasie względnego pokoju w Europie. Oczywiście poczucie bezpieczeństwa, które nam daje, jest w znacznym stopniu ograniczone tempem podejmowania decyzji przez organy dochodzenia czy też decyzje Paktu. Mimo wszystko NATO jest stabilizatorem światowego bezpieczeństwa. Próby „rozmiękczenia” Sojuszu Północnoatlantyckiego – poprzez osłabianie jego pozycji w postaci rozbudowy struktur wojskowych Unii Europejskiej – są błędem. Unia Europejska na dziś ma problem z uzgodnieniem ostrych decyzji politycznych, a co dopiero wojskowych.

Unia powinna skoncentrować się na wzmocnieniu bezpieczeństwa wewnętrznego i zwiększeniu zdolności obronnych swoich członków, zwłaszcza wobec państw graniczących z krajami o dużym poziomie niestabilności, państw, w których popularne są ideologie skrajnie nacjonalistyczne czy też państw będących w polu zainteresowań ugrupowań terrorystycznych. Unia nie powinna się zbytnio angażować w działania na rzecz powstania dużych sił ekspedycyjnych do operacji poza Europą.

3-114

Alojz Peterle (PPE-DE). – Spoštovani visoki predstavnik za skupno zunanjo in varnostno politiko gospod Solana se je upravičeno vprašal, kje smo bili leta 1990. Še bolj zanimivo bi se bilo vprašati, kako je bilo s skupno politiko na začetku devetdesetih let.

Takrat je bila Evropska skupnost nemočna, potem so željam sledile vizije, strategiji politična volja in zmogljivosti, kar nas je pripeljalo tudi do akcij, ne samo v Evropi, ampak tudi po svetu. V teh letih, zlasti po zgodovinski širitvi leta 2004, sta se močno spremenila kontekst in ambicije skupne varnostne in zunanje politike.

Pred desetimi leti smo se še precej ukvarjali sami s seboj. Danes imamo za seboj uspešne akcije in ne moremo si predstavljati SVZP ali EVOP brez globalne dimenzije. Glede na to me ne čudi, da vsa tri poročila kot tudi številni govorniki opozarjajo na novo situacijo, potrebe po korekcijah strategije, po še več enotnosti in več medinstitucionalnega sodelovanja.

Vse to je okrepljeno s konkretnimi predlogi za izboljšave operativnih struktur kot tudi procesa političnega odločanja, kar z veseljem pozdravljam. Strinjam se, da smo glede skupne politike na novi stopnji in bi rad v tej zvezi opozoril na dvoje.

Natančno bo treba pogledati, kaj prinašajo v kontekst skupne politike posledice finančne oziroma gospodarske krize. Prepričan sem, da je treba biti zelo pozoren do političnih posledic krize, zlasti če bo prišlo še do širše monetarne krize.

Drugo: že vrsto let ugotavljam presenetljivo dejstvo, da številni naši partnerji želijo Evropsko zvezo z enotno, jasnejšo in močnejšo zunanjepolitično in obrambno identiteto. Se pravi, da je Evropska zveza kot globalni igralec zaželen. V tem duhu se mi zdi potrebno naša bilateralna partnerstva gledati v še bolj globalni luči kot doslej in razviti tudi inovativnost v smislu multilateralnih partnerstev, ki ne bi pokrivala samo bilateralnih interesov, ampak stabilizirala širše regije.

3-115

Μαρία-Ελένη Κοππά (PSE). – Κυρία Πρόεδρε, το διεθνές σύστημα βρίσκεται σε μεταβατικό στάδιο και οι προκλήσεις είναι μεγάλες για όλους μας. Επιβάλλεται λοιπόν μία επανεκτίμηση και βελτίωση των σχέσεων της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης με το NATO προς αντιμετώπιση τω κοινών απειλών όπως είναι η τρομοκρατία, η διάδοση των όπλων μαζικής καταστροφής, η έξαρση της διεθνούς πειρατείας, αλλά και τα νέα προβλήματα που προκύπτουν από την κλιματική αλλαγή.

Παράλληλα όμως, θεωρώ ότι αυτή είναι η σωστή στιγμή για να επιβεβαιώσουμε τον ρόλο του Συμβουλίου Ασφαλείας του ΟΗΕ ως τον βασικό εγγυητή της διεθνούς ειρήνης και ασφάλειας. Η ανάγκη αναθεώρησης του Οργανισμού καθίσταται πλέον επιτακτική και εμείς έχουμε δεσμευθεί να προωθήσουμε αυτή την αναθεώρηση ώστε να μπορεί ο ΟΗΕ να ανταποκριθεί με μεγαλύτερη αποτελεσματικότητα στο σημαντικό του έργο.

Είναι σημαντικό επίσης να τονίσουμε ότι όλα τα κράτη και οι διεθνείς οργανισμοί, συμπεριλαμβανομένου του NATO, θα πρέπει να απέχουν από την απειλή και χρήση βίας με οποιονδήποτε τρόπο δεν συνάδει με τους σκοπούς και τις αρχές του καταστατικού χάρτη του ΟΗΕ. Το NATO και η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση έχουν κοινά συμφέροντα και οι σχέσεις τους δεν θα πρέπει να είναι ανταγωνιστικές. Χρειαζόμαστε μία πιο ισορροπημένη εταιρική σχέση με καλύτερο συντονισμό ενεργειών και ενδυνάμωση της συνεργασίας μας. Η κάθε πλευρά όμως θα πρέπει να σέβεται την ανεξαρτησία του άλλου εις ό,τι αφορά τη λήψη των αποφάσεων και να διασφαλίζεται η αλληλοκατανόηση όταν προκύπτουν αποκλίνουσες στρατηγικές εκτιμήσεις.

Τέλος, θα ήθελα να τονίσω την ανάγκη σεβασμού του δικαιώματος στην ουδετερότητα των κρατών και, στο σημείο αυτό, να ζητήσω τη διαγραφή της σχετικής έκκλησης προς την Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία να συμμετάσχει στον Συνεταιρισμό για την Ειρήνη. Η απόφαση αυτή αποτελεί κυριαρχικό δικαίωμα κάθε κράτους και η Κύπρος είναι ανεξάρτητο και κυρίαρχο κράτος ικανό να αποφασίσει για το μέλλον του.

3-116

Jana Hybášková (PPE-DE). – Oslavme šedesátiny NATO. Máme před sebou velké summity USA-EU-NATO. Návrat Francie do vojenských struktur NATO spolu s energií věnovanou evropské bezpečnostní a obranné politice je vynikající příležitost ke sladění evropské bezpečnostní strategie a možné nové strategie pro NATO. Ratifikace Lisabonské smlouvy dnes i poslaneckou sněmovnou České republiky vytváří nový kvalitativní stupeň pro evropskou obranu a bezpečnost. Postavme evropské společné velitelství. Racionalizujeme evropský obranný trh. Věnujme prostředky do vědy a výzkumu, do Evropské obranné agentury, vytvořme statut evropského vojáka, zamezme duplicitám a doslovně obejdeme turecký syndrom. Využijme šance nové americké administrativy k opravdové spolupráci v Afghánistánu a v protiraketové obraně Evropy. Máme před sebou velkou šanci evropské bezpečnostní a obranné politiky jako motoru další integrace a bezpečnosti Evropy. Nepromarněme ji.

3-117

Libor Rouček (PSE). – Dovolte, abych řekl několik slov ke vztahům Evropské unie a Ruska. Podle mého názoru utváření společné zahraniční a bezpečnostní politiky nelze provádět bez dialogu s Ruskem. Do Evropské bezpečnostní agentury, jež zahrnuje Spojené státy, NATO, OBSE, mezinárodní dohody o odzbrojení, by mělo být v dialogu zahrnuto i Rusko.

Chtěl bych proto vyzvat Radu i Komisi, aby přijaly konstruktivní a otevřený postoj k případným rozhovorům mezi Evropskou unií, Spojenými státy a Ruskem o obnovení transatlantického dialogu v oblasti bezpečnosti založeného na helsinském procesu.

Jsem toho názoru, že tyto rozhovory by měly zahrnovat i diskuzi na téma protiraketové obrany. Evropská unie by v této otázce měla hrát mnohem větší roli, než je tomu doposud. Podle mého názoru dohodu nelze nechat jenom na Spojených státech a Rusku. Toto evropská veřejnost od nás očekává.

3-118

Józef Pinior (PSE). – Pani Przewodnicząca! Parlament Europejski jest zgodny co do wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa Unii Europejskiej. Co do tego istnieje konsensus głównych sił politycznych. Problem, realny problem polityczny, polega na tym, jak osiągnąć ten zasadniczy cel.

Po pierwsze - jak najszybsza ratyfikacja traktatu lizbońskiego. Ci przywódcy polityczni, którzy opóźniają proces ratyfikacji traktatu osłabiają kształtowanie wspólnej polityki zagranicznej i bezpieczeństwa Unii Europejskiej. Trudno na poważnie mówić o wspólnej polityce bezpieczeństwa Unii Europejskiej bez traktatu lizbońskiego.

Po drugie - pragnę podkreślić kwestię praw człowieka w kształtowaniu polityki zewnętrznej Unii. Polityka ta powinna wspierać prawo międzynarodowe: międzynarodowe prawo humanitarne, demokrację liberalną i rządy prawa.

Po trzecie - polityka ta wymaga poważnego rozwoju europejskiej polityki obronnej, rozwoju struktur wojskowych Unii Europejskiej oraz europejskiego przemysłu obronnego.

3-119

Adrian Severin (PSE). – Madam President, I want to make two points. Firstly, on values. The European Union is a Union of values. These values are criteria for accession. They guide us in our behaviour. They are a means to build interoperability with our external partners. But we should not make the scope of our external policy from exporting our values. On the contrary, we have to learn to operate in a diversified world and even to respect the other's right to be wrong.

Secondly, on institutions. The international institutions and international law of today were shaped and created in a completely different world. Each day we realise that they are not adapted to the new challenges, new opportunities and new threats of today's world. I believe, therefore, that the European Union should support the idea of a new conference on security and cooperation in Europe in a larger Europe – from Vancouver to Shanghai, not only to Vladivostok – in order to create a new space of security, of freedom and of cooperation. I think that this should be one of our top priorities, and we should not be afraid that others perhaps have other ideas on that.

3-120

Luis Yáñez-Barnuevo García (PSE). – Señora Presidenta, en primer lugar deseo expresar mi apoyo global a los tres informes que estamos debatiendo.

En segundo lugar, quisiera felicitar a la Comisaria Benita Ferrero, sobre todo por la expresión que ha hecho de la estrecha cooperación y colaboración entre su equipo y el del Alto Representante. Y en tercer lugar quisiera felicitar al Alto Representante, porque sin su personalidad y su creatividad probablemente la PESC no sería hoy lo que es: la base jurídica y documental, incluso con el avance del documento de estrategia de 2003, no hubiera sido suficiente para llegar tan lejos en esa política exterior y de seguridad común que ha logrado en estos años. Y en cuarto lugar quisiera decir que el Tratado de Lisboa, del que, como se ha dicho hoy, hay buenas noticias de que pueda ser ratificado prontamente, va a suponer sin duda un instrumento mucho mayor y mucho mejor en sus manos y en las de la Unión Europea para convertirla en lo que ésta debe ser: un actor global en el pleno sentido del término.

Me quedo, por último, con la idea que él mismo ha expresado, de que Europa debe ser un actor, una potencia civil con medios militares y no una potencia militar.

3-121

Proinsias De Rossa (PSE). – Madam President, having returned at the weekend from a visit to Gaza, I am going to spend my 60 seconds talking about what I believe to be a serious problem there. Our principle of human security is one which obliges us to respond to the humanitarian crisis, but it also obliges us to respond and tell Israel that enough is enough and that no more can Europe turn a blind eye to the abuse of the Palestinian right to self-determination.

The most significant abuse of that right is the relentless and deliberate colonisation of the West Bank and East Jerusalem by Israel. There are now 500 000 settlers squatting on territory which is supposed to comprise the main territory of the proposed independent Palestinian state. It is increasingly difficult to believe that Israel really favours an independent Palestinian state, while proceeding to annex more and more Palestinian territory – and does so up to the present date.

Declarations that Europe and the USA are committed to a two-state solution, which includes a sovereign and viable Palestinian state, are not really worth the paper they are written on unless we say 'stop' to Israel in relation to settlements. They must be frozen now and eventually dismantled; otherwise there will never be a sustainable peace in the Middle East, Mr Solana.

3-122

Călin Cătălin Chiriță (PPE-DE). – Doresc să îmi exprim aprecierea pentru cei trei raportori. Rolul NATO în arhitectura de securitate a Europei s-a dovedit a fi esențial până acum, dar are și reale perspective pentru secolul XXI. Consider că Uniunea Europeană și NATO trebuie să colaboreze între ele, evitând orice eventuală rivalitate.

O relație transatlantică puternică și productivă poate constitui cel mai bun garant al păcii, securității și stabilității în Europa, dar și al respectării principiilor democrației, drepturilor omului, statului de drept și bune guvernări. Ne aflăm într-un moment istoric în care a devenit crucială cooperarea transatlantică în vederea elaborării concomitente a noii strategii de securitate a Uniunii Europene și a noului concept strategic al NATO.

La summit-ul NATO de la București, din aprilie 2008, aliații au apreciat rolul politic pe care îl poate avea Uniunea Europeană dacă își dezvoltă capacitatea de acțiune în domeniul securității și apărării. Parteneriatul pentru pace promovat

de NATO și proiectul parteneriatului estic promovat de Uniunea Europeană au o importanță vitală pentru dezvoltarea democrației, statului de drept și pentru tranziția spre o economie de piață funcțională în anumite țări din zona Mării Negre.

3-123

Rosa Miguélez Ramos (PSE). – Señor Solana, estoy aquí desde las 3 de la tarde sólo para hablar de piratería marítima y sólo para poder felicitarle a usted por la puesta en marcha de la operación naval europea en contra de la piratería marítima en aguas del Índico. Usted sabe que el gobierno de mi país está absolutamente involucrado en esta misión y quiero recordarle a usted que en abril se inicia la temporada de pesca y que nuestros pescadores están preocupados por la que es, en este momento, la distribución de fuerzas geográficas, de fuerzas, en el Índico. Ellos quisieran una protección más aproximada a la zona donde van a faenar, es decir, hacia el sur, y quisiera escucharle a usted decir algo en este sentido.

También quisiera decirle que me preocupa la continuidad de esta operación más allá del mandato temporal que tiene establecido. Creo que sería una lástima que tanto esfuerzo conjunto con los tres pilares a la vez terminase abruptamente al cumplirse el plazo de un año, sobre todo teniendo en cuenta que la situación en Somalia y en la región no parece que vaya a cambiar o a mejorar ni a corto ni a medio plazo.

3-124

Marios Matsakis (ALDE). – Madam President, NATO is the backbone of European defence, and we rely on NATO forces for the security of our Union. But NATO forces in Cyprus – Turkish NATO forces – are not a force of freedom, but one of occupation: occupation of EU territory. Not only did these Turkish forces cause death and destruction on the island when Turkey invaded in 1974, but they today continue to keep an EU Member State divided, causing fear and oppression among both Greek and Turkish Cypriots and obstructing the current negotiations between the two Community leaders on the island.

So, in discussing NATO's important role in European defence, it is fair to remember that the EU has not yet put the necessary pressure on Turkey to get its NATO invasion army out of Cyprus unconditionally and immediately. Do you not agree with me, Mr Solana? Perhaps he is not listening. Do you not agree that the Turkish army should leave Cyprus immediately, Mr Solana?

3-125

Marie Anne Isler Béguin (Verts/ALE). – Madame la Présidente, je voudrais prendre l'exemple de la Géorgie pour vous montrer combien nous sommes encore loin de l'ambition que nous affichons en matière de PESC, cela malgré les efforts fournis par notre Haut représentant ou par la commissaire Ferrero Waldner.

Alors, bien sûr, Monsieur Solana, vous demandez plus de capacités, plus d'aides. Pour ma part, je voudrais vous poser la question suivante: l'Union européenne est-elle actuellement en mesure de tenir ses engagements, notamment en ce qui concerne l'accord de cessez-le-feu que nous avons proposé avec la Russie?

Évidemment – j'ai entendu, Madame la Commissaire –, nous savons combien l'Union européenne a été présente et est intervenue rapidement, mais aujourd'hui nous devons savoir également que les Géorgiens ont, face à eux, l'armée russe, basée, installée sur les territoires de l'Abkhazie et de l'Ossétie du Sud. Et je ne mets absolument pas en cause le travail remarquable de la mission civile d'observateurs sur le terrain. Mais quand même, que peuvent faire nos observateurs pour défendre les civils des violences quotidiennes? Pas grand-chose, mis à part en témoigner.

Et l'ambition de la PESC, dans ce cas en Géorgie, sera mesurée en fonction du courage d'y envoyer enfin des forces de maintien de la paix pour stabiliser cette région que nous avons intégrée dans notre politique de voisinage.

3-126

Alexandru Nazare (PPE-DE). – Am regăsit astăzi în cele trei rapoarte dezbătute repere relevante și utile în definirea viitoarelor politici ale Uniunii Europene ca actor global.

Aș avea trei observații: în primul rând, aș dori să subliniez importanța dimensiunii transatlantice în politica externă a Uniunii. Trebuie să profităm de momentul actual în privința relației cu Statele Unite, pentru a deschide un nou capitol al acesteia care să amplifice forța noastră pe plan global.

În al doilea rând, dimensiunea de securitate a Uniunii Europene trebuie să fie coordonată cu cea a NATO, pentru a evita dublarea și lipsa de resurse.

În al treilea rând, cred că Uniunea trebuie să utilizeze politica europeană de securitate și cooperare pentru consolidarea stabilității în Balcanii de Vest, ulterior clarificării statutului Kosovo. Kosovo este acum într-un stadiu de „independență supravegheată”, conform reprezentantului special al Uniunii, Peter Faith. Chiar dacă dl Faith a respins în recenta audiere din Parlamentul European termenul de protectorat al UE pentru Kosovo, acesta a recunoscut că drumul către „independență totală” este unul anevoios și îndelungat. „Ar fi un miracol să ne încheiem misiunea în doi ani”, declara dl Faith.

Cu toate acestea, cred că avem nevoie de o evaluare, de un orizont de timp clar în ceea ce privește implicarea Uniunii în Kosovo; de aceea salut inițiativa Comisiei de a dezvolta un studiu în privința Kosovo, atât timp cât el contribuie la succesul misiunii EUREX.

3-127

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, *Member of the Commission*. – Madam President, let me just make a few remarks, and one in particular: I think this debate has shown that there is a growing acceptance of the approach Europe follows in crisis management and conflict prevention. The Munich Conference on Security confirmed the comprehensive approach, because security and development go together – you cannot have one without the other. I believe this European approach is a core element of our strategy to promote peace and security in our neighbourhood, but also beyond.

It works, but it must be adequately resourced, so we have to work on building our capacities and capabilities in both the civilian and military fields, and we will try at least to play our part as much as we can.

But I would also like answer your questions, in particular that of Mr Saryusz-Wolski, Chair of the committee on Foreign Affairs, on the underfunding of the CFSP budget. It is true that the budget has been reduced this year, but this should, we hope, not be an impediment to our political ambitions in civilian ESDP, provided that there are no new significant missions this year. It is important to remember that only certain costs are covered by the CFSP budget – equipment costs, contracted staff, special allowances, for instance the EU special representatives – but Member States also pay for the cost of their seconded staff. The budget will increase – as you know, not this year but in 2013 – to EUR 400 million.

Concerning transfers between budget articles, which Mr Dombrovskis mentioned, the Commission includes information on transfers within the CFSP budget with its quarterly reports to the budgetary authority, and in recent years all appropriations under the CFSP budget have been committed.

Let me comment on two specific issues: firstly, on human security. Human security is something which I am personally very fond of, because it must be promoted: freedom from want and freedom from fear as a good of foreign and security policy. This is also recognised in our 2008 report on European security strategy (ESS), that we both mentioned before. Furthermore, the ESS report recognises that without development and poverty eradication there will be no sustainable peace. Therefore, this is very important, and the promotion of human rights is also a part of this equation.

Finally, let me say a word on early warning and conflict prevention, which Mr Pīks spoke about. I agree in general that as a European Union we must work more on the early parts of the conflict cycle, which means early warning, conflict prevention and preventive diplomacy. From the Commission side, one initiative we are taking in this field is to strengthen links with NGOs as part of a peace-building partnership, and also improving our uses of open sources of information. But we will try to reinforce the early prevention side in the future. We know this is a very important part.

3-128

Javier Solana, *High Representative for CFSP*. – Madam President, I shall be very brief. I would like to thank those Members of Parliament who have intervened, and I have taken note of their remarks and their questions. I will certainly be in touch with you to respond to those who have to be responded to properly.

I would like to say that this is the second time that we have had a debate of this nature in the European Parliament, an almost three-hour discussion on European security. I think this is very important, and I hope very much that this idea will be maintained in the future. To the three rapporteurs, thank you very much for your work, and you can be sure that we will continue cooperating with you in the future.

3-129

Jacek Saryusz-Wolski, *rapporteur*. – Madam President, this is a very broad, and for me satisfactory, debate about successes, gaps and actions in progress. Roughly speaking, I would say that it is the syndrome of the half-empty/half-full glass, depending on who is looking at it.

Some questions were answered at least by the mainstream of those who spoke. Is there progress in this area? Yes. Is it enough? No. Is there more convergence between institutions like Parliament, Council, Commission and Member States? Yes, there is more progress, although this broadband of foreign policy of the Union is not sufficiently big enough, and here I refer to your words, Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner, on money. If we had more money, or at least as much as the Commission proposed for broadband in rural areas – EUR 1.5 billion – perhaps Member States, without having to pay, would more willingly participate in CFSP actions. You know well that this House is appealing for the Union budget to pay for that.

Do the citizens value this foreign policy? The answer is, again, 'yes'. Do we make sufficient use of foreign policy to legitimise the Union? The answer is 'no'. Capabilities: in the broader sense of the term, everything that is crisis prevention management and rapid response, we have what we could get and – I could expect that Mr Solana will nod – more. I have

already touched upon finance. In terms of legal and institutional instruments – Lisbon – everyone agrees that we need more and better equipped instruments under the Treaty rules.

This convergence is being worked out in a discreet manner, and I would like to pay tribute to the discreet action and diplomacy of the High Representative, not only outside, but also within. How does this like-mindedness come about? When you are able, Mr Solana, to speak on behalf of the whole Union, there has to be, beforehand, action to persuade everybody and to get everybody on board.

The question of values was raised. Do we agree on values? Yes, we do, but we have different practices and this axis of values vis-à-vis interest is also present, and the best example is how to deliver it in Central Asia: it was present in the debate on the Central Asia strategy.

To close, I would say that I was touched by what Mr Solana said – that, through foreign policy, the EU identifies itself. It gets more identity. What we are adding in our approach in Parliament is that it gives more legitimacy, which means it gives more power. For that reason it can be an integral part of European integration. The dominant debate has shown that there is hunger for more Europe in foreign policy and that more pooling of European political and material capital is needed.

3-130

La Présidente. – Nous laissons un petit peu plus de temps aux rapporteurs, mais là nous avons des contraintes horaires et nous ne pouvons pas continuer comme ça.

3-131

Karl von Wogau, Berichterstatter. – Frau Präsidentin, verehrte Kolleginnen und Kollegen! Ich will zu einigen Punkten Stellung nehmen.

Zunächst einmal zu der Frage: Warum habe ich die Prinzipien „*Human Security*“ und „*Responsibility to protect*“ nicht in meinen Bericht übernommen? Das war sehr umstritten. Ich persönlich bin der Auffassung, dass das sehr wichtige Konzepte sind, die entwickelt worden sind, dass sie aber für eine Sicherheitspolitik nicht taugen, weil sie dazu missbraucht werden können, militärische Interventionen in allen Gegenden der Welt zu begründen. Das ist eine Gefahr, die ich ganz konkret sehe. Darum befürworte ich diese beiden Konzepte, aber nicht für die Sicherheitspolitik.

Dann wurde gesagt, ich sei dabei und würde mit dem Bericht fordern, eine europäische Armee aufzustellen. Ich möchte Sie bitten, den ganzen Bericht noch einmal durchzulesen – das Wort „europäische Armee“ werden Sie in diesem Bericht ganz bestimmt nicht finden. Was dieser Bericht sagt, ist, dass das Geld des Steuerzahlers in diesem Bereich besser ausgegeben werden soll, als das bis heute der Fall gewesen ist.

Dann haben wir die Sicherheitsstrategie, die jetzt von allen befürwortet wird. Die hierfür notwendige Arbeit nahm einige Jahre in Anspruch und war sehr erfolgreich. Ich bin der Meinung, dass der nächste Schritt ein Werk über die Umsetzung der Sicherheitspolitik sein muss, ein Weißbuch zur Sicherheitspolitik. Das ist eine Aufgabe für die nächste Legislaturperiode.

Last but not least glaube ich, dass sich die nächsten Gespräche, die wir zu diesem Thema führen müssen, mit der Frage der EUBAM Rafah beschäftigen müssen, in welcher Art und Weise diese Mission wiederbelebt werden kann und in welcher Art und Weise sie möglicherweise erweitert werden könnte.

3-132

Ari Vatanen, rapporteur. – Madam President, I shall just repeat what President Wilson said in 1917 and what, for example, our honourable colleague Mr Swoboda said half an hour ago: the nation alone cannot solve problems. This House, and the EU, are testimony to that. We have to learn from our mistakes. In whatever walk of life, we must work together: there is no cherry-picking, there is no free riding in the real world. We cannot let the burden be borne by just some shoulders: we have to share it, because we are democratic nations. That is a noble cause.

Sometimes I have difficulty in understanding why, immediately the word ‘NATO’ is mentioned, people – perhaps because of their anti-American feelings, or because they have anti-military leanings – are against it. Yes, we are pacifists. Who is not a pacifist? Anybody of sound mind is a pacifist. Who wants suffering; who wants war? But we must have the means to prevent it. We must be proactive. Wars come and go if there is this kind of attitude, but we must build peace actively.

I really give credit to the majority of Members in this House who again proved tonight that constructive, responsible common sense will prevail; that this House is what it is meant to be: a House that looks forward, because, unless we work together, peace will become a casualty.

Let me make one last comment. Mr Platini – a maestro of football – is speaking in another hall at this very moment. I was in France when the massacre in Rwanda took place – and this is not directed against France, but is a comment on how the

media report information – and the fact that Mr Zidane, the football star, had a wart on his knee literally drew more attention than the massacre in Rwanda. No, we cannot be silent: we must be proactive; otherwise we condone these kinds of events in the world.

3-133

La Présidente. – Le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi 19 février 2009.

Déclarations écrites (article. 142)

3-134

Alexandra Dobolyi (PSE), írásban. – Miként reagáljon Európa arra, hogy keleti határain egyre erősödik számos feltörekvő nagyhatalmat és energiahordozókban gazdag tagállamot tömörítő regionális szervezet, a Sanghaji Együttműködés Szervezet? Oroszország révén a SESZ szomszédos az Európai Unióval, ezért megkerülhetetlen, hogy az érdemben foglalkozzon e szervezettel. Ha a SESZ tagjait, illetve megfigyelőit elemezzük, akkor arra a következtetésre kell jussunk, hogy ezen országok rendelkeznek a világ olaj- és gáztartalékainak jelentős hányadával.

Mindezek következtében egy megújított Oroszország- és Közép-Ázsia stratégia kérdése megkerülhetetlen, az egyes országokra lebontott politikai kockázatelemzéssel egybekötve.

Megjegyzendő, hogy az EU jelenlegi kiszolgáltatottsága és nagymértékű energiatüggősége, ahogyan azt az orosz-ukrán gázárvita megmutatta, aláássa a hiteles, hatékony és következetes közös kül- és biztonságpolitika fejlődését.

Ehhez adódik még hozzá, hogy a különböző országok különféleképpen reagálnak, történelmi tapasztalataiktól és gazdasági érdekeiktől vezérelve. Ma az EU-nak – sokkal inkább, mind eddig bármikor – fontos az egységes politikai fellépés, az eltérő nemzeti érdekek és álláspontok összehangolása.

Nélkülözhetetlen, hogy az Unió javítsa fellépésének hatékonyságát és következetességét a globális szinten, melyhez nagymértékben hozzájárulhat a Lisszaboni Szerződés ratifikálása és a szerződésben biztosított külpolitikai eszközök.

Az EU nagyobb hatékonyságú, fordulatszámú működtetésének egyre sürgetőbb igénye, az egyre gyorsabb intellektuális válaszokat kikényszerítő történések felvetik a külpolitika irányítása szervezeti, döntési mechanizmusainak áttekintését, a megfelelő strukturális válaszok megadását.

3-134-500

Glyn Ford (PSE), in writing. – I congratulate Mr Vatanen on his report which I endorse. In particular I support the idea of an EU Operational Military Headquarters being established. Of course NATO should be and is our first port of call when security is threatened. Yet during the Bush-Gore debates just over a decade ago, George Bush said that had he been President he would not have intervened in Kosovo.

Now despite my antipathy to the Bush Administration's foreign policy it seems to me that it is a perfectly reasonable position for Bush to take on the basis of US self-interest. Yet it is not a position that Europe could or should have followed. Apart from the strong moral argument that we had a responsibility to protect those facing the genocide of the Serbs, we also had the consequences of tens/hundreds of thousands of refugees. We, in our own and their interests, must have the capacity to engage without the Americans. To do this, it is a small price we pay to have a permanent EU Operational Military HQ ready for such a future eventuality.

3-135

Anneli Jäätteenmäki (ALDE), kirjallinen. – Herra Puhemies!

Suomen ei tarvitse hävetä turvallisuuspoliittisia ratkaisujaan. Naton ulkopuolella Suomi on oikeassa seurassa yhdessä Ruotsin, Itävallan ja Sveitsin kanssa. Niihin on helppo samaistua. Naton ulkopuolinen liittoutumattomuus on kypsän valtion moderni vaihtoehto.

On ryhdytty puhumaan entistä pehmeämmästä Natosta, kun "sotaisa presidentti" vaihtui "rauhaisaan presidenttiin" Yhdysvalloissa. Onkin luultavaa, että Obaman ja ulkoministeri Hillary Clintonin johdolla hurmauspuheet pehmeästä Natosta yleistyvät. Mutta annetaanpa ajan kulua ja katsotaan rauhassa, miten Nato kehittyy.

Oma arvioni on, että Naton perusluonne ei ole muuttunut miksiään sen jälkeen kun kaksinaapainen turvallisuusjärjestelmä murtui. Sen sijaan propaganda pehmeästä Natosta on onnistunut hyvin.

Tuijottaminen pelkästään Venäjään (Venäjä, Venäjä, Venäjä) tai uuden talvisodan odottelu eivät johda mihinkään. Myöskään Nato ei ole pätevä vastaus mihinkään Suomea lähiaikoina kohtaaviin suurimpiin ongelmiin, jotka ovat luonteeltaan lähinnä taloudellisia.

3-136

Adrian Manole (PPE-DE), în scris. – Evaluarea privind rolul alianței NATO-UE trebuie să pornească de la recunoașterea faptului că peisajul politic al Europei, dar și cel al SUA s-au schimbat fundamental în ultima perioadă, astăzi, Uniunea Europeană devenind un actor legitim al securității internaționale.

Acest lucru solicită „repolitizarea” alianței, care trebuie să devină un forum pentru un dialog deschis despre aspectele majore în care urmează să se implice. Un dialog trans-atlantic sincer, de exemplu, despre modul în care trebuie abordat terorismul, este extrem de necesar exact datorită faptului că aliații au perspective diferite asupra modului în care trebuie să arate răspunsul în cazul acestei provocări comune.

În contextul provocărilor tot mai diverse la adresa securității globale - de la conflicte interetnice din imediata vecinătate a teritoriului aliat, la rețele teroriste globale și de proliferare a armelor de distrugere în masă, statele membre trebuie să acorde o importanță deosebită procesului de reflecție și dialogului pe această temă și să sprijine procesele de reformă din alianță și mă refer, mai ales la problemele de securitate din spațiile aflate în vecinătatea imediată, alianța putând juca un rol cheie în construcția instituțiilor democratice de apărare și securitate din Balcani și regiunea extinsă a Mării Negre.

3-137

Marian-Jean Marinescu (PPE-DE), în scris. – Avem nevoie de o politică europeană de securitate comună, coerentă și actualizată, care să contribuie la întărirea identității europene și să permită Uniunii să vorbească cu o singură voce credibilă pe plan internațional.

Realitatea actuală în care ne confruntăm cu provocări majore, precum criza economică, securitatea energetică, schimbările climatice, managementul migrației, necesită cooperare și responsabilitate din partea statelor membre pentru protejarea intereselor comune, promovarea păcii, securității și a respectului pentru integrarea teritorială.

Uniunea poate avea impact doar dacă vorbește cu o singură voce, are la dispoziție și folosește eficient instrumentele necesare, întărind cooperarea cu vecinii.

Avem nevoie de gândire strategică, implicare activă și coerență în acțiunea la nivel global, precum și de securitate regională și relații strânse cu actorii regionali relevanți.

Parteneriatele strategice cu vecinii estici sunt necesare și trebuie să investim în relația cu Rusia, aplicând o strategie coerentă cu angajamente comune, reciproc avantajoase.

Trebuie să investim în vecini, mai ales în cei răsariteni și să le oferim stimulentele necesare pentru a continua reformele și pentru a putea întări prezența Uniunii în zonă. Avem la dispoziție noi instrumente, precum Parteneriatul Estic, care ne facilitează o nouă abordare, consolidată și la un nivel superior cu partenerii noștri din regiune.

3-138

Zdzisław Zbigniew Podkański (UEN), na piśmie. – Bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe jest jedną z największych wartości dla wszystkich podmiotów stosunków międzynarodowych. Współcześnie jesteśmy świadkami redefinicji tego pojęcia i przesunięcia środka ciężkości na czynniki pozamilitarne zagrażające stabilności i bezpieczeństwu międzynarodowemu. Przykładami takich zagrożeń może być przestępczość zorganizowana, cyberterroryzm, piractwo (czego świadkami jesteśmy u wybrzeży Somalii) zmiany klimatyczne czy zagrożenia wynikające z światowego kryzysu ekonomicznego. Unia Europejska, poświęcając swoją uwagę budowie wspólnych instrumentów o charakterze wojskowym, takich jak Eurokorpus, europejska flota transportu powietrznego i stała kwatera operacyjna UE, nie może zapomnieć jednak o innych, nie mniej ważniejszych zagrożeniach. Więcej uwagi należy poświęcić budowie organów i instytucji, które pozwoliłyby nam pokonać trudną sytuację finansową spowodowaną przez światowy kryzys ekonomiczny oraz ochronie środowiska naturalnego i różnorodności biologicznej. Nie można zapomnieć także o zagrożeniach wewnętrznych, takich jak narkotyki, ubożenie społeczeństwa i przestępstwa popełniane w internecie.

Wszystkie te elementy są ważnymi czynnikami warunkującymi bezpieczeństwo międzynarodowe, bezpieczeństwo Unii Europejskiej i każdego narodu. Bez rozwiązania tych wyżej wymienionych, podstawowych kwestii niemożliwe jest stworzenie stabilnej europejskiej strategii bezpieczeństwa.

3-139

Flaviu Călin Rus (PPE-DE), în scris. – Politica de securitate comună reprezintă un subiect care a fost dezbătut de multe ori și despre care s-a scris mult. Uniunea Europeană reprezintă un vector din ce în ce mai important atât la nivel zonal, cât și la nivel mondial. Tocmai din acest motiv consider că Uniunea Europeană trebuie să se manifeste activ în interiorul granițelor sale și proactiv în orice zonă a globului.

În urma analizei celor trei rapoarte de astăzi: Raportul anual 2007 privind aspectele principale și opțiunile de bază ale PESC, Strategia europeană de securitate și PESA, Rolul NATO în arhitectura de securitate a UE, cred că putem desprinde trei concluzii:

1. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să aibă o politică de securitate comună în măsură să sprijine atât democrațiile din interiorul granițelor sale, cât și parteneriatele cu țările aflate în vecinătatea sa.
2. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să se manifeste ca un tot unitar și are nevoie de o forță de reacție rapidă, capabilă să intervină în orice moment pentru sprijinirea păcii, a democrației și a drepturilor omului.
3. Uniunea Europeană trebuie să-și consolideze poziția la nivel mondial și să continue să fie un factor de stabilitate și de echilibru între marile puteri ale lumii.

3-139-500

Katrin Saks (PSE), kirjalikult. – Lp president,

Soovin tänada kolleeg Vataneni hea raporti eest ELi ja NATO sünergia vallas. Koostöö ja partnerluse igakülgne tihendamine, ressursside mõistlik kasutamine ja dubleerimise vältimine, üleskutse mõlema liikmetele olla paindlikumad ning eesmärgipärased ja pragmaatilised – see raport sisaldab kõike seda, mida oleme Euroopas ja ka Euroopa Parlamendis alati oma seisukohtades rõhutanud.

Raporti muu olulise seast leidsin ka ettepaneku, et euroliidu kandidaatriigid, kes on samas ka NATO liikmesriigid, saaksid mingi ajutise staatuse Euroopa Kaitseagentuuris (EDA). See oleks kindlasti võtmelahendus Türgi probleemile NATO poolt vaadates.

Ka kolleeg von Wogau ESDP ja ESS teemaline raport on üldiselt suunitluselt tabav. ESSi aruanne, mis detsembri Ülemkogul heaks kiideti, vastas enamusele tõstatatud küsimustest. Aruandes esitatud uued aspektid ja EL julgeolekualast tegevust suunavad seisukohad aitavad Euroopa Liidul oma julgeolekuhuvide eest tõhusamalt seista, nagu von Wogau raport soovitab. Tuleb kiita raporti suunitlust EL poolse koostöö otsimiseks teiste partneritega.

Tänan!

3-140

Theodor Dumitru Stolojan (PPE-DE), în scris. – Îmi exprim susținerea pentru raportul domnului Sariusz Wolski, care subliniază, pe bună dreptate, că asigurarea securității energetice pentru cetățenii europeni trebuie să devină o prioritate majoră pentru politica externă și de securitate comună.

Doresc să spun foarte clar: securitatea aprovizionării cu energie, și mai ales diversificarea surselor de aprovizionare cu gaz vor rămâne doar un vis frumos, dacă nu construim conducta Nabucco.

Proiectul Nabucco trebuie asumat ca obiectiv strategic de către întreaga UE. Nabucco necesită atât o serioasă investiție financiară, cât mai ales o politică externă și de securitate europeană eficientă. Eficiența impune garanții de stabilitate regională a zonei prin care va trece această conductă de gaz. În acest scop, trebuie să depunem toate eforturile pentru a conferi politicii externe și de securitate comune coerența și eficiența de care are atâta nevoie pentru a produce rezultate tangibile.

Între altele, consider că UE are nevoie de un Înalt Oficial pentru Politica energetică externă, care să se bucure de o puternică susținere politică și să dispună de instrumentele necesare de acțiune.

Apreciez că UE trebuie să aloce politicii sale externe și de securitate mijloace financiare și resurse umane suficiente pentru a obține rezultatele concrete pe care cetățenii europeni le așteaptă de la noi.

3-141

Daniel Stroj (GUE/NGL), v písemné formě. – Zásadně odmítám zprávu o evropské bezpečnostní strategii a evropské bezpečnostní a obranné politice v předloženém znění (A6-0032/2009). Tato zpráva je typickým projevem militarizace Evropské unie a důkazem toho, že v bezpečnostní sféře Unie mají vojenské prostředky a opatření nahrazovat, ba vytlačovat potřebná opatření politického charakteru. Řada závěrů a požadavků obsažených ve zprávě je v příkrém rozporu s tím, že Unie by měla být budována jako mírový projekt. Není divu, že občané EU, pokud mohou projevit své stanovisko, se staví proti Lisabonské smlouvě mimo jiné i pro zakotvení militaristického charakteru EU. Zcela scestné a nebezpečné je stanovisko obsažené ve zprávě, které na jedné straně hovoří o bezpečnostních zájmech EU a na druhé straně kritizuje Rusko za hájení jeho zcela legitimních bezpečnostních zájmů na Kavkaze.

3-142

Душана Здравкова (PPE-DE), в писмена форма. – Уважаеми колеги,

Обсъждането на трите свързани със сигурността и отбраната доклада в ЕП е израз на висока политическа отговорност пред гражданите на Европа в навечерието на срещата на върха на НАТО. Установената практика на приемане на резолюции за доклада на Съвета върху главните аспекти и решения по общата външна политика и сигурността е добра възможност да се призоват страните-членки да приложат тази практика на национално ниво.

От особена важност е развитието на независим академичен капацитет за анализ и оценка на Европейската политика за сигурност и отбрана заедно с националните политики за сигурност. На тази основа, чрез мрежа от аналитични центрове с корени в страните-членки, ще се постигне публичен дебат по ЕПСО.

Работата по бяла книга за сигурността и отбраната на ЕС не може без страните-членки да пренесат този документ в националните си стратегии. Това включва укрепване на националния аналитичен капацитет и способност за компютърно подпомагано обучение и учения с цел тестване и усвояване на нови концепции в сферата на гражданско-военото сътрудничество.

Трябва да окуражим страните-членки да предприемат съвместен стратегически преглед в сферата на сигурността за създаване на солидна база за взаимодействието между ЕС и НАТО в процеса на разработка на новата стратегическа концепция на НАТО в контекста на ЕПСО.

3-143

20 - Processus de Barcelone: Union pour la Méditerranée (débat)

3-144

La Présidente. – L'ordre du jour appelle le rapport de Pasqualina Naipoletano, au nom de la commission des affaires étrangères, sur le Processus de Barcelone: Union pour la Méditerranée (2008/2231(INI)) (A6-0502/2008).

3-145

Pasqualina Naipoletano, relatrice. – Signora Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, signor Presidente del Consiglio, con questo rapporto il Parlamento si propone di offrire un contributo costruttivo alla prospettiva di rafforzare il partenariato euro-mediterraneo.

Le proposte scaturite dal summit di Parigi del 14 luglio scorso si propongono due obiettivi condivisibili: il primo è quello di rendere più concreti ed efficaci i progetti nel campo dell'integrazione economica, territoriale e ambientale, attraverso l'istituzione di un segretariato che dovrebbe operare a questo fine e con finanziamenti pubblici e privati; il secondo è quello di rafforzare il dialogo politico all'interno dell'intero processo, attraverso nuove istituzioni, quali la copresidenza, il summit dei capi di Stato e di governo e le riunioni scadenze dei Ministri degli Esteri. In questo quadro io vorrei sottolineare il ruolo dell'Assemblea parlamentare euro-mediterranea, che è stato anche riconosciuto nei documenti di Parigi e successivamente di Marsiglia.

Il Parlamento vuole contribuire a superare l'impasse grave che si è determinata dopo i tragici avvenimenti di Gaza. Molto tuttavia dipenderà dalle politiche che il governo israeliano che si formerà dopo le elezioni metterà in atto. Nonostante ciò, vorrei sottolineare che l'Assemblea parlamentare euro-mediterranea si riunirà prossimamente e questo a dimostrazione del ruolo che anche in questa difficile situazione i parlamenti possono svolgere.

Sottolineiamo il valore di istituzioni che coinvolgono allo stesso tempo l'Unione europea e i paesi del sud e dell'est del Mediterraneo. Segnaliamo tuttavia la necessità di non ridurre tutto il processo alla dimensione intergovernativa. Auspichiamo un ampio coinvolgimento della società civile e delle parti sociali, anche perché la crisi economica può acuire i drammatici problemi già endemicamente presenti, quali la disoccupazione, aumentando la pressione migratoria e il governo già difficile di questo fenomeno. Chiediamo un'attenzione maggiore ai temi dei diritti della persona che toccano comportamenti di tutti i paesi partner in diversa misura.

Per ciò che riguarda le istituzioni, ribadiamo il concetto che con l'entrata in vigore del trattato di Lisbona l'Unione europea potrà assicurare una rappresentazione coerente e strutturata attraverso le nuove figure del Presidente del Consiglio e del Ministro degli Esteri europei. Nel frattempo sarebbe utile assicurare una continuità della presenza europea almeno nella copresidenza. Sappiamo che la Presidenza ceca su questo è stata sensibile. Ci auguriamo che anche la Presidenza svedese voglia accettare, diciamo, questo messaggio.

Signora Presidente, cari colleghi, voglio ringraziare tutti i colleghi e funzionari dei vari gruppi politici e le commissioni che si sono espresse per parere. Tutti hanno contribuito all'elaborazione di questo rapporto che mi pare essere ampiamente condiviso.

3-146

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – Madam President, I am grateful for this opportunity to contribute to today's discussion on the issue of the Barcelona Process: Union for the Mediterranean. I know that Parliament follows this with particular interest. Pasqualina Naipoletano is to be commended in particular. As a result, the motion for a resolution on which you will be voting later constitutes a valuable contribution to our work together.

The Paris Summit last July created the Union for the Mediterranean and established a partnership built on the existing Barcelona Process. The current rotating presidency gives priority to strengthening this partnership. Even though the Lisbon

Treaty has not yet come into force, I can assure you that, in the spirit of co-ownership, we are placing a particular focus on the development of this initiative and, in particular, the regional projects. These are important. They offer concrete signs to the citizens of the region that the partnership works in their interest.

The Union for the Mediterranean is not the only mechanism for cooperation. The bilateral dimension continues under the European neighbourhood policy, and is complemented in some cases by the pre-accession framework – as well as, in the case of Mauritania, the ACP framework.

These approaches together encourage reform within individual countries, and reinforce regional cooperation. The neighbourhood policy, of course, also has an important eastern dimension, and we very much welcome the parallel development of this policy.

The Paris Summit agreed to take work forward in four key areas: de-pollution of the Mediterranean; maritime and land highways; civil protection; and the development of alternative energies through, for example, the Mediterranean Solar Plan.

There is also particular focus on higher education and research, as well as on support for business through the Mediterranean Business Development Initiative. The technical aspects of project proposals put forward in this area will be handled by the secretariat to be established in Barcelona, as was agreed in Marseilles last year.

In addition to these specific project areas, the ministerial conferences of the Union for the Mediterranean will address a number of global challenges that affect us all. These include the search for peace and security in the region, the social and geopolitical impact of the economic crisis, environmental concerns, the management of migratory flows, and the role of women in our respective societies.

There are two particular areas of cooperation which I know are important to this Parliament and which we also fully support. The first is interparliamentary cooperation through the creation of the Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly and its committees. This initiative is key to developing a strong parliamentary dimension to the Union for the Mediterranean. It will, as is pointed out in your resolution, serve to reinforce its democratic legitimacy. It will also help promote the basic values which lie at the heart of the European Union. We very much welcome the way in which you and your President have embraced this particular initiative, and offer you our full support.

The second area which I believe should be a particular priority for us is the development of intercultural relations. This is absolutely crucial if we are to encourage greater understanding between cultures in the Mediterranean region. Civil society, local social and regional partners all need to be involved. The Anna Lindh Foundation has a particularly important role to play in this area.

The Union for the Mediterranean offers us the potential for developing better relations among its members. Recent events have shown that this is not an easy enterprise, but they have also underlined the importance of our continuing to work to this end. We are only too aware of the difficulties faced by the populations in the region as a result of the crisis in Gaza. As you know, this has led to the postponement of meetings of the Union for the Mediterranean. But the Presidency believes that regional cooperation and dialogue is the way to achieve peace, build confidence and create prosperity and we certainly expect to resume work within the Union for the Mediterranean as soon as possible.

Therefore, a démarche of the Czech EU Presidency and the French Union for the Mediterranean Co-Presidency, on behalf of the EU members of the Union for the Mediterranean, possibly together with the Egyptian Co-Presidency, addressed to the Arab partners, is just being prepared. Its purpose is to appeal for a resumption of all Union for the Mediterranean activities automatically and without any conditionality immediately after the League of Arab States Doha Summit at the end of March. We intend to use the opportunity of the Donor Conference on Gaza, which will be held on 2 March in Sharm el-Sheikh in Egypt, for further consideration by the three Ministers of Foreign Affairs: Karel Schwarzenberg, the Czech Foreign Minister; Bernard Kouchner, the French Foreign Minister; and the Foreign Minister of Egypt.

3-147

PRZEWODNICZY: MAREK SIWIEC
Wiceprzewodniczący

3-148

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, *Membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs les députés, chère Madame Napoletano, tout d'abord permettez-moi de vous féliciter pour le travail accompli puisqu'il a permis d'aboutir à un rapport qui, vraiment, interpelle à plusieurs titres.

D'abord parce qu'il constitue vraiment une contribution positive et constructive du Parlement européen à la définition d'une politique euroméditerranéenne cohérente, un défi qui nous tient tant à cœur.

Ensuite, parce que vous soulignez, à juste titre, que l'Union pour la Méditerranée doit être complétée. Elle ne doit pas être seulement intergouvernementale, mais doit être complétée, justement, en s'ouvrant à la participation d'autres acteurs, tels que des collectivités locales et régionales. Il importe d'intensifier la dimension parlementaire en renforçant le rôle de l'assemblée parlementaire ainsi que de pérenniser l'implication de la société civile.

Il est vrai que l'Union pour la Méditerranée a vocation à valoriser le caractère paritaire institutionnel et politique d'un partenariat régional qui a besoin d'une relance. Mais il est tout aussi vrai que celle-ci ne pourra se faire qu'à partir de l'acquis de Barcelone, qu'il faut prolonger et qu'il faut consolider.

La coopération régionale financée par la Commission fait partie de cet acquis. Il n'y a donc aucune raison, aujourd'hui, de la remettre en cause. Bien au contraire, elle cautionne et elle garantit la cohérence de l'action de l'Union européenne dans la région, d'autant plus que ses objectifs sont parfaitement compatibles avec les ambitions de la politique européenne de voisinage, le cadre principal de nos relations bilatérales avec les pays de la région.

Il en va de même pour le respect des méthodes communautaires appliquées aux mécanismes de prise de décision et de définition des priorités à l'intérieur de l'Union européenne, dans la mesure où l'Union pour la Méditerranée est une initiative qui s'inscrit pleinement dans le cadre européen.

Monsieur le Président, le sommet constitutif de l'Union pour la Méditerranée avait, comme vous le savez, pour triple objectif de redonner une vigueur politique aux relations euroméditerranéennes, de changer la gouvernance institutionnelle de ces relations au profit d'une conduite paritaire de l'initiative et, finalement, de cristalliser la coopération multilatérale de l'Union européenne avec ses partenaires méditerranéens autour de projets structurants, porteurs d'intégration sous-régionale et susceptibles de réduire les écarts de développement entre les deux rives de la Méditerranée.

Réduire ces écarts, effectivement, grâce au développement économique social ainsi qu'au renforcement des échanges et à l'accroissement des investissements. Contrer le radicalisme idéologique, dont le manque de développement et le sentiment d'injustice constituent justement le terreau fertile, par le dialogue et des solutions politiques aux conflits. Mener des politiques migratoires responsables et concertées, comme vous l'avez dit, afin de tirer parti de la stabilisation démographique en Europe et de la croissance démographique des pays méditerranéens. Voilà quelques exemples des défis que nous devons relever ensemble avec nos partenaires dans le cadre de l'Union pour la Méditerranée.

Effectivement, nous savons que nous ne pourrions pas atteindre ces objectifs sans le soutien parlementaire, le soutien à la fois du Parlement européen et de l'Assemblée parlementaire Euromed. C'est dans cet esprit que nous travaillons, avec la ferme conviction que, sur toutes ces questions, la Commission européenne pourra compter sur votre collaboration, et je tiens à vous en remercier d'avance.

Mais nous savons aussi naturellement que, face à la situation très préoccupante qui règne au Proche-Orient, suite à la guerre de Gaza – nous en avons discuté aujourd'hui – effectivement, nous avons un problème: nous ne pouvons pas laisser l'Union pour la Méditerranée dans un vide politique. Nous l'avons toujours dit; effectivement, c'est le cas.

C'est à cela qu'est due la suspension actuelle des travaux que, personnellement, je regrette beaucoup, mais nous espérons naturellement pouvoir retravailler à un moment donné. Et, effectivement, la réunion qui se tiendra à Charm el-Cheikh, où la Commission aura bien sûr un rôle important à jouer comme "cosponsor", sera très importante. J'espère qu'après, se tiendront différentes autres réunions. On a beaucoup travaillé déjà, en effet, et quand la Commission travaille, elle le fait d'une façon très sérieuse.

Par ailleurs, beaucoup a été fait concernant les règles, régissant le secrétariat, qui sont là et doivent permettre à Barcelone d'entamer ses travaux.

3-149

Vural Öger, *Verfasser der Stellungnahme des mitberatenden Ausschusses für internationalen Handel*. – Herr Präsident, liebe Pasqualina, meine verehrten Damen und Herren! Mit der Union für den Mittelmeerraum sollte der 1995 eingeleitete Barcelonaprozess eine Neubelebung erfahren. Leider müssen wir heute feststellen, dass das Projekt aufgrund der jüngsten Nahostkrise brach liegt. Die Eröffnung des Sekretariats in Barcelona ist auf unbestimmte Zeit verschoben, zugesagte Gelder können nicht fließen.

Konkrete Ergebnisse bleiben also bislang aus, was ich sehr bedaure. Ich frage mich, ob wir uns zu stark auf Institutionen konzentriert haben und ob dies der Grund für die derzeitige Sackgasse ist. Haben wir den Einfluss politischer Krisen auf die Union für den Mittelmeerraum unterschätzt?

Wie können wir die Fortsetzung der Projekte sichern? In der Geschichte der europäischen Integration waren wir im Bereich Wirtschaft und Handel sehr erfolgreich. Genau deswegen haben wir uns im Ausschuss für internationalen Handel Gedanken darüber gemacht, wie unsere erfolgreichen Mechanismen auf unsere Nachbarn im Süden Europas übertragen

werden könnten. Ein Ziel ist die Errichtung einer Freihandelszone bis 2010. Auch hier stockt es. Gerade weil politische Konflikte diesen Prozess blockieren, sollten wir den Bereich der Wirtschaft stärken.

Der internationale Handel könnte sich nicht nur auf die ökonomische, sondern – und vor allem – auch auf die politische und gesellschaftliche Situation der Region positiv auswirken. Dabei ist die regionale wirtschaftliche Integration von zentraler Bedeutung. Unsere südlichen Nachbarn müssen auch untereinander enger kooperieren.

Gleichzeitig sollten die Länder, die bereits ein Netz an bilateralen Handelsbeziehungen aufgebaut haben, vom Mehrwert einer multilateralen Dimension überzeugt werden. Dabei spielt die Kommunikation über die Vorteile von wirtschaftlicher Integration mit den Bürgern vor Ort eine wichtige Rolle. Das wäre ein Schritt, um die Situation südlich des Mittelmeers zu stabilisieren. Das wünsche ich uns allen, vor allem den Bürgern in der Region!

3-150

Íñigo Méndez de Vigo, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Asuntos Constitucionales*. – Todo poema nunca se termina, sólo se abandona, decía un poeta mediterráneo nacido en Sète, y yo creo que al Proceso de Barcelona le pasó algo similar: no se terminó, pero se abandonó, o al menos un poco.

Por lo tanto, para este Parlamento es importante el impulso dado bajo la Presidencia francesa para renovar este Proceso de Barcelona. Y por eso hemos colaborado activamente desde la Comisión de Asuntos Constitucionales con el informe de la señora Napoletano, a quien quiero agradecer su paciencia y comprensión.

¿Qué le importaba a la Comisión de Asuntos Constitucionales en este tema, señor Presidente? Pues varias cosas: en primer lugar, garantizar la continuidad del Proceso de Barcelona con la Unión para el Mediterráneo; en segundo lugar, evitar la duplicación de estructuras e inscribir este proceso en el marco institucional de la Unión, y no de forma separada; y, en tercer lugar, como ha dicho ya la comisaria Ferrero-Waldner, decir que no es un proceso únicamente intergubernamental, sino recalcar la dimensión parlamentaria.

Y por ello hemos insistido desde la Comisión de Asuntos Constitucionales en temas que ya expresó el Presidente Pöttering el 13 de julio de 2008 y que se refieren a cómo la Asamblea Parlamentaria debe reunirse una vez al año, debe organizarse en grupos constituidos según familias políticas y hacer dictámenes consultivos.

También intentamos ayudar al Consejo en las decisiones importantes que éste tenía que tomar. Este Parlamento, señor Vondra, quiere cooperar con el Consejo y establecimos cuáles eran los criterios que debían reunir la sede de esa nueva Unión para el Mediterráneo y, casualmente, esos criterios coincidieron con la ciudad de un país que yo conozco muy bien y, efectivamente, la Comisión de Asuntos Constitucionales decidió que Barcelona podía ser una buena sede. Y los ministros lo reconocieron poco tiempo después, con lo cual se refleja nuevamente esa voluntad de cooperar con el Consejo, señor Presidente.

Empecé citando a Paul Valéry; déjenme que termine citando también un verso de Paul Valéry: *«Tu n'as que moi pour contenir tes craintes!»*.

Yo creo que para resolver los temores que puede haber en ambas orillas del Mediterráneo, nada mejor que el éxito de esta Unión para el Mediterráneo. Así sea, señor Presidente, y, nuevamente, señora Napoletano, gracias por su comprensión y ayuda.

3-151

Vito Bonsignore, *a nome del gruppo PPE-DE*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, mi complimento con la collega Pasqualina Napoletano per il lavoro fatto e l'equilibrio che ha messo in campo in questo lavoro. Alla signora Ferrero-Waldner, sempre attenta al nostro lavoro, vanno i miei ringraziamenti per l'importante attività che fa in giro per il mondo.

Dobbiamo tutti assieme dimostrare grande unità perché i problemi e le sfide che ci troviamo a dover affrontare nell'area del Mediterraneo sono sfide particolarmente difficili. Dobbiamo spingere per un ruolo sempre più forte ed importante per l'Europa, considerando che strategicamente noi siamo a fianco degli Stati Uniti.

Il gruppo PPE-DE si è molto speso, nel corso di questi anni, perché l'Europa tutta abbia un ruolo sempre più forte, sempre più attivo. Non bastano i finanziamenti, non sono più sufficienti solo i finanziamenti, serve un'ampia rinnovata azione politica. Fra tutte e tante sfide comuni vi è anche quella di fronteggiare l'immigrazione verso i confini europei. Questo problema non può essere affrontato con il buonismo, non può essere affrontato con populismo, ma con molto rigore, teso a far rispettare le norme e la Convenzione dei diritti dell'uomo.

L'Unione per il Mediterraneo, l'Assemblea parlamentare euro-mediterranea e la politica estera comune diretta verso il sud sono tutti ottimi e validi strumenti per avere un ruolo sempre più forte per l'Europa e sempre più serio e credibile.

Per questo motivo il mio gruppo politico voterà contro gli emendamenti della sinistra estrema che riteniamo eccessivamente polemici e molto poco costruttivi. La mia famiglia politica vuole dare un grande rilancio a questa importante attività che diventerà prioritaria nel prossimo futuro e quindi sosteniamo il rilancio parlamentare dell'APEM, non più solo un forum di discussione ma un luogo dove si possa prendere insieme decisioni importanti per il futuro nostro e di tutti i popoli che si affacciano sul Mediterraneo.

3-152

Carlos Carnero González, *en nombre del Grupo PSE*. – En nombre del Grupo Socialista, me gustaría, antes que nada, felicitar a la señora Napoletano por el excelente informe que nos presenta esta tarde, pero sobre todo y ante todo porque ella ha sido una euromediterránea *da prima ora*. Sin su trabajo, sin su impulso, no hubiéramos podido imaginar, primero, un Foro Parlamentario Euromediterráneo ni, después, una Asamblea Parlamentaria Euromediterránea, y no estaríamos hoy en condiciones de reclamar el papel que a los representantes de los ciudadanos les corresponde en lo que estamos tratando de poner en marcha.

Quiero seguir a mi colega Méndez de Vigo, que siempre cita a grandes literatos, recordando una frase contenida en el *Rey Lear* de Shakespeare, cuando se afirma que «cuando uno dice que está en el peor momento, es que lo peor todavía está por llegar». Nosotros nos hemos empeñado en ir en sentido contrario, porque, precisamente cuando en el Próximo Oriente la situación está peor que nunca hemos puesto en marcha un instrumento para tratar de que la región, en su conjunto, contribuya al desarrollo político, económico y social como marco imprescindible para solucionar los conflictos. Eso es la Unión por el Mediterráneo, al fin y al cabo. Eso es una Unión por el Mediterráneo que no es *ex novo*, sino que viene de la raíz profunda del Proceso de Barcelona; eso sí, creando nuevas instituciones como la Secretaría Permanente, que estará en Barcelona, algo por lo que nos felicitamos como europeos, como mediterráneos, como españoles y como parlamentarios que lo pedimos en su momento, y también acogiendo a la Asamblea Parlamentaria Euromediterránea como lo que debe ser: la expresión parlamentaria, ciudadana en esta Unión.

Eso sí, hay que darle a la APEM lo que merece: labores de consulta, de control y de propuesta. La Unión por el Mediterráneo tiene que basarse en la cogestión, debe tener financiación suficiente y debe centrarse en la integración regional y en la satisfacción de las necesidades ciudadanas: así podremos ser capaces de construir un Mediterráneo de paz, de solidaridad y también de alianza de civilizaciones.

3-153

Marios Matsakis, *on behalf of the ALDE Group*. – Mr President, I also wish to congratulate Ms Napoletano, not only on the excellent report she has produced, but also for the valuable cooperation she has offered to the shadow rapporteurs. The subject matter of the report is extremely important as it deals with the prospect of having a Euro-Mediterranean Union of states bound together through friendship and cooperation and aiming at the common goal of achieving peace, stability and prosperity for their citizens.

This is not an easy task, not least because regional conflicts such as the Israeli-Palestinian problem are not easy to resolve – or even to cope with, sometimes. Nevertheless, hope must never be given up and the Union for the Mediterranean can only be of help in keeping such hope alive. And who knows? Perhaps it would help to turn hope into reality in the form of long-term stability and lasting solutions to regional problems.

It is important to note in this debate the valuable contribution made to the initiation of the proposed project by the French Government, and it is also important to reiterate that the formation of the Union for the Mediterranean is not offered as an alternative to Turkey's planned accession to the EU. We should make sure that the Turkish people know and understand that there is no such hidden aim or trickery.

Finally, with regard to the amendments before us, the ALDE Group, with the PSE Group, have agreed on five compromise amendments aiming to improve further the report. The additional five amendments submitted by the GUE/NGL Group are not thought to be very helpful and will not be supported by my group.

My congratulations once again to the rapporteur.

3-154

Salvatore Tatarella, *a nome del gruppo UEN*. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, esprimo il mio più convinto sostegno ad ogni iniziativa tesa al potenziamento dell'Unione per il Mediterraneo.

In quest'ottica auspico il rafforzamento del ruolo parlamentare dell'Assemblea parlamentare euro-mediterranea, anche attraverso l'intensificazione delle relazioni con i partner mediterranei, la possibilità di presentare raccomandazioni alle riunioni dei Ministri degli Affari esteri, la partecipazione come osservatore alle riunioni dei capi di Stato e di governo, dei Ministri nonché alle riunioni preparatorie degli alti funzionari.

Sottolineo la necessità di rafforzare il ruolo e le iniziative del Fondo euro-mediterraneo di investimento e partenariato e la creazione di una Banca euro-mediterranea per gli investimenti da tempo annunciata e non ancora realizzata.

Apprezzo la proposta di creare, sullo schema delle omologhe istituzioni europee, un'Assemblea euro-mediterranea delle comunità regionali e locali, al fine di ottenere un maggior coinvolgimento delle regioni e delle città, e un Comitato economico e sociale euro-mediterraneo per il coinvolgimento delle parti sociali e delle organizzazioni della società civile.

Accolgo con grande favore anche la proposta di creare una Comunità euro-mediterranea dell'energia, nel quadro di una politica tesa a realizzare progetti su ampia scala nei settori delle energie rinnovabili e delle infrastrutture energetiche.

Auspico inoltre un ruolo dell'Unione sempre più efficace nella ricerca della pace, nella risoluzione dei conflitti, nel rafforzamento della democrazia, nella difesa della libertà religiosa e nella lotta al terrorismo, al traffico di stupefacenti, alla criminalità organizzata e alla tratta di esseri umani.

L'Unione, infine, non può sottrarsi al compito di gestire in uno con tutti gli Stati interessati le politiche e i flussi migratori nell'area del Mediterraneo, da attuare non più e non soltanto in termini di sicurezza, legalità e repressione dell'immigrazione clandestina, ma anche e soprattutto in termini di politiche attive, fonti di regole condivise e di mirata e durevole occupazione.

3-155

David Hammerstein, *en nombre del Grupo Verts/ALE*. – Gracias, señora Napoletano, por este excelente informe. Unos dos días antes de estallar la guerra en Gaza estuve representando al Parlamento y la APEM en Jordania, en la última conferencia ministerial que tuvo lugar antes de que se suspendiesen las actividades por la violencia en Oriente Próximo, otra vez. Era una conferencia sobre el agua; era una conferencia ministerial sobre una de las cuestiones clave donde tiene que haber cooperación por todo el Mediterráneo, que va a crear conflictos, que es una cuestión de supervivencia, que es también objetivo de grandes proyectos posibles que implican energía solar, que implican transferencia de agua, muchas cosas, en el Mediterráneo.

Así de crucial es. Esas actividades han quedado en suspenso y yo espero que haya pronto una continuación de las actividades de la Unión para el Mediterráneo y que haya progresos en el Oriente Próximo.

Hemos tenido unos objetivos muy ambiciosos en el Mediterráneo. Los resultados han sido mucho más modestos, sobre todo en los ámbitos de derechos humanos, democracia y medio ambiente.

Tenemos que fomentar también el mercado Sur-Sur, la colaboración entre los países del Sur, y no sólo obsesionarnos con un gran mercado libre del Mediterráneo, que no está precedido por cooperación entre países que tienen conflictos enquistados, uno tras otro.

Al mismo tiempo, tenemos que enfrentarnos a la crisis energética. Y la crisis energética, la crisis económica actual, puede ser una oportunidad para avanzar con proyectos muy importantes, tanto para Europa como para los vecinos del Sur, como son la proyección de plantas termosolares (de energía solar de alta temperatura) y la creación de redes inteligentes y limpias que conecten el norte de África, Oriente Próximo y Europa en un gran proyecto limpio que lucha contra el cambio climático y lucha contra la crisis económica.

3-156

Willy Meyer Pleite, *en nombre del Grupo GUE/NGL*. – Señor Presidente, en primer lugar quisiera agradecer el trabajo de la señora Napoletano. En segundo lugar, decirles que como ponente alternativo he solicitado a mi grupo que no se vote favorablemente a este informe, y ello por dos razones fundamentales.

En primer lugar, porque el conflicto último, la última agresión israelí sobre Gaza es de tal magnitud, que no puede quedar impune. Todo tiene un límite, no es la primera vez, pero es de tal magnitud esta agresión sobre la soberanía palestina, que impide realmente la concreción del acuerdo de Annapolis y que impide un horizonte de la creación del Estado palestino, que es la única posibilidad de tener una Unión por el Mediterráneo en paz y solidaridad.

La segunda razón por la que he recomendado que no votemos favorablemente es porque a la hora de abordar la zona de libre comercio no se tienen en cuenta las asimetrías. Para nosotros es una cuestión fundamental que se tengan en cuenta los aspectos comerciales en el trato de igual a igual, teniendo en cuenta las asimetrías regionales y las características particulares de cada país.

3-157

Luca Romagnoli (NI). – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, credo che voterò invece favorevolmente a questa proposta di risoluzione della collega, perché mi appare senz'altro strategica l'individuazione di grandi progetti da realizzare e mi sembra altrettanto utile sottolineare che per realizzarli bisogna, in qualche modo, adottare una formula di accordo di programma, che siano comunque ispirati – e questo ci tengo a sottolinearlo – al principio di sussidiarietà.

Francamente mi trovo un po' perplesso a proposito dell'invito a dare il nuovo slancio alla gestione delle politiche migratorie comuni, anche se riconosco che l'importanza della collaborazione tra gli Stati membri, e non solo, e i paesi della sponda meridionale appunto del Mediterraneo sia senz'altro importante e da implementare.

Ho anche qualche perplessità, francamente, sulle iniziative economiche e commerciali volte a consentire la realizzazione nella zona euro-mediterranea di libero scambio. Questo non per pregiudizio, ma perché vorrei che fosse un po' più chiaro come esse possano essere reciprocamente vantaggiose.

3-158

Ioannis Kasoulides (PPE-DE). – Mr President, first of all I would like to congratulate Ms Napoletano on her report. Certainly the Union for the Mediterranean is a significant step forward in the efforts for the Euro-Mediterranean partnership. One of the impediments to this partnership so far has been visibility: the capability of the populations of the partners to acknowledge the impact of the Barcelona Process and our Union for the Mediterranean.

Let me give you an example. When I was asked to prepare a report on de-pollution of the Mediterranean, the programmes involved are the following: the Mediterranean Hotspot Investment Programme, the Strategy for Water in the Mediterranean, the EU Marine Strategy, the UNEP/MAP, the Mediterranean Strategy for Sustainable Development, the Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme, the Mediterranean EU water initiative and the MYIS, which have been running under the umbrella of the Horizon 2020 programme. This fragmentation makes visibility suffer.

The other impediment is the Middle East problem. I salute the position of Mr Solana that the Quartet will this time operate in a different way to the past. This is not due to the lack of will on the part of the European Union, but due to the previous policy of the American Administration. I hope that, this time, with the dispatch of Mr Mitchell to the area, political progress will be made. We have done a lot on this issue. I visited Lebanon very recently, and I saw there that UNIFIL, with the presence of the European contingents, makes a repeat of hostilities in southern Lebanon and Israel impossible.

3-159

Jamila Madeira (PSE). – Obrigada à colega Napoletano pelo excelente relatório. Catorze anos após Barcelona e cinco anos após a primeira Assembleia Parlamentar Euro-Mediterrânica, temos a União para o Mediterrâneo com poder económico, com poder parlamentar, com sociedade civil, com os chefes de governo a decidir em conjunto. Todos com vontade de fazer mais e melhor no território onde 720 milhões de cidadãos representam um potencial de desenvolvimento e de paz para o mundo. Cingir-nos apenas ao lado económico e empresarial é um erro claro. Dar resposta às crises de crescimento exige naturalmente resposta política, mas dar resposta às crises humanitárias, a situações de emergência e a crises militares como a que se viveu no fim de 2008, princípio de 2009 é crucial.

Os políticos e os cidadãos têm que dar respostas aos problemas do mundo. O mundo pediu-lhes respostas e meses depois continuamos ainda, cidadãos e políticos, designadamente numa plataforma como a União para o Mediterrâneo, a tardar a reagir. Espero que, no mínimo, este momento tenha servido para aprender e avançar, pois só aprende quem erra, mas avançar na agilização da reacção é absolutamente crucial.

3-160

Miguel Portas (GUE/NGL). – A Comissária Ferrero-Waldner sintetizou na sua intervenção os objectivos da nova União. Na verdade, esta União nasceu durante a Presidência francesa sob o signo dos equívocos. Primeiro equívoco: removeu da sua agenda os conflitos da região, em particular o israelo-palestiniano e do Sara Ocidental. Segundo equívoco: quer afirmar-se através da partilha de projectos económicos e ambientais, sem questionar o contexto de livre comércio em que decorre. Terceiro equívoco: insinua a possibilidade de transferir para esta União o pedido de adesão da Turquia à União Europeia.

O relatório da colega Pasqualina não enfrenta o primeiro equívoco, e esse é o seu limite. Nenhuma integração económica e regional verá a luz do dia se a política não tiver a coragem de abordar os conflitos existentes e de o fazer na base do direito internacional. Em contrapartida o relatório contém recomendações claras sobre o segundo e o terceiro dos equívocos, e essas vão todas na boa direcção.

A União para o Mediterrâneo não pode ser a sala de espera ou a porta dos fundos para a Turquia, desde que esta cumpra os critérios de adesão, e a União para o Mediterrâneo não pode ser um adicional da estratégia europeia de comércio livre amputado de políticas de integração no plano social.

As recomendações do relatório são importantes – uma União com dimensão cidadã e representativa que envolva a Liga Árabe; projectos regionais com dimensão social; alargamento dos projectos a domínios essenciais para a vida das pessoas: água, agricultura, educação. Há ainda regras claras nos acordos-programa e um banco Euro-Mediterrânico.

A União nasceu equívoca, mas ela aí está. Apoio este relatório porque acredito que esta União acabará por ser o que conseguirmos fazer dela. Dou-lhe o benefício da vontade.

3-161

Luís Queiró (PPE-DE). – Uma larga parte das questões com maior importância política para a Europa passa pela Bacia do Mediterrâneo. A iniciativa "União para o Mediterrâneo" é, pois, merecedora do nosso apoio, na medida em que pode dar um novo impulso a um processo que é necessário e útil, mas que não tem tido nem o sucesso nem a visibilidade necessários. A questão que se coloca é de saber como é que podemos prosseguir esta estratégia. O modelo seguido em Barcelona não teve os resultados esperados. Poderá esta nova parceria resultar?

O relatório da nossa colega Napoletano vai ao encontro desta percepção. Mas desejamos que a União não venha a sofrer do mesmo mal que tem afectado o processo de Barcelona. Aparentemente muitos projectos, muitas áreas de intervenção, mas uma deficiente hierarquização das prioridades. Relegar para o 26.º parágrafo do relatório a compreensão social e cultural entre os povos das duas margens, deixar o tema da democratização e promoção dos direitos humanos para o parágrafo 27.º e os fluxos migratórios para o 28.º, depois de muito se falar sobre outros sectores e outras temas, é dar um sinal errado do que são, ou devem ser, as prioridades desta parceria.

Importa ter uma estratégia clara. Em nossa opinião essa estratégia deve passar por oferecer mais benefícios, mais cooperação aos nossos vizinhos, mas também por pedir-lhes mais resultados, nos planos económico, social e democrático, e concentrar-nos em sectores bem definidos, porventura em menor número, para evitar que todas as áreas sejam igualmente prioritárias correndo o risco de que nenhuma o seja afinal. E, claro, fazendo-o com o suporte e enquadramento financeiro adequados. O reconhecimento da necessidade de um banco de investimento para o Mediterrâneo tem finalmente de ter uma resposta favorável. É preciso ser ambicioso, o que significa fazer bem o que está ao nosso alcance.

Por último, Sr. Presidente, uma palavra sobre o conflito no Médio Oriente. Este processo, não sendo uma alternativa às negociações de paz, pode e deve ser um contributo para o melhor entendimento, a interdependência e o respeito mútuo entre os beligerantes. Estes são factores essenciais – todos bem o sabemos – para a pacificação da região.

3-162

Przewodniczący. – Lista mówców została w ten sposób wyczerpana. Informuję, że z sali zgłosiły się do wystąpienia 4 osoby.

3-163

Christopher Beazley (PPE-DE). – Mr President, would the Commissioner, in her reply to Parliament, explain exactly how the newly phrased 'Union for the Mediterranean' – as opposed to 'Mediterranean Union' – remains an EU policy? I think it is very important that she also considers two other EU seas: the Black Sea, and its synergy, and the Baltic Sea, and its strategy.

My country has an interest in the Mediterranean. I think we have observer status too. Member States are Commonwealth members, and – though I do not wish to irritate my Spanish colleagues – Gibraltar, as far as I know, still is technically part of Her Majesty's Dominions.

It is very important that this is not just some sort of regional hive-off in which the rest of the EU is not fully involved – as I hope they will be fully involved in the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea.

3-164

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE). – Dezvoltarea economică și socială, prosperitatea cetățenilor din statele din Uniunea pentru Mediterană trebuie să fie una sustenabilă. Consider că noua creație Uniune pentru Mediterană trebuie să abordeze și problema schimbărilor climatice.

În regiunea euro-mediteraneană trăiesc aproximativ un miliard de cetățeni ce realizează o treime din produsul intern brut mondial. Amenințările la adresa mediului înconjurător constituie domeniul în care colaborarea regională este cea mai necesară.

Creșterea populației și reducerea precipitațiilor în această regiune, datorate schimbărilor climatice, fac ca apa potabilă să fie unul din principalele elemente aflate în pericol în această zonă. Lipsa apei, poluarea apei, lipsa stațiilor de epurare, marea negre rezultate în urma accidentelor maritime, tăierea pădurilor și eroziunea solului trebuie să facă parte din preocupările parteneriatului pentru Mediterană.

Consider că una dintre principalele valori promovate de Uniunea pentru Mediterană trebuie să fie protecția mediului și lupta împotriva schimbărilor climatice, atât în ceea ce privește adaptarea la acestea, cât și reducerea cauzelor care contribuie la acestea.

3-165

Marie Anne Isler Béguin (Verts/ALE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Ministre, Madame la Commissaire, je voulais également remercier Mme Napoletano car, lors de la première discussion sur l'Union pour la Méditerranée, j'étais plutôt sceptique, et, bien que je le sois encore, je considère aujourd'hui qu'il y a un espoir.

Les défis sont absolument considérables, énormes. Avons-nous les moyens d'y faire face? Nous savons que nous ne les avons pas. Les objectifs sont, certes, nobles: environnement, énergie, lutte contre la désertification, immigration, etc. Mais il ne faudrait pas sombrer dans ce qu'on appellerait une liste à la Prévert qui ne laisserait que des déçus de l'autre côté de la Méditerranée.

Mais, si vous me le permettez, Madame la Commissaire, je voudrais parler d'un pays particulier qui ne se trouve pas en bordure de la Méditerranée mais qui a été intégré, qui est un pays ACP et qui est également membre de l'Union pour la Méditerranée. Ce pays, qui est la Mauritanie, traverse aujourd'hui une crise politique très grave et je pense qu'en tant que partenaire de l'Union pour la Méditerranée, en tant que pays ACP et au nom de la politique de voisinage, ce pays mérite que nous le soutenions pour l'aider à sortir de cette crise.

Je crois que c'est ce que nous demandent les deux parties au conflit et qu'il est de notre responsabilité de nous engager afin de les aider à sortir de cette crise politique majeure.

3-166

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Mr President, water is a key issue of cooperation across the Mediterranean. So too, I hope, is a pan-European super-grid, or HVDC interconnection, including a connector between Spain and the north-western coast of Africa.

It is of critical importance to mainstream the use of renewable energy including wind, hydro, various solar technologies and others. Being able to rely on it at peak demand depends entirely on spreading the input into our grids from as many sources as possible so that the output can always respond to demand. If the wind is not blowing off the north-west coast of Ireland – and Ireland has been described as the Saudi Arabia of Europe in terms of wind energy! – it will be off the north-west coast of Africa, or the solar thermal operations in the Mediterranean, especially Spain, will be feeding the grid, or the range of PV installations across the region will be inputting.

This scenario is a win-win for the Mediterranean region, for energy security, for energy politics and above all for serious regional decrease in our carbon dioxide emissions from our current dependence on fossil fuels for industries, transport and heating and cooling.

3-167

Przewodniczący. – Dotarła do nas pani poseł Figueiredo, który przedstawi opinię Komisji Praw Kobiet i Równouprawnienia, jako zgłaszająca się z sali (procedura *Catch the Eye*).

3-168

Ilda Figueiredo, relatora de parecer da Comissão dos Direitos da Mulher e da Igualdade de Oportunidades. – No parecer da Comissão dos Direitos da Mulher salientou-se a necessidade de dar maior atenção, por parte de todos os Estados-Membros, à ratificação da Convenção sobre a Eliminação de Todas as Formas de Discriminação Contra as Mulheres, bem como de todos os outros instrumentos da ONU e da Organização Internacional do Trabalho no domínio dos direitos humanos. E também foi dada atenção à situação das mulheres, lamentando que a posição da comunicação da Comissão não lhe tenha dado uma especial atenção, designadamente na dimensão "projectos", onde deve incluir a promoção da coesão geográfica, económica e social e deve ter sempre em conta a questão da igualdade de oportunidades entre homens e mulheres e a perspectiva do género.

Por último queria só sublinhar ainda a preocupação com a pobreza e a exclusão social, que atinge fundamentalmente as mulheres. Deixo aqui uma última palavra para os casos graves da Palestina e do Sara Ocidental, onde as mulheres e as crianças são as principais vítimas da guerra, da exploração, enfim de todo o processo de discriminação que atinge estes povos e que atinge, fundamentalmente, as mulheres e as crianças.

3-169

Alexandr Vondra, President-in-Office of the Council. – Mr President, first of all, thank you very much for this useful debate, which brought forward a number of ideas. You have prepared a really interesting document.

Where are we now? We know why we are doing this: the Mediterranean region is the cradle of our civilisation and therefore it is logical that we in the European Union want to give it special attention. Last year there was a French initiative, and we need to keep this process in motion and to develop its full potential.

So we know why we are doing this and what we want to achieve. Many of you have stressed how important it is that the Mediterranean becomes an area of peace, stability and security, where democratic principles, human rights and fundamental freedoms – including gender equality and the role of women in society – are upheld and fully respected.

We also know how we want to achieve that, so we have the Union for the Mediterranean and a broad spectrum of activities. You are very well aware of the most important areas, the emphasis on renewables, the solar programme and the water management programme. I was in Portugal just a week ago and that country could serve as an example of how to

develop a sustainable, dynamic programme for a renewable source of energy, which is very important for the Mediterranean region.

We just need to move. When we met last year, both in Paris and in Marseilles, we could not have anticipated the situation that would arise in Gaza, but the Presidency, together with the Commission, is doing enough to be able to start with the implementation of all the agreements which we reached last year. So I think we can reasonably expect to move on after the end of March, as I informed you, with the latest activity of the Presidency.

The programme of our activities for 2009 is very substantial: about nine sectoral ministerial conferences are scheduled. There are the resources, which, as far as I know, come to over EUR 1 billion. So I think we are ready. There are certain realities related to the situation in Gaza which have caused some delays, but I believe we will be able to overcome that.

Thank you very much for a useful debate. We are certainly ready to assist you further.

3-170

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, *Membre de la Commission*. – Monsieur le Président, chers membres du Parlement, il reste beaucoup à dire, naturellement, mais je vais commencer par la question suivante: quelle est la dimension communautaire de tout cela?

Premièrement, je peux vous dire que la dimension communautaire est importante dans ce dossier, car le projet de l'Union pour la Méditerranée se base sur le processus de Barcelone, mais a également hérité de l'acquis du processus de Barcelone. Alors tout l'acquis est là. Nous avons beaucoup travaillé là-dessus.

Deuxièmement, l'Union pour la Méditerranée s'inscrit dans le cadre de la politique de voisinage. La politique de voisinage représente la politique bilatérale et le processus de Barcelone, et aujourd'hui l'Union pour la Méditerranée constitue la partie multilatérale. Naturellement, je peux vous dire aussi que la mer Noire et la mer Baltique s'inscrivent exactement dans le même cadre, mais au Nord. Alors ne vous inquiétez pas, heureusement, tout est là. C'est effectivement ce que la Présidence française voulait, à savoir partager la coprésidence avec les pays de la Méditerranée – je l'avais dit avant – et travailler ensemble.

Maintenant, nous – la Commission – gérons aussi tous les projets communautaires futurs, parce que c'est nécessaire et parce que nous sommes aussi sous le contrôle du Parlement. Seuls les projets devant éventuellement être financés par des fonds privés sont gérés d'une autre façon.

Le secrétariat, qui se trouvera à Barcelone, fera la promotion des projets. C'est ainsi que nous concevons la promotion, ensuite nous essaierons la promotion par des fonds privés parce que, pour le reste, cela restera du ressort de la Commission. La décision sera prise tout d'abord par les vingt-sept, comme toujours, et après, de nouveau, la coprésidence aura la possibilité de travailler en coopération avec les cent-quarante-trois, le Sud et le Nord.

Quant à la Mauritanie, chère Madame Isler Béguin, elle participe simplement aux relations multilatérales, à savoir l'Union pour la Méditerranée, mais n'est pas concernée par la politique de voisinage. C'est toute la différence.

Ayant dit cela, je peux ajouter que, malgré cette suspension momentanée, nous travaillons à la Commission dans un esprit constructif, naturellement, pour mettre en œuvre les quatre à six projets qui ont été mis en avant comme étant prioritaires, à savoir la protection civile, la dépollution de la mer Méditerranée, les autoroutes maritimes et aussi un plan solaire, Madame, dans le cadre duquel nous travaillons beaucoup sur l'énergie renouvelable, solaire notamment, parce que cette dernière, ainsi que l'énergie éolienne et d'autres sources d'énergie, sont très importantes.

Au total, l'Union pour la Méditerranée pourra dès lors bénéficier d'un soutien financier de 60 millions d'euros sur le budget 2008-2009 à travers, notamment, des programmes régionaux. Par ailleurs, 50 millions d'euros ont déjà été engagés sur le Fonds d'investissement de voisinage, pour soutenir des projets d'investissement dans la région.

Nous avons également voulu accompagner la promotion des échanges universitaires et c'est ainsi que, par exemple, j'ai décidé d'étendre le programme Erasmus Mundus aux pays du sud de la Méditerranée pour leur offrir des bourses universitaires supplémentaires.

Pour la question des femmes, Madame, nous nous en occupons naturellement aussi puisqu'elle figure dans l'acquis de Barcelone. Je me souviens, j'étais à la première conférence des femmes pour la Méditerranée, qui s'est tenue en 2007 à Istanbul; nous continuons bien sûr à traiter cette question.

Mais il y a toujours, comme vous le savez, d'un côté, l'aspect bilatéral, concernant les relations avec chaque pays et, de l'autre, l'aspect multilatéral, qui est maintenant au cœur des préoccupations de l'Union pour la Méditerranée.

Un mot, rapidement, à propos du secrétariat: nous envisageons la création d'un comité rédactionnel qui sera prochainement chargé notamment de préparer les statuts juridiques du secrétariat. La Commission a déjà bien progressé dans les travaux préparatoires. Ces statuts conféreront une personnalité juridique au secrétariat; ensuite, ils devront être approuvés formellement par les hauts fonctionnaires de l'Union pour la Méditerranée.

Pour conclure, je souhaiterais vous dire encore une fois que la participation de l'APEM en tant qu'observateur à toutes les réunions de l'Union pour la Méditerranée est très importante et nous soutenons le renforcement de ce rôle au sein de l'Union pour la Méditerranée. D'ailleurs, quand Mme Kratsa s'est rendue à Marseille, nous l'avons beaucoup soutenue sur ce point.

Je crois que j'ai évoqué les points les plus importants. Naturellement, il reste beaucoup à dire sur le sujet.

3-171

Pasqualina Napoletano, relatrice. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, signora Commissario, signor Presidente del Consiglio, credo che questo dibattito sia stato molto utile e abbia anche chiarito alcuni aspetti di questa situazione, abbastanza complicata, degli strumenti che noi abbiamo di partenariato bilaterale e multilaterale con i paesi del sud.

Io mi compiaccio dei chiarimenti che la Commissaria ha dato, sottolineando che l'*acquis* di Barcellona rimane per intero e che forse noi come Parlamento avremmo preferito, proprio per questo, la prima definizione che era: "Processo di Barcellona: Unione per il Mediterraneo". Questo forse avrebbe reso più chiaro che noi rafforzavamo un sistema che però aveva già una sua base.

Così come io mi auguro – lo dico molto apertamente, io non sarò più relatrice – che lo stesso quadro istituzionale per quanto riguarda l'Europa possa essere suscettibile di una evoluzione. Perché? Perché quando noi avremo il Ministro degli Esteri europeo, e quindi le funzioni della Commissione e quelle del Consiglio saranno in qualche modo rappresentate da questa figura, io mi auguro che questa figura non sia il 28° Ministro degli Esteri che si aggiunge agli altri ma che, almeno per la parte europea, gli Stati membri si sentano rappresentati da questa figura. Quindi forse non ci sarà bisogno di moltiplicare Stati, Unione, ma diciamo di avere anche con la figura dell'Alto rappresentante Ministro degli Esteri un consolidamento della funzione dell'Unione europea, cosa a cui tutti abbiamo lavorato. Per cui sosteniamo senz'altro il fatto che non solo i programmi regionali debbano rimanere, ma come la Commissaria sa il Parlamento tiene molto a questi programmi che hanno dato forse migliori risultati.

Grazie a tutti per questa discussione.

3-172

Przewodniczący. – Zamykam debatę.

Głosowanie odbędzie się w czwartek 19 lutego 2009 r.

Oświadczenia pisemne (art. 142)

3-173

Lidia Joanna Geringer de Oedenberg (PSE), na piśmie. – Bliskie partnerstwo między Unią Europejską i krajami basenu Morza Śródziemnego powinno być oparte przede wszystkim na poszanowaniu praw człowieka i zasady państwa prawa. „Proces barceloński: Unia na rzecz Regionu Morza Śródziemnego”, przyjęty w Paryżu 13 lipca 2008 r., jest wkładem w zapewnienie pokoju i dobrobytu i może stanowić ważny krok naprzód ku integracji gospodarczej i terytorialnej, a także ku współpracy związanej z ochroną środowiska i klimatem.

Szkoda, że od momentu rozpoczęcia procesu barcelońskiego nie poczyniono konkretnych postępów w niektórych krajach partnerskich, dotyczących przyjęcia i poszanowania niektórych wspólnych wartości i zasad wyraźnie zapisanych w deklaracji barcelońskiej z 1995 r., którą kraje te podpisały (szczególnie w zakresie demokracji, praw człowieka i zasady państwa prawa).

W krajach basenu Morza Śródziemnego niepokojącym zjawiskiem jest ponadto ubóstwo i wykluczenie społeczne, dotyczące przede wszystkim kobiety i dzieci. Niezbędne jest, aby państwa członkowskie i partnerzy zaangażowani w proces barceloński kładli nacisk na włączenie wymiaru płci do wszystkich polityk i konkretnych środków promujących równouprawnienie kobiet i mężczyzn. Wszystkie państwa uczestniczące w inicjatywie „Proces Barceloński - Unia na rzecz Regionu Morza Śródziemnego” powinny jak najszybciej ratyfikować Konwencję w sprawie eliminacji wszelkich form dyskryminacji kobiet (CEDAW) oraz wszystkich innych instrumentów ONZ i Światowej Organizacji Pracy z zakresu praw człowieka.

3-174

Tunne Kelam (PPE-DE), in writing. – I welcome the efforts made to further develop the EU's relations in the Euromed region. But I would like also to underline that the EU should not neglect its two other seas – the Baltic Sea and the Black Sea. The Baltic Sea strategy will be one of the priorities under the Swedish Presidency. Also the Black Sea synergy carries

strategic importance. The EU has to take care and find a common spirit in developing all these regions in balanced manner. The EU is an integrated community and the long-term strategic development of all its regions has equal importance.

There is clearly a need to have a close partnership with non-EU countries in the Mediterranean based on respect for human rights and the rule of law. Regrettably there are still several countries that have serious problems in this domain. I urge the EU Member States to address these issues with the utmost seriousness.

Involving the Arab League is a significant opportunity to bring all states together to jointly find solutions for conflicts in the region. I call on the EU Member States to take a balanced stand and play the role of negotiator rather than taking sides in different conflict situations. Only by being balanced can we contribute to achieving long-term peace in Middle-East.

3-175

21 - Jednominutowe wypowiedzi w znaczących kwestiach politycznych

3-176

President. – The next item is the one-minute speeches on matters of political importance.

3-177

Csaba Sógor (PPE-DE). – Romániában a Székelyföld autonómiája több évszázados múlttal rendelkezik. A modern román állam megszületési alapokmánya garantálta a székelyföldi területi autonómiát, amely a kommunista időkben is létezett.

Figyelembe véve az Európai Unió országainak biztosított autonómiaformákat, 2009. február 8-án Sepsiszentgyörgyön, több ezres tömeg követelte, hogy az államelnök vonja vissza az erdélyi magyarokat sértő kijelentéseit, biztosítsák az etnikai arányos képviseletet az állami intézményekben, állítsák le az irányított betelepítéseket, állítsák meg a székelyföldi gazdaság szándékos elsovasztását, gyorsítottan szolgáltatassák vissza az elkobzott egyházi és közösségi vagyont, állítsák le a militarizált egységek bővítését, hozzák létre az állami támogatású önálló magyar egyetemet, ismerjék el a magyar nyelvet regionális hivatalos nyelvként és ismerjék el a kollektív jogokat és a Székelyföld területi autonómiáját.

3-178

Илияна Малинова Йотова (PSE). – Трябва да поздравим Долната камара на чешкия парламент с ратифицирането на Лисабонския договор: още една победа на европейската идея, още едно доказателство, че все повече хора вярват в европейските ценности. И затова призовавам да се разграничим от всеки, който посяга на тези ценности и разрушава вярата ни в тях.

Как можем от една страна да записваме основните ни права със златни букви в Хартата, а от друга да търпим те да се пренебрегват и отричат? Говорим за етническа и религиозна толерантност, за правата на възрастните хора за достоен живот и активно участие в него. Едновременно лидер на партия в България, пълноправен член на Европейската народна партия, прокарва разделителни линии между етноси и възрасти, внушава различно качество хора. Какво да е отношението ни към такива лидери? И въпросът ми е към дясната страна на тази зала, защото президентът на ЕНП, г-н Martens, препоръчва този човек да бъде следващият премиер-министър на моята страна. Нека да отхвърлим двойните стандарти и да зачитаме собствените си действия и думи, и да си припомним, че човешките права са ни събрали преди повече от 50 години.

3-179

Филиз Хакъева Хюсменова (ALDE). – Европейският икономически план за възстановяване от финансовата криза е факт. Проблемът с кризата е общ, но се забеляза протекционизъм, стимулиране на родните индустрии и кадри. Подлага се на изпитания основната свобода на движение на работна ръка и свободната търговия. Кризата се развива в страните по различен начин. В очертаващите се преди време икономически тигри на Европейския съюз, сред които и България, банковата система е сравнително стабилна, безработицата не е висока, има висококвалифицирани кадри, стабилност на валутата. Призовавам с оглед на динамиката на кризата, планът за възстановяване да се актуализира към по-голяма координация с реалната икономика. В условия на криза, капиталът търси нискорискови зони и могат да се влагат пари в нови технологии на зелена поляна, а не в нежизнени производства. Трябва да се използва възможността на последните изпадащи в рецесия да се възродят първи и с помощта на тези финанси и ноухау да станат центрове на стабилност, около които по-бързо да се възстановява икономическата и финансова система на Европейския съюз.

3-180

Andrzej Tomasz Zapalowski (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! W dobie rozszerzającego się kryzysu chciałbym pogratulować Komisji Europejskiej zniszczenia polskich stoczni. Egoistyczne podejście elit europejskich, ich radość z powodu utraty pracy przez ponad 100 tys. osób w stoczniach i firmach z nimi współpracujących spowoduje zapewne, iż w najbliższym czasie duża część tych pracowników zjawi się na rynku pracy w Europie Zachodniej. Przecież ta decyzja tylko pogłębiła europejski kryzys.

Jestem ciekaw, jak zachowają się elity europejskie, czy wykażą solidarność z państwami członkowskimi, w których kryzys przybiera ogromną skalę, czy też zajmą się tylko i wyłącznie swoimi interesami. Właśnie w dobie kryzysu społeczeństwo

europiejskie zobaczy, czy deklaracje i zasady, które legły u podstaw powstania Unii Europejskiej są prawdziwe, czy tylko i wyłącznie jest to gra jednych państw przeciw drugim wewnątrz instytucji mającej szczytne założenia. W tym kontekście dziwi mnie brak reakcji Komisji na obecne działania wielu członków Unii łamiących obowiązujące zasady, za które ukarana została Polska.

3-181

Rebecca Harms (Verts/ALE). – Mr President, I received some strange news from Northern Ireland last week. It was that Mr Sammy Wilson, the Environment Minister in the regional government, banned a UK information campaign organised by the UK Government on energy efficiency. I cannot believe that the good reasons behind our common climate and energy targets – 20% less CO₂, 20% renewables and 20% more energy efficiency – are not accepted in the regional government of a Member State.

I am therefore asking the Commission to find out what the reasons are behind this strange and quite bizarre ban in Northern Ireland. I think even a climate sceptic like Mr Wilson should take care of citizens and support energy efficiency and efforts to decrease the energy bill.

3-182

Ilda Figueiredo (GUE/NGL). – Gostaria hoje de trazer aqui uma situação escandalosa da Corticeira Amorim, em Portugal, cujos lucros, no conjunto dos dois últimos anos, foram superiores a 30 milhões de euros, sendo que mais de 6 milhões se registaram em 2008. No entanto, este mês a corticeira Amorim anunciou o despedimento de cerca de 200 trabalhadores, alegando o efeito da crise, esquecendo que foram eles quem ajudou a construir o grupo que vale muitos milhões e que recebeu apoios públicos, incluindo fundos comunitários, para os milhões de lucros que continua a ter. Por isso, aqui deixo o meu protesto e indignação contra este anúncio de despedimento, que é um escândalo, e espero que todos se associem no repúdio a este aproveitamento da crise para despedir trabalhadores mesmo quando as empresas continuam a manter lucros elevados.

3-183

IN THE CHAIR: Edward McMILLAN-SCOTT
Vice-President

3-184

President. – Just before I call the next speaker, let me announce with pleasure that Dr Ayman Nour, the Egyptian parliamentarian who was imprisoned some years ago for reasons which the EU Council said were not serious, has been released today. He has been the subject of many resolutions in the European Parliament, so I am very pleased to announce that he has now been released.

3-185

Bernard Wojciechowski (IND/DEM). – Panie Przewodniczący! Polska wybiera posłów do Parlamentu Europejskiego, lecz ich możliwości działania w kraju są ograniczone. Ich pozycja prawna jest bardzo słaba. Polskie ustawodawstwo nie przyznaje posłom do Parlamentu Europejskiego żadnych instrumentów prawnych zapewniających skuteczne wykonywanie mandatu. Dotyczy to kwestii tak istotnych, jak wywieranie skutecznego wpływu na organy administracji rządowej i samorządu terytorialnego.

Posłowie i senatorowie polskiego parlamentu mają szereg uprawnień: możliwość uzyskiwania informacji od podmiotów państwowych, interweniowanie w organach administracji rządowej i samorządu, ustawowy czternastodniowy termin na odpowiedź w kwestii interwencji poselskiej. Z europosem rzadko kto się w Polsce liczy, z wyjątkiem mediów, które szukają taniej sensacji. Na stronie internetowej poinformowałem wyborców o braku możliwości ustawowych form działania przez europosłów. Niechlujność legislacyjna kolejnych ekip prawodawczych w Polsce jest w tym wypadku znana. Uważam, że Parlament Europejski powinien domagać się większych możliwości działania dla swoich przedstawicieli na terenie krajowym.

3-186

Jim Allister (NI). – Mr President, EU funds distributed by the lottery of ‘first come, first served’ is wrong. Yet that is what we have seen in Northern Ireland this week. The minister who decided on cavalier distribution of EU rural development funds on this basis, leading to the demeaning and bizarre spectacle of farmers queuing for two days to get some of their own modulated money back, is a minister not fit to hold office. In that, at a stroke, she both humiliated hard-working farmers and displayed crass ignorance of basic requirements for the distribution of EU funds.

The source of this embarrassment is the wanton refusal of the minister to allocate sufficient funds to rural development. The pitiful GBP 50 million she put into Axis 1 – and only GBP 15 million of that into the modernisation fund – is what caused the spectacle of Tuesday.

Let me say on another matter, in defence of Mr Wilson, the Minister of the Environment in Northern Ireland, that I am glad he does not fit the stereotype that unthinking climate-change hysteries expect in this House.

3-187

Colm Burke (PPE-DE). – Mr President, the recent poll in the *Irish Times* on Monday showed growing support for the Lisbon Treaty in Ireland, with 51% of voters now saying they would vote ‘yes’, particularly at this moment of Irish economic fragility. This is an increase of eight points since the last poll was taken by the *Irish Times* in November of last year. The ‘no’ vote has also dropped six points to 33%.

Concerning our current strained relationship with the European Union, in the absence of leadership from the present government, an attempt must be made to address the root causes of the Irish electorate’s periodic disenchantment with the EU. There must be a meaningful engagement with the Irish people to rebuild an understanding of, and support for, the European process. This communication shortfall can be breached by allowing more positive information to flow freely about the advantages of being part of the EU.

I believe it is important that the positive role of Europe must be highlighted through our education systems. This should not apply to Ireland only, but also to all Member States. I would urge that the communication deficit be tackled at the earliest possible date.

3-188

Маруся Иванова Любчева (PSE). – Обръщам внимание на проблема с възобновяването на разкола в българската православна църква. Разколът в църковните среди се зароди в годините на силна политизация в страната, в период, в който българската православна църква, както и много други структури, отстояваха мястото си в демократичното лице на България. За съжаление това доведе до обявяването на т.нар. втори синод на българска православна църква, въпреки българския закон за вероизповеданията. Той е силно либерален и всяко едно вероизповедание може да се регистрира на негово основание, стига да няма антихуманни цели. Но т.нар. втори синод иска регистриране именно като Свети синод на българската православна църква. Законът определя българска православна църква като традиционна за България, неподлежаща на регистрация. Изборът на патриарх и състав на Светия синод не са обект на субекти на правото. Призовавам всички, за които свободата на вероизповеданията в съответствие с личните духовни потребности е ценност да не се влияят от манипулативните определения за т.нар. втори синод. Такъв не може да бъде регистриран и няма право.

3-189

Toomas Savi (ALDE). – Mr President, last week’s elections in Israel showed that the majority of citizens support the parties that see the reinforcement of the military as the best way to protect the country. Even though the centrist party, Kadima, received the largest number of votes, the fact that the right-wing parties now hold 65 seats in the Knesset, compared to 50 in the previous elections, reflects the changing views of the Israeli citizens about the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Those parties are in favour of taking a hard line rather than relying on seemingly endless and ineffective peace talks.

The Middle East must be one of the top priorities in the European Union’s common foreign and security policy and the stability of the whole region depends largely on Israel-Palestinian relations. It is absolutely crucial, therefore, for the European Union to continue pursuing the peace talks and to restore hope to Israelis and Palestinians that a peaceful coexistence is possible.

3-190

Mirosław Mariusz Piotrowski (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! Jutro z wizytą w Parlamencie Europejskim gościł będzie prezydent Czech Vaclav Klaus. Pamiętni skandalu wywołanego na Hradczanach mamy nadzieję, że prezydent państwa sprawującego przewodnictwo w Unii Europejskiej zostanie godnie przyjęty i otoczony należyty szacunkiem. Słuszne opinie wyrażone przez prezydenta Klausa na temat traktatu lizbońskiego próbuje się okryć wrzawą maskującą to, że głównym hamulcowym wprowadzenia traktatu w życie mogą okazać się Niemcy. Kluczowa będzie decyzja Trybunału Konstytucyjnego w Karlsruhe. Połowa jego składu, jak podają media, ma poważne wątpliwości, czy nie narusza on krajowej konstytucji. Pokazuje to, że z tak ważną decyzją nie należy się spieszyć, co dostrzega nie tylko przybywający do nas prezydent Czech.

3-191

László Tőkés (Verts/ALE). – După alegerile din toamnă din România și după formarea guvernului, la fel ca în Slovacia și în România revine în forță în viața politică instigarea antimaghiară.

Demonstrația din 9 februarie din Sfântu Gheorghe, organizată de bisericile maghiare, a protestat tocmai împotriva acestui fenomen. În petiția formulată cu ocazia demonstrației, mii de localnici secui au protestat împotriva schimbării proporțiilor etnice în Țara Secuilor, prin popularea direcționată a regiunii cu grupuri de români din alte zone.

În mod absurd, dl președinte Traian Băsescu a acuzat secuii maghiari de epurare etnică. Paralel cu aceasta, cu ocazia alegerilor pentru primăria Clujului, foile volante ale democrațiilor instigau împotriva candidaților maghiari, folosind aceeași calomnie. După decenii de discriminare și privare de drepturi, cine acuză pe cine?

Doresc să atrag atenția Parlamentului că în România, prin metode subtile, chiar și acum continuă omogenizarea, românizarea Transilvaniei prin metoda schimbării artificiale a proporțiilor etnice.

3-192

Gerard Batten (IND/DEM). – Mr President, on 12 February 2009 the Dutch MP, Geert Wilders, was refused entry to the United Kingdom by order of the Home Secretary. Never before has a democratically elected politician, representing a democratic party from a democratic European country, been denied entry.

It seems odd that the British Government can find the legal means to ban Mr Wilders, but is powerless to prevent the entry of assorted terrorists, political and religious extremists, gangsters, criminals, rapists and paedophiles from the European Union and, indeed, the wider world.

Perhaps Mr Wilders' banning had something to do with the alleged threat by a British peer, Lord Ahmed, that, were Mr Wilders to appear in the House of Lords, 10 000 Islamist demonstrators would appear outside. This was an act of appeasement to a Dark Age ideology and it seems that we do not quite have the free movement of ideas across European Union borders.

3-193

Mairead McGuinness (PPE-DE). – Mr President, on the theme of the Lisbon Treaty my colleague has spoken about the increase in support among the Irish electorate for the Treaty, but I would warn that one swallow does not make a summer. I think that must be taken against a background of a recent Eurobarometer poll, which shows that support for Irish membership of the EU has dropped by 10 percentage points from 77% in the spring of 2006 to 67% in the autumn of 2008. Yes, there is a job to be done to persuade the Irish electorate about the positive benefits of the European Union.

That is why I would be concerned about those who want an earlier date for a second referendum in Ireland. I believe that we need to be cautious, we need to give time for the clarifications to be given on the issues of concern to the Irish voters and we need time for those issues to be debated in full and in public – and in due time allow the electorate to give their view.

3-194

Vasilica Viorica Dăncilă (PSE). – Actuala criză economică și financiară reprezintă un test important pentru Europa care, mai mult ca oricând, trebuie să fie unită pentru a lua măsuri care vor permite o redresare a economiei în cel mai scurt timp.

Bugetele statelor membre sunt supuse la presiuni mari pentru a face față acestor provocări, motiv pentru care trebuie găsite cele mai bune instrumente și acțiuni care să le permită acestora să nu depășească foarte mult limitele prevăzute de Comisie pentru deficitul bugetar și să nu existe măsuri protecționiste ale unora din statele membre sau în favoarea unor producători privați.

Asemenea decizii trebuie să treacă rapid prin procedurile de adoptare pentru a evita extinderea crizei și, mai ales, pentru a permite recâștigarea încrederii în piețele financiare și a evita extinderea crizei și în domeniul politicului, având în vedere și apropierea alegerilor pentru Parlamentul European.

O soluție posibilă de finanțare a cheltuielilor publice ar putea fi emiterea de euro-obligațiuni. Trebuie însă să luăm în calcul și riscul că, prin măsurile luate, ne îndatorăm excesiv și este greu de evitat să nu ajungem la situația de a lăsa pe umerii generațiilor viitoare plata acestor datorii.

3-195

Ignasi Guardans Cambó (ALDE). – Señor Presidente, hace un año y medio aprobamos aquí la Directiva de Medios Audiovisuales, un texto que llevaba en su corazón el principio de respeto al país de origen que definimos como esencial para poder asegurar la libre circulación de información audiovisual en el interior de la Unión Europea.

Sin embargo, en el interior de mi país, en España, la Directiva no se puede aplicar porque se trata del interior de un Estado miembro, la Comunidad Valenciana impone exactamente el principio contrario y por razones políticas está imponiendo la clausura de los repetidores que permitían, hasta ahora, que sus ciudadanos recibieran la señal de la televisión pública de Cataluña.

Es decir, hay plena libertad de circulación de información audiovisual entre los Estados miembros de la Unión Europea, pero al mismo tiempo hay que denunciar que en España hay autoridades que tienen miedo a esa misma libertad cultural tan esencial, tan esencial como para haberla impuesto para toda Europa y, sin embargo, dentro de España se impide que unos puedan recibir la televisión de otros. Esta paradoja es la que quería compartir con ustedes.

3-196

Zdzisław Zbigniew Podkański (UEN). – *(początkowo mikrofon wyłączony)* tragiczniejszych okresów w historii ludzkości. W jej trakcie śmierć poniosło kilkadziesiąt milionów osób. Wiele z tych ofiar zostało pozbawionych życia w ponad dwunastu tysiącach niemieckich obozów zagłady, obozów koncentracyjnych funkcjonujących na terenie III Rzeszy i w krajach podbitych. Dziś próbuje się wypaczyć prawdę o tamtych tragicznych latach i upowszechnia się informacje, jakoby obozy te były obozami polskim czy łotewskimi, a nie niemieckimi. Przoduje w tym niemiecka prasa. Ostatnio *Die Welt* informował, że Majdanek był polskim obozem koncentracyjnym.

W związku z tym przygotowałem projekt rezolucji, która zmierza do ujednolicenia nazewnictwa obozów koncentracyjnych poprzez dopisanie do ich nazw słów „niemiecki” lub „nazistowski” obóz koncentracyjny. Moją inicjatywę przyjęła grupa polityczna UEN, niestety doszły do mnie informacje, że jest ona blokowana na Konferencji Przewodniczących.

Panie i Panowie Posłowie! Unia Europejska może trwać i rozwijać się tylko wtedy, gdy będzie kierowała się prawdą historyczną i poszanowaniem praw człowieka. Zwracam się więc z prośbą do pań i panów posłów o poparcie inicjatywy UEN, tak by już nikt nigdy więcej nie wypaczał historii i nie czynił z ofiar katów, a z katów ofiary.

3-197

Nicolae Vlad Popa (PPE-DE). – Deoarece în ultima vreme câțiva colegi maghiari s-au plâns că în România nu le sunt respectate drepturile, doresc să fac câteva precizări.

Apropierea campaniei electorale nu ar trebui să dea naștere la atacuri și insulte la adresa unui stat de drept care, prin legislația sa, a oferit un exemplu în domeniul relațiilor interetnice. Respectarea drepturilor minorităților este garantată de Constituția României.

Cetățenii de naționalitate maghiară sunt proporțional reprezentați în structurile administrative locale, partidele minorității maghiare având 195 de primari și patru președinți de consilii județene, 2.684 de consilieri locali și 108 consilieri județeni. Având majoritatea în consiliile locale și județene susmenționate, aceștia gestionează bugetele locale după voința lor; asta înseamnă autonomie locală.

La nivel parlamentar, minoritatea maghiară are trei membri în Parlamentul European, 22 de deputați și nouă senatori în parlamentul național și a participat la guvernarea României în ultimii doisprezece ani. Plângerile auzite sunt pure declarații electorale politicianiste.

3-198

Luis Yañez-Barnuevo García (PSE). – Señor Presidente, el referéndum de Venezuela se ha saldado con un triunfo del «sí» reconocido elegantemente por la oposición democrática.

No es menos cierto que no ha existido igualdad de oportunidades en la campaña y que el oficialismo ha contado con el abrumador apoyo de todo el aparato del Estado, mientras que la oposición ha sufrido constantes hostigamientos y coacciones.

Aun en esas condiciones el país ha quedado prácticamente dividido en dos mitades y será muy difícil construir el futuro sólo con una de ellas. La Unión Europea debe promover el diálogo, la inclusión y el consenso entre los actores políticos y sociales venezolanos para el bien del país.

No es con actitudes viscerales, descalificaciones o insultos como ayudaremos a Venezuela a encontrar su camino democrático, pluralista y libre.

En este sentido criticamos la decisión del Gobierno venezolano de expulsar a un eurodiputado español y mucho más la manera en que tal expulsión se realizó, pero hacemos un llamamiento a esta Cámara instándola a evitar que nuestros representantes, en sus visitas a países terceros, hagan declaraciones que violen la legislación local vigente y, aún menos, que insulten a un jefe de Estado, por mucho que sea éste criticable. Con estas actitudes estamos comprometiendo futuras misiones del Parlamento Europeo en otros países.

3-199

Marian Harkin (ALDE). – Mr President, I want to refer to the issue of transparent and accurate food labelling and in particular I refer to poultry and pigmeat.

Right now meat can be transported from outside the EU into the EU, substantially transformed – and by that I mean encased in breadcrumbs or batter – and then labelled and sold as EU produce. This is an absolute nonsense, and the labelling is designed to fool the consumers. We need country-of-origin labelling so consumers are able to make informed choices.

We also have the situation where pigmeat and poultry meat has been frozen, then defrosted, labelled and sold as fresh. Not only is this an example of inaccurate labelling, it is potentially dangerous for human health.

I note that Hilary Benn, the UK Environment Secretary, and the Shadow Secretary have called for clearer labelling. I am sure that many across the EU would support this, as nobody would want to fool consumers. I would ask the Commission to deal with this matter as a matter of urgency.

3-200

Hanna Foltyn-Kubicka (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! Podczas dzisiejszego posiedzenia grupa UEN jednogłośnie przyjęła projekt rezolucji wzywającej do ustanowienia 25 maja Dniem Bohaterów Walki z Totalitaryzmem. Jej tekst zostanie niebawem przesłany do przedstawicieli najwyższych władz Unii, w tym także do pana przewodniczącego Pötteringa. Wybór daty 25 maja nie jest przypadkowy - to dzień, w którym w 1948 r. sowieckie władze zamordowały rotmistrza Witolda Pileckiego, polskiego żołnierza, który dobrowolnie udał się do obozu zagłady w Oświęcimiu, by budować tam ruch oporu. Po ucieczce, do końca wojny walczył z nazistami, by po wkroczeniu do Polski wojsk radzieckich rozpocząć podziemny bój z kolejnym okupantem. Pilecki był tylko jednym z wielu Europejczyków, którzy stracili życie w walce z bestialskimi systemami totalitarnymi. Wielu pozostało nieznanych, ale odwaga i poświęcenie wszystkich zasługuje na pamięć. Dlatego proszę pana, Panie Przewodniczący, o wsparcie inicjatywy naszej grupy.

3-201

Alexandru Nazare (PPE-DE). – Istoria recentă a Uniunii Europene consemnează poveștile de succes în ceea ce privește protecția drepturilor minorităților. Este și cazul minorității maghiare din România. Această minoritate beneficiază de o varietate de drepturi, inclusiv poziții în administrație, iar aceste drepturi au fost constant susținute de președintele României Traian Băsescu.

Totuși în alte zone, mai avem foarte multe de făcut și aș vrea să vorbesc aici de problema comunității rrome. Acesta este un test pentru capacitatea Uniunii Europene de a integra grupuri cu risc mare de excluziune.

Cazul handbalistului român Marian Cozma, ucis cu bestialitate de doi reprezentanți ai comunității rrome din Ungaria, ne arată, încă o dată, că infracționalitatea nu are granițe și că ignorarea problemelor acestei comunități este contraproductivă.

Situația acestei minorități, inerent transnațională și cu risc mare de excluziune, nu poate fi ameliorată decât printr-o politică concertată la nivel european. În acest sens, am depus împreună cu colegul meu Rareș Niculescu o rezoluție privind crearea unei Agenții europene pentru rromi. Uniunea are o strategie privind minoritatea rroma, dar nu are o agenție care să o implementeze coerent și eficient.

Pentru a rămâne relevantă pe plan internațional, dar și pentru a-și păstra coeziunea internă, Uniunea trebuie să fie capabilă să creeze un mediu paneuropean tolerant.

3-202

Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón (PSE). – Señor Presidente, acabo de llegar de Venezuela, donde fui invitado por su Poder Electoral como miembro de un grupo de acompañamiento electoral internacional para el referéndum del pasado día 15.

Los integrantes europeos de ese grupo han elevado un informe al Consejo Nacional Electoral con una valoración global positiva del proceso en cuanto a su organización, transparencia, participación, ejercicio libre y secreto del derecho de voto y seguridad en todas sus fases.

Sobre las declaraciones del diputado Herrero a una televisión venezolana, señalo que venían a deslegitimar el proceso electoral en curso, vierten graves acusaciones contra instituciones democráticas de aquel país, rayan en la injerencia en la política interna de un país soberano.

Nuestro Parlamento no debería propiciar ningún tipo de enfrentamiento con las instituciones democráticas de Venezuela. Al contrario, correspondería al señor diputado dar explicaciones a esta Cámara sobre una actuación que repercute sobre todos nosotros.

3-203

Călin Cătălin Chiriță (PPE-DE). – Resping acuzațiile pe care colegii mei, Sógor Csaba și Tőkés László, le-au adus la adresa României.

România este o țară membră a Uniunii Europene, a NATO, a Consiliului Europei, a Organizației pentru Securitate și Cooperare în Europa și respectă la standarde europene drepturile omului și drepturile persoanelor aparținând minorităților naționale. România aplică, în litera și în spiritul lor, toate tratatele internaționale relevante în domeniu.

Prin lege, limba maghiară se utilizează în administrație în toate localitățile și județele unde persoanele aparținând minorității maghiare reprezintă peste 20% din populație. Este o situație de fapt și de drept. România oferă posibilități foarte largi de educație în limba maternă maghiară în grădinițe, școli, licee, școli profesionale, facultăți, masterate și doctorate. În zonele în care locuiesc etnici maghiari, alături de români, este o regulă bine respectată să funcționeze în școli secții cu limba de predare maghiară pentru toți copiii de origine maghiară. Și dacă cumva au uitat dâșii, Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai din Cluj-Napoca are trei secții cu predare în limbile română, maghiară și respectiv germană, plus o puternică dezvoltare instituțională a studiilor ebraice, dar și locuri speciale pentru rromi.

3-204

Csaba Sándor Tabajdi (PSE). – Elnök úr! Gratulálok az Európai Parlament hivatalos honlapja készítőinek, az EP sajtóosztályának, amiért tiszteltben tartja a többnyelvűséget és az országok térképén a települések nevét a honlap nemzeti

nyelvén tünteti föl. Így az Unió állampolgárai anyanyelvükön tájékozódhatnak a másik 26 országról. A cseh nyelvű Németországról szóló oldalon Köln Kolín, a francián Cologne. A szlovák nyelvű, Magyarországról szóló oldalakon szlovákul vannak feltüntetve a városok nevei, és ez így helyes. Ugyanilyen természetes kell hogy legyen, hogy a szlovákiai magyarok szülőfalujukat, szülővárosukat saját anyanyelvükön magyarul hívják.

Ezért üdvözlöm, hogy a szlovák parlament megszavazta a közoktatási törvényt, amely lehetővé teszi, hogy a kisebbségi tankönyvekben a kisebbség nyelvén feltüntessék a helységek földrajzi nevét, ezzel - ha a törvényt végrehajtják -, helyreállhat a korábbi status quo, újra használhatják a magyarok magyar nyelven a települések nevét.

3-205

James Nicholson (PPE-DE). – Mr President, I would like to draw to your attention the situation that occurred in my constituency yesterday morning when farmers were forced to queue outside government offices, in some cases for two nights, in order to apply for a European Union farm modernisation grant scheme.

Our local Agriculture Minister decided to allocate these grants on a 'first come, first served' basis. This can only be described as an inadequate way to deal with the allocation of EU rural development money. I was glad to hear, therefore, that a Commission official yesterday questioned the validity of this allocation procedure.

We are aware that not every farmer can benefit from this particular funding package. However, I feel the situation clearly demonstrates the dire straits of the agriculture industry, certainly in my region, if farmers have to queue for days outside, during winter months, in an attempt to secure modest sums of EU funding.

3-206

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE). – Implementarea pachetului energie schimbări climatice presupune investiții semnificative în măsuri de reducere a emisiilor de gaze cu efect de seră.

Sectorul clădirilor este responsabil de 40% din consumul de energie primară. Creșterea eficienței energetice a clădirilor contribuie la reducerea consumului de energie primară și la reducerea emisiilor de dioxid de carbon.

Anul viitor Comisia împreună cu statele membre vor evalua, la mijlocul perioadei 2007-2013, programele operaționale și gradul de absorbție a fondurilor structurale. Solicit statelor membre să își revizuiască modul de utilizare a fondurilor structurale, dând prioritate eficienței energetice a clădirilor și mobilității urbane, pentru perioada 2010-2013.

Solicit Comisiei Europene și statelor membre să mărească la 15% procentul de 3% din FEDER alocat fiecărui stat membru pentru cheltuielile legate de ameliorarea eficienței energetice a clădirilor și utilizarea energiei regenerabile. Această creștere va oferi statelor membre o mai mare flexibilitate în utilizarea fondurilor structurale, accelerând absorbția acestora, mai ales în această perioadă de criză economică.

3-207

Ryszard Czarnecki (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! Z wielkim smutkiem i poruszeniem chciałem powiedzieć, że w ostatnich dniach zginął w Pakistanie nasz rodak, polski inżynier, ale jest to kolejny obywatel kraju członkowskiego Unii Europejskiej, który ginie właśnie w tamtym regionie. To kolejna śmierć, która pokazuje, że istnieje świat antywartości, świat ludzi, którzy nie uznają tego, co w innych cywilizacjach jest rzeczą świętą - ludzkiego życia.

Myślę, że ten dramatyczny fakt, kolejny zresztą, powinien być dla nas kolejnym, istotnym sygnałem i asumptem do tego, aby zjednoczyć się w walce ze światem antywartości, także w walce politycznej i w kontekście - trzeba to również powiedzieć wprost - wspólnego frontu antyterrorystycznego. Myślę, że ci politycy w Unii Europejskiej, którzy uważają, że można walczyć z terrorem bez przemocy, są w błędzie.

3-208

Oldřich Vlasák (PPE-DE). – Postupující hospodářská krize dopadá na všechny státy Evropské unie. Narůstající nezaměstnanost však v žádném případě není důvodem proto, abychom začali porušovat základní principy společného trhu. Rád bych se zde, na této půdě ohradil proti výrokům francouzského prezidenta Nikolase Sarkozyho, ve kterých vyzval k přestěhování francouzské značky Peugeot z továrny v Kolíně, v Čechách, zpět do Francie. Takové výroky politiků, kteří by chtěli v době krize ochraňovat a omezovat firmy, jsou zcela neospravedlnitelné. Pokusy o protekcionismus a uzavírání zemí do sebe nejsou žádoucí a ohrožují smysl Evropské unie.

Prezident pobočky Federální rezervní banky v Dallasu Richard Fisher řekl: „Protekcionismus je pro ekonomiku jako dávka kokainu. Může vás povznést, ale je návykový a vede k ekonomické smrti.“ Zamysleme se nad tím, odolejme populistickým tlakům a neztrácejme tvář v tvář krizi hlavu. Dbejme na dodržování priorit českého předsednictví a prosazujme myšlenku otevřené Evropy bez bariér.

3-209

Iuliu Winkler (PPE-DE). – Mr President, a large coalition government was set up in Romania after the elections in November of last year, with a parliamentary share of 73% in the two houses of the Romanian Parliament.

One of the first measures taken by this coalition was to work out a scheme to divide among themselves the leading positions of state-controlled public institutions and the public administration of Romania.

This is an unacceptable situation for two reasons. Firstly, it leads to renewed partisanship in state administration, which contravenes the law on the public servants' statute. Secondly, in the regions where the Hungarian population forms a large majority, the measure has an anti-minority facet as well: ethnic Hungarian public servants are being replaced by ethnic Romanian persons. On 8 February, a public gathering in Sfântu Gheorghe/Sepsiszentgyörgy, Romania, was attended by more than 3 000 people protesting against the political games of the Romanian parties and requesting that the Hungarian communities' rights be respected.

3-210

Nicodim Bulzesc (PPE-DE). – Mr President, regarding the report on patients' rights in cross-border health care, I would like to emphasise the issue of the right of patients to be informed about the available medication and treatment options. European patients should have access to quality health information regarding the latest medication available, the treatment options home and abroad, the legal and financial implications of being treated abroad, the reimbursement of the treatment costs and many other areas. For the moment we do not have this type of quality information. We may have some national initiatives, but nothing that could be effective at European level.

The problems we face are European. I therefore support the idea of setting up a European health literacy network. Such a network should consist of patients' organisations from all the Member States and should work closely with the health sector and the policymakers. In the hope of making the Commission aware of the need to better inform the 150 million European patients, I have initiated a written declaration on health literacy. We have all been patients at some point, and we never know when it will happen again.

3-211

Maria Petre (PPE-DE). – Astăzi și mâine veți întâlni aici câțiva tineri studenți din Republica Moldova. Ei au venit la Parlamentul European pentru că la ei acasă nu pot vorbi, sau pot vorbi dar suportă represaliile.

Toate rapoartele Comisiei Europene, audierile noastre în Comisia pentru drepturile omului, precum și rapoartele societății civile din Moldova ne arată că libertatea de expresie este adesea încălcată și că mass-media nu poate fi independentă. Zeci de tineri care utilizau forumurile pe internet pentru a-și exprima opiniile au fost anchetați și amenințați cu dosare penale în 2008.

Vă rog să îi priviți, să îi invitați în birourile dumneavoastră și să îi ascultați și să semnați declarația scrisă nr. 13/2009 care a fost creată pentru ei, pentru a le da libertatea de a se exprima, pentru această generație de la granița de răsărit a Europei noastre unite.

3-212

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Mr President, under Directive 2000/84/EC, summer time begins on the final Sunday in March and ends on the last Sunday in October. I would like to propose that this period be expanded in order to maximise many economic, safety and environmental benefits which are associated with the summer time period.

In 2005, the United States implemented a programme of extending daylight saving time by four weeks – an additional three weeks in the spring and an additional week in the autumn. There is already clear evidence that this has helped reduce both energy consumption and carbon dioxide emissions. In fact, a report by the United States Department of Energy found that extending daylight saving time by four weeks saved enough electricity to power some 100 000 homes per annum. Similarly, a recent study by the University of Cambridge also suggests that increasing summer time would lead to a decrease in both energy consumption and carbon-dioxide emissions, as, during the peak demand period from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m. each day, many of the more expensive and carbon-emitting ancillary power stations are switched on.

As the rapporteur of the review of the EU ETS, which formed the cornerstone of the EU's climate and energy package adopted last December by this House, I urge you to consider this proposal as a contribution to meeting the 2°C target. So I would like a review, please, of the Daylight Saving Time Directive.

3-213

Hans-Peter Martin (NI). – Herr Präsident! Zwei Anregungen: Es war heute immer wieder vom Vertrag von Lissabon die Rede. Man dürfte in diesem Haus wenigstens erwarten, dass ein Unterschied gemacht wird zwischen einem Gegner des Vertrags von Lissabon und einem EU-Gegner. Es ist auch zu wünschen, dass die Iren – wenn sie schon noch einmal abstimmen müssen – eine faire Chance bekommen und dass nicht so manipuliert wird, dass die bisher geltenden Regeln, wonach Ja und Nein eine gleichberechtigte Chance bekommen, in der Öffentlichkeit aufzutreten, untergraben werden und man das dann als Sieg der Demokratie feiert – oder von was?

Der zweite Punkt: Hier wird natürlich in Bezug auf die herannahenden Wahlen zusehends Selbstlob betrieben. Ich möchte gerne anregen, dass untersucht wird, wie dieses Haus sich über die Jahre hinweg konkret zu den Problemen der

Weltfinanzkrise verhalten hat und wer wie abgestimmt hat. Dann wird man nämlich herausfinden, dass die, die sich jetzt als Feuerwehr gebärden, zum großen Teil Brandstifter waren.

3-214

Danutė Budreikaitė (ALDE). – Europos Komisija šių metų sausį pateikė papildomų pasiūlymų paketą dėl Europos ekonomikos atkūrimo plane numatytų energetikos ir plačiajuosčių tinklų projektų finansavimo. Siūloma 5 milijardus eurų skirti šioms projektams, panaudojant 3,5 milijardų eurų iš 2008 m. žemės ūkio biudžeto. Tačiau 6 valstybės praeitą savaitę blokavo Komisijos pasiūlymą. Matyt, tai tos pačios šalys, kurios formuoja dabartinę finansinę perspektyvą, reikalavo sumažinti įmokas į ES biudžetą iki 1 procento BNP. Grįžtame prie nacionalizmo ir protekcionizmo, kurių nuosekliai buvo atsisakoma 50 metų, nuo Bendrijos įkūrimo pradžios. Gerbiamieji, tik valstybių solidarumas gali padėti atlaikyti finansų ir ekonominės krizės iššūkius ir užtikrinti ES ateitį.

3-215

President. – That concludes the item.

3-216

22 - The review of the European Neighbourhood Policy Instrument (debate)

3-217

President. – The next item is the report by Konrad Szymański, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the review of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (2008/2236(INI)) (A6-0037/2009).

3-218

Konrad Szymański, sprawozdawca. – Panie Przewodniczący! Bardzo bym chciał się zwrócić również do przedstawiciela Rady, ale Rada nie zdecydowała się wysłać nikogo na tę debatę. Myślę, że to szkoda, że to zły obyczaj. I myślę, że przewodniczący powinien zareagować na tą sytuację.

Wracając do sprawy sąsiedztwa, to musimy przyznać, musimy zauważyć, że bardzo dynamicznie zmienia się nasze otoczenie. Dlatego potrzebujemy zmian w polityce sąsiedztwa. Unia Śródziemnomorska jest naszą odpowiedzią na potrzeby południa, a synergia czarnomorska odpowiada na wyzwania, które nabrzmiały wraz z ostatnim rozszerzeniem Unii Europejskiej. Partnerstwo wschodnie jest aktualną odpowiedzią na oczekiwania naszych europejskich sąsiadów na Wschodzie.

Abyśmy osiągnęli cele, jakie postawiliśmy w latach dwutysięcznych przed polityką sąsiedztwa, obywatele państw sąsiedzkich muszą odczuć realne zbliżenie polityczne i gospodarcze z Unią. Stąd tak wielka waga pogłębionej strefy wolnego handlu, szybkiego ograniczenia opłat za wizy oraz postulat zniesienia wiz dla znacznej części tych krajów w dalszej, możliwie bliskiej perspektywie. Naszym wspólnym celem, obopólnym interesem, powinno być włączenie energetyki do najważniejszych celów polityki sąsiedzkiej, w tym zaangażowanie naszych pieniędzy w modernizację niezależnych sieci przesyłowych, w szczególności na wschodzie i południu. Tylko tak osiągniemy polityczne zbliżenie z Ukrainą, Gruzją, Mołdową, Armenią i w końcu Azerbejdżanem, a w przyszłości - także we właściwych proporcjach - z pięcioma republikami Azji Środkowej.

Kiedy mówimy o wschodnim aspekcie sąsiedztwa nieuchronnie dotykamy problemu Rosji i naszego partnerstwa z tym krajem. Dziś, u progu negocjacji nad nowym porozumieniem, możemy powiedzieć jednak tylko jedno - Rosja jest wyzwaniem dla bezpieczeństwa w naszym wspólnym sąsiedztwie. Bardzo trudno widzieć w Rosji partnera w tym zakresie. Dotykamy tutaj zasadniczego problemu politycznego, jakim jest problem rozszerzenia Unii na wschód. Proces sąsiedzki w oczywisty sposób nie zastępuje akcesji, ale nie może być oderwany od perspektywy członkostwa w przypadku krajów europejskich. Bez tej perspektywy nasze wysiłki będą istotnie osłabione.

Korzystając z tej okazji chciałbym bardzo podziękować wszystkim koordynatorom spraw zagranicznych w grupach politycznych, kontrsprawozdawcom, a także sekretariatowi Komisji Spraw Zagranicznych, dzięki którym udało się stworzyć sprawozdanie, które już dzisiaj cieszy się szerokim poparciem, czego świadectwem jest bardzo niewielka liczba poprawek zgłoszonych do tego sprawozdania na sesję plenarną, co istotnie ułatwi nam jutro głosowanie.

3-219

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, two-and-a-half years ago Parliament and the Council adopted the Commission proposal for a simplification of the external financial instruments. We streamlined many different instruments, one of which was the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI). This is a highly important instrument because it makes our external cooperation stronger, more 'policy driven', and better targets our funding in support of key sectors.

I was very pleased to read Mr Szymański's comments and to see that he considers that the ENPI regulation is adequate and valid for the purpose of cooperation with our neighbouring countries. The preliminary findings of our review point exactly in the same direction.

The ENPI country programmes underpin the implementation of ENPI action plans and reflect the ambition of the EU and the partner countries. In a way they have been transmission belts for the political and economic reforms that we seek to encourage through the ENPI. Moreover, instruments such as twinning and TAIEX, provide support for institution-building, legislative approximation and regulatory alignment. Sector and budget support operations are used to promote the agreed reform agenda. The different ENPI regional approaches and dimensions are supported through specific regional programmes. A multi-country programme was created, particularly to implement highly visible initiatives common to all neighbouring countries such as TEMPUS, Erasmus Mundus or CIUDAD. The innovative cross-border cooperation component has been successfully launched.

All of this clearly shows that the 2006 agreement on the ENPI regulation gave us a tool which allows us to deliver and produce tangible results. There is always room for improvement and I am always grateful for suggestions.

Let me also say that the report, firstly, underlines the need to further develop consultations with civil society and local authorities, which is what we are already doing.

Secondly, I have noted your call for even more ambitious actions in the fields of democracy, the rule of law and human rights. As you know, these topics are already at the forefront of our cooperation with partner countries, and political reforms and good governance are at the very heart of the ENP. We have also targeted projects to strengthen the judiciary.

However, let us be honest. First, because our partners face important structural challenges, we cannot expect things to change overnight and, as Lord Patten once said: 'democracy is not instant coffee'. I think that is really true.

Thirdly, I see that the report calls for more resources. Clearly, more resources improve our leverage – that is true. In the first two years we had to come back to the budgetary authority several times, asking for sufficient supplementary funds, for instance for Palestine and Georgia. Therefore, we have proposed to draw on fresh funds for an ambitious Eastern Partnership, which we will soon be discussing in Parliament.

Finally, let me say that I am very pleased to see that the report welcomes the recent Commission proposal on the Eastern Partnership, which we consider has a very important multilateral dimension, together with the Union for the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. I hope that I will continue to have your support and understanding in the future.

3-220

Danutė Budreikaitė, *Vystymosi komiteto nuomonės referentė*. – Po 2004 metų ES plėtros sukurtą EKPP taikoma 17 šalių, kurių 15 priskiriamos prie besivystančių. Priemonė apima naujas rytines ES kaimynes – Armėniją, Azerbaidžaną, Gruziją, Ukrainą, Moldovą ir Baltarusiją.

Rytų kaimynių saugumas, ypač Ukrainos ir Baltarusijos energetinis saugumas yra ir ES saugumas. Tai parodė jau tradicine tapusi Ukrainos – Rusijos naujametinė dujų krizė. Vasaros karinis konfliktas Gruzijoje privertė mus visus susimąstyti apie ES valstybių saugumo ir nepriklausomybės grėsmes.

Esant tokiai situacijai, jau anksčiau siūliau ir dabar siūliau dalyvaujant Europos Parlamentui ir remiantis EUROMED ir EUROLAT asamblėjų principais, sukurti Rytų kaimynystės asamblėją EUROEAST, kuri būtų skirta įgyvendinti EKPP Rytų Europos šalyse.

Džiaugiuosi, kad tam pritarta ir pranešime.

EUROEAST suteiktą Europos Parlamentui galimybę skirti lygiavertį dėmesį visoms kaimynėms ir besivystančioms šalims.

3-221

Tunne Kelam, *rapporteur for the opinion of the Committee on Regional Development*. – Mr President, I would like to congratulate my colleague Mr Szymański on his very good report. On behalf of the Committee on Regional Development, I welcome the inclusion of cross-border cooperation within the scope of the ENPI Regulation as an instrument to develop common projects and to strengthen relations between ENP countries and the EU Member States.

At the same time, I would like to highlight the necessity of regularly monitoring the management and implementation of joint operational programmes on both sides of EU borders. Cross-border cooperation should contribute to integrated sustainable development between neighbouring regions. We ask the Commission to prepare a detailed overview of all joint operational programmes approved for the current financial period, with an assessment of how the principles of transparency, efficiency and partnership have been respected. Such an assessment, together with an inventory of the most frequent problems faced by the managing authorities, should contribute to finding more appropriate solutions for the next programming period.

I would also encourage the Commission to facilitate the exchange of experiences and best practices in cross-border cooperation between ENP programmes and projects, on the one hand, and actions taken under the European Territorial Cooperation objective and under the already completed Interreg IIIA Community Initiative, on the other.

Finally, the Regional Development Committee considers that ENPI should focus on a balanced strategy between the east and the south, with specific approaches for both areas.

3-222

Ioannis Kasoulides, *on behalf of the PPE-DE Group*. – Mr President, I would also like to congratulate Mr Szymański on his comprehensive report, which will have the support of our group in the vote tomorrow.

I would also like to congratulate Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner, both on the success of the ENPI and of the projects that lie ahead, with the need for an Eastern partnership concerning, in particular, our Eastern neighbours and partners, as well as the Black Sea synergy. Once these are constituted and take on their own identity – for example, with a parliamentary assembly, etc., as we are doing for the Mediterranean – perhaps they will all assume a distinct identity, even in the way they are financed.

I discern some kind of rivalry – or, let us say, anxiety – among Members. We have just heard about not creating one thing to the financial detriment of another. That should not happen. We know that the Union for the Mediterranean, the Eastern Partnership and the Black Sea synergy, etc. are in the interests of the European Union. Those arrangements should not be a reason for countries aspiring to join the European Union to have to be told time and time again that this is not the alternative to membership that some are worrying about.

3-223

PRESIDÊNCIA: MANUEL ANTÓNIO DOS SANTOS
Vice-Presidente

3-224

Μαρία-Ελένη Κοππά, *εξ ονόματος της ομάδας PSE*. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, η αναθεώρηση του μηχανισμού γειτονίας και εταιρικής σχέσης είναι απαραίτητη ούτως ώστε να εξασφαλισθούν πιο απλές διαδικασίες αλλά, παράλληλα, να ενισχυθεί και η διαφάνεια. Η βάση για την ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική γειτονίας είναι η δημιουργία κλίματος εμπιστοσύνης στην εγγύτατη περιφέρεια της Ένωσης.

Είναι προς το συμφέρον όλων να ενισχυθεί η οικονομική ανάπτυξη και η σταθερότητα σε όλες τις γειτονικές χώρες, τόσο ανατολικά, όσο και στην περιοχή της Μεσογείου. Όμως, υπάρχει ανάγκη να ορισθούν κριτήρια και συγκεκριμένες προσεγγίσεις ανά χώρα, ανάλογα με τις πολιτικές προτεραιότητες που αυτή θέτει, σε σχέση με τα ανθρώπινα δικαιώματα, τη δημοκρατία, το κράτος δικαίου, τα δικαιώματα των μειονοτήτων. Είναι επίσης σημαντικό η κοινοτική βοήθεια να φτάσει σε όλες τις ενδιαφερόμενες ομάδες πολιτών. Γι' αυτό, πρέπει να προβάλλονται με κατάλληλο τρόπο οι δυνατότητες του μηχανισμού γειτονίας.

Για να επιτευχθούν αυτοί οι φιλόδοξοι στόχοι, πρέπει η κατανομή των κονδυλίων να είναι ισοβαρής ανάμεσα στις χώρες της Ανατολικής Ευρώπης και τις Μεσογειακές χώρες, όπως αυτό προβλέπεται στο δημοσιονομικό πλαίσιο 2007-2013. Η διαδικασία της Βαρκελώνης, οφείλει να συμπληρώνεται από την ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική γειτονίας και οι στόχοι πρέπει να είναι σαφώς προσδιορισμένοι.

Ειδικά σε αυτή την περίοδο, με την οικονομική κρίση να αγγίζει όλες πλέον τις χώρες που επωφελούνται από το μέσο γειτονίας, πρέπει να είναι σαφές κατά πόσο συμβάλλει η Ένωση στην αντιμετώπιση της κρίσης μέσω της χρηματοδοτικής αυτής βοήθειας. Γι' αυτό, η Ευρωπαϊκή Επιτροπή πρέπει να δημοσιοποιεί αξιολογήσεις πάνω στο ζήτημα αυτό.

Τέλος, θα ήθελα να αναφερθώ στη συνέργεια του Εύξεινου Πόντου: η περιφέρεια αυτή πρέπει να επωφεληθεί από την ευρωπαϊκή πολιτική γειτονίας. Η στήριξη που χορηγεί η Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση στην περιφερειακή αυτή συνεργασία πρέπει να στοχεύει στην παραγωγή απτών αποτελεσμάτων σε ορισμένους τομείς προτεραιότητας όπως της ενέργειας, των μεταφορών, της μετανάστευσης, αλλά και της καταπολέμησης του οργανωμένου εγκλήματος.

3-225

Metin Kazak, *au nom du groupe ALDE*. – Monsieur le Président, je soutiens pleinement le rapport de M. Szymański, en particulier la proposition d'augmenter l'enveloppe financière de l'instrument européen de voisinage et de partenariat. Il est nécessaire de nous engager davantage avec nos pays voisins, notamment après les trois conflits récents qui ont eu lieu, ces six derniers mois, à Gaza, en Ukraine et en Géorgie.

Un nombre considérable d'amendements proposés par notre groupe, dont les onze amendements que j'ai avancés en tant que rapporteur fictif, ont été adoptés par la commission des affaires étrangères. Mais ici encore, je souhaiterais soumettre deux amendements supplémentaires au nom de notre groupe, l'ALDE.

Si je suis d'accord avec l'idée de coopérer davantage avec la Turquie et la Russie afin de résoudre certains des conflits non réglés et de renforcer les liens entre les pays de la mer Noire, la rédaction du paragraphe 39 peut mener à la confusion. La coopération en mer Noire s'exerce à quatre niveaux différents: les pays membres, les pays candidats à l'adhésion, les pays de la politique européenne de voisinage et la Russie, en tant que partenaire stratégique.

La Turquie étant candidate à l'adhésion, elle ne fait pas partie de la politique européenne de voisinage et bénéficie de l'instrument d'aide de préadhésion et non pas de l'instrument européen de voisinage. Donc, la politique européenne de voisinage ne fournira certainement pas une base appropriée de coopération avec la Turquie.

Il existe déjà des plateformes de coopération avec les pays de la mer Noire. On devrait peut-être essayer de créer des liens avec ces initiatives régionales pour renforcer cette synergie au lieu de se pencher sur de nouvelles formes de coopération.

Le deuxième amendement traite la question de l'énergie. Le paragraphe 44 du rapport fait uniquement référence à l'Ukraine et à la Moldavie, alors que la plupart de nos voisins sont des pays importants pour le secteur énergétique, pays de source ou pays de transit. Je pense, en particulier, à la Géorgie et à l'Azerbaïdjan, dont l'importance va s'accroître avec le lancement du projet Nabucco, qui a fait l'objet d'une conférence internationale au mois de janvier. Il me semble donc que les mesures dans le domaine de l'énergie devront inclure tous les pays de notre voisinage.

3-226

Hanna Foltyn-Kubicka, *w imieniu grupy UEN*. – Panie Przewodniczący! Europejska polityka sąsiedztwa powstała w celu integracji krajów objętych tym programem ze strukturami Unii Europejskiej. Zakłada ona silną współpracę na polu gospodarczym, kulturalnym i politycznym, bez faworyzowania jednych krajów kosztem drugih. Mając to na uwadze, ciężko zrozumieć różnice, jakie występują w podziale środków finansowych dla państw śródziemnomorskich i wschodnich, z niekorzyścią dla tych drugih.

Sama idea oddzielenia europejskiej polityki sąsiedztwa (EPS) wobec tych regionów jest słuszna ze względu na odmienną problematykę, z jakimi się zmagają. Nie może być jednak ona usprawiedliwieniem dla rozbieżności w podziale środków finansowych. Wydaje się to szczególnie bezzasadne, mając na uwadze tragedię, jaka dotknęła ostatnio jeden z krajów objętych EPS, a mianowicie Gruzję. Jej obywatele właśnie teraz oczekują naszej pomocy i poczucia, że są tak samo traktowani, jak inne państwa współpracujące z Unią Europejską.

Kolejnym ważnym celem, jaki EPS miała zrealizować, jest bezpieczeństwo energetyczne. Obecny kryzys w Europie jest jednak ewidentnym przejawem niespójności założeń współpracy w ramach polityki sąsiedztwa. Bez wątpienia ukazał potrzebę zidentyfikowania działań w ramach wspomnianej polityki, wzmocnienia sektora energetycznego w ramach partnerstwa wschodniego. Cieszy mnie, że Komisja Europejska dostrzegła ten problem i taką właśnie politykę chce wprowadzić w życie.

3-227

Cem Özdemir, *im Namen der Verts/ALE-Fraktion*. – Herr Präsident, Frau Kommissarin, sehr geehrte Damen und Herren! Auch von meiner Seite zunächst Dank an den Berichterstatter, Herrn Szymański, für den sehr guten Bericht. Das Instrument der Europäischen Nachbarschafts- und Partnerschaftspolitik kann nur dann ein wirksames Instrument sein, wenn es Anreize für demokratische Reformen bereithält und eine nachhaltige, d.h. ökologische und gerechte Entwicklung fördert.

Um die Wirksamkeit dieses Instruments überprüfen zu können, müssen für alle Aktionspläne im Rahmen der europäischen Nachbarschaftspolitik klare, konkrete und messbare Ziele definiert werden. Wir Grüne fordern insbesondere, dass die Kohärenz bei allen Menschenrechtsinstrumenten im Rahmen der ENP-Aktionspläne erfüllt sein muss, sowie eine gründliche Untersuchung der so genannten Justizprojekte, die durch das Instrument der Europäischen Nachbarschafts- und Partnerschaftspolitik gefördert werden.

Ein weiterer, wichtiger Punkt, den auch der Bericht zu Recht betont, ist die stärkere Beteiligung der Zivilgesellschaft an Gestaltungs- und Überwachungsprozess des ENPI. Der Georgien-Krieg im Sommer 2008 verdeutlichte, dass die Europäische Union bis dahin keine nachhaltige Politik zur Konfliktbewältigung in der Kaukasus-Region entwickelt und umgesetzt hat.

Immer noch stellen die so genannten *frozen conflicts*, wie beispielsweise in Berg-Karabach, ein Hindernis für die weitere Entwicklung der Europäischen Nachbarschaftspolitik in der Region Südkaukasus dar. Wir fordern deshalb den Rat auf, sich aktiver um die Konfliktbewältigung zu bemühen. Die Europäische Union hat mit diesem Instrument die Chance, eine aktive Rolle in ihrer Nachbarregion zu spielen, um demokratische Reformen und eine nachhaltige Entwicklung voranzutreiben.

Nicht zuletzt um ihre – also unsere – Glaubwürdigkeit zu bewahren, muss die Europäische Union endlich anfangen, die Demokratie- und Menschenrechtsklauseln in ihren Abkommen mit Drittstaaten ernst zu nehmen und Konsequenzen zu ziehen, im Idealfall positive, und wenn notwendig, negative.

3-228

Zbigniew Zaleski (PPE-DE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Dziękując naszemu koledze Szymańskiemu za dobre sprawozdanie, chcę się podzielić taką refleksją na temat dlaczego polityka sąsiedztwa jest dla nas ważna. Na to musimy sobie odpowiedzieć. Po pierwsze dlatego, że Unia Europejska ani Europa nie jest jakąś odizolowaną wyspą. Unia jest zlokalizowana w Europie i to jest dla nas ważne, tym bardziej, że jesteśmy ambitni, chcemy „eksportować” nasze wartości, nasze idee i nasze doświadczenia do innych krajów.

Myślę, że poza decyzjami o dużym formacie – dotyczącymi spraw transportu, energetyki, wolnego rynku handlowego, wspólnej wymiany – są także drobniejsze czy mniejsze rzeczy, a więc sprawy edukacji, sprawa wymiany naukowej, kulturalnej, które są bardzo istotne, a przede wszystkim kontakty międzyludzkie. Wyobrażam sobie Unię Europejską jako rodzinę ludzi wzajemnie się ze sobą komunikujących. Europa, przynajmniej ja sobie to tak wyobrażam, będzie miała siłę wtedy, kiedy każdy jej element będzie miał pewną rolę do odegrania i będzie mógł ją realizować, a więc nie tylko kraje Unii, ale także te, które są jej sąsiadami.

Myślę, Pani Komisarz, że na dzisiaj zakończyliśmy w dużym stopniu budowanie Euromed, a więc pewnej ciekawej konstrukcji. Dajemy dużo pieniędzy, może aż za dużo, jak powiedziała koleżanka z UEN, i trzeba teraz wzmocnić idee Euroeast. Jest to bardzo ważne i myślę, że po ostatnich wydarzeniach energetycznych, nikt nie ma wątpliwości, że jest to wymiar bardzo, bardzo dla nas istotny. Chodzi tutaj o programy wspólnotowe, programy regionalne, które trzeba wspierać, niestety, ale finansowo. Trzeba na to przeznaczyć odpowiednie sumy. Podejmujemy tutaj dobre decyzje, które kraje i sąsiedzi będą realizować we współpracy przy wspólnych projektach.

3-229

Aloyzas Sakalas (PSE). – Mr President, in 2008, several new regional initiatives were launched under the umbrella of the European Neighbourhood Policy. Although the financial instrument was designed in 2006, it proved a sufficiently effective tool as it was oriented towards the future.

The EU has decided to strengthen multilateral and regional cooperation with and between its neighbouring countries. The instrument already allows the EU to receive co-funding from other international organisations and to cooperate with other multilateral organisations in its neighbourhood. Let us actively use these opportunities.

My second point concerns the distribution of financial allocations between our neighbours on the south and eastern shores of the Mediterranean and our neighbours to the east. Ultimately, it amounts to a question of credibility of EU policy. Therefore, the EU needs to stick to its commitments and maintain the geographical distribution of financial allocations, as laid down in the financial perspective for the years 2007-2013.

But there is another important allocation gap between the neighbours. I am speaking about the gap of allocations spent on programmes in the future democracies relating to the rule of law and human rights. Between 2007 and 2010, 21% of the total funding for the Eastern neighbours is spent on allocations to support democratic development, but for the Southern neighbours this amounts to only 5%. I ask the Commission to take this concern into consideration.

3-230

Grażyna Staniszevska (ALDE). – Panie Przewodniczący! Finansowanie za pomocą europejskiego instrumentu sąsiedztwa inicjatyw na rzecz basenu Morza Śródziemnego i przyszłego partnerstwa wschodniego nie powinno się odbywać, jak to się dzieje dziś, ze szkodą dla żadnej z nich. Istotne jest uwzględnienie specyfiki zarówno wschodnich, jak i południowych krajów partnerskich.

Niedawne wydarzenia geopolityczne u naszych wschodnich sąsiadów wyraźnie unaocznily także potrzebę lepszego dostosowania EPS do potrzeb tego regionu. Przykładem może być Ukraina. Największemu wschodniemu sąsiadowi Unii Europejskiej powinno się zaoferować konkretne zachęty i korzyści w ramach partnerstwa wschodniego, które będą działały mobilizująco na ten kraj o europejskich ambicjach. Ponadto istotne byłoby przyspieszenie ustanowienia strefy wolnego handlu oraz zakończenie rozmów w sprawie ruchu bezwizowego z Ukrainą.

Europejska polityka sąsiedztwa to nie tylko działalność rządów i polityków krajowych. Bardzo się zatem cieszę, że w sprawozdaniu podkreślono potrzebę większego zaangażowania społeczeństwa obywatelskiego i władz lokalnych w proces planowania i wdrażania europejskiej polityki sąsiedztwa. Pamiętajmy również, że dla dobrej, efektywnej i przynoszącej obopólne korzyści współpracy sąsiedzkiej niezwykle ważne i cenne są wymiany doświadczeń i najlepszych praktyk, inicjatywy szkoleniowe, w tym programy nauki języków krajów sąsiadujących.

3-231

Pierre Pribetich (PSE). – Monsieur le Président, je voudrais tout d'abord féliciter mon collègue Konrad Szymański pour son rapport équilibré sur la révision de l'instrument européen de voisinage et de partenariat.

Souvenons-nous que l'objet premier de ce rapport consiste à éviter l'émergence de nouvelles lignes de division, pire, de fracture, entre l'Union européenne élargie et ses voisins géographiques proches, mais aussi à renforcer la stabilité et la sécurité de l'ensemble de l'espace ainsi considéré.

Propager la paix est une volonté maintes fois répétée, mais qui trouve, bien souvent, sur son chemin les obstacles de la réalité des haines et des intolérances. Par conséquent, la bonne conduite de cette politique détermine, pour partie, l'ordre géopolitique européen international.

Comment revoir efficacement cet instrument européen de voisinage et de partenariat? Un mot résume à lui tout seul l'essentiel: l'ambition.

Plus d'ambition, en effet, dans les dialogues avec la société civile et les autorités locales, pour mieux les associer à la conception et au contrôle de la mise en œuvre de cet instrument.

Plus d'ambition dans le concours des aides, en vue de renforcer les capacités administratives, locales et régionales dans les pays limitrophes et, aussi, de promouvoir des programmes d'échanges pour la société civile.

Plus d'ambition dans les domaines de la démocratie, de l'État de droit et des droits de l'homme.

Toutefois, ces appuis budgétaires doivent faire l'objet d'une sélection pour les rendre accessibles uniquement à ceux capables d'en cueillir les fruits, avec une approche par pays, sous conditionnalité politique, sans oublier une meilleure évaluation des politiques. Il est également urgent de clarifier les relations entre la politique européenne de voisinage, politique d'encadrement par excellence, et les initiatives régionales, comme la synergie de la mer Noire, l'Union pour la Méditerranée, le futur partenariat oriental.

En effet, à force de réduire les politiques à des domaines géographiques de plus en plus limités, on court le risque de perdre le sens, la visibilité, la lisibilité de la politique de voisinage d'ensemble que l'Union européenne souhaite mener.

C'est à ce prix que nous renforcerons la cohérence et la synchronisation de l'Union, que notre budget consacré se déploiera, avec ampleur, dans les directions souhaitées, et que l'Union européenne jouera pleinement, enfin, son rôle de pôle de stabilité.

3-232

Nicolae Vlad Popa (PPE-DE). – Instrumentul european de vecinătate și parteneriat a contribuit în mod semnificativ la dezvoltarea relațiilor cu statele din vecinătatea Uniunii Europene.

O oportunitate de finanțare o reprezintă Fondul de investiții pentru vecinătate, la care, pe lângă suma alocată din Instrumentul european de vecinătate și parteneriat, statele membre UE au posibilitatea să participe cu donații. Suntem conștienți că în acest studiu finanțarea de care beneficiază instrumentul european de vecinătate și parteneriat nu este suficientă pentru a răspunde obiectivelor ambițioase pentru această zonă.

Solicităm Comisiei Europene o analiză privind alocarea, în viitor, a unor sume mai consistente acestui instrument, mai ales în contextul în care este necesar să fie susținute cu finanțare adecvată și inițiative precum sinergia Mării Negre. România a susținut și va continua să susțină relevanța regiunii Mării Negre pentru Uniunea Europeană, plecând de la valențele evidente ale regiunii pentru stabilitate, dezvoltare economică, securitate energetică, siguranța cetățenilor și protecția mediului.

3-233

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE). – Instrumentul european de vecinătate și parteneriat poate și trebuie să fie utilizat mai mult în regiunea Mării Negre. Apreciez ca fiind pozitivă sinergia la Marea Neagră, dar consider că această regiune prezintă o importanță geostrategică deosebită și merită un cadru de cooperare mai structurat, pe modelul dimensiunii nordice sau al Uniunii pentru Mediterană.

Instrumentul european de vecinătate și parteneriat ar trebui să contribuie mai mult la dezvoltarea legăturilor de transport dintre Uniunea Europeană și Marea Neagră, și dintre Uniunea Europeană și Republica Moldova și Ucraina. România dorește să dezvolte mai multe programe de cooperare între orașe din România și orașe din Republica Moldova. Salut lansarea programului Ciudad ce favorizează dezvoltarea dialogului între orașe.

Dezvoltarea porturilor comunitare situate la Marea Neagră, construcția unor terminale pentru gaz lichefiat, precum și dezvoltarea legăturilor feroviare și rutiere între statele din regiunea Mării Negre și statele membre trebuie să facă parte dintre prioritățile pentru care va fi folosit acest instrument. De asemenea, consider că acest instrument trebuie să fie folosit și pentru cooperarea în domeniul energetic, pentru extinderea și integrarea infrastructurii pentru transportul de electricitate către regiunea Balcanilor de Vest.

3-234

Presidente. – Apresento as minhas desculpas ao Deputado Alexandru Nazare uma vez que, por erro da Mesa, não lhe demos a palavra quando estava inscrito no período normal. Dar-lhe-ei a palavra depois do período "catch the eye".

3-235

Zbigniew Krzysztof Kuźmiuk (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! W tej debacie chcę zwrócić uwagę na trzy kwestie. Po pierwsze, konieczne jest utrzymanie geograficznego podziału pomocy finansowej z budżetu Unii między kraje śródziemnomorskie i wschodnioeuropejskie zgodnie z postanowieniami perspektywy finansowej na lata 2007-2013, a także kontynuowanie wsparcia pożyczkowego dla tych krajów ze strony Europejskiego Banku Inwestycyjnego. Pułapy środków przewidziane przez EBI w latach 2007-2013 - w wysokości 8,7 mld euro dla krajów śródziemnomorskich i tylko 3,7 mld dla krajów wschodnich i Rosji - wydają się być jednak w niekorzystnej dysproporcji dla potrzeb krajów wschodnioeuropejskich.

Po drugie, w ramach partnerstwa wschodniego konieczne jest rozwijanie współpracy energetycznej z tymi krajami i tworzenie warunków dla zapewniania Europie dostaw surowców energetycznych z tych krajów, jako alternatywnych źródeł zaopatrzenia dla Europy. Wreszcie po trzecie, konieczne jest pogłębianie integracji gospodarczej Unii z krajami partnerstwa wschodniego poprzez poszerzanie strefy wolnego handlu z tymi krajami, a także integracja społeczna, której rozwiązaniem docelowym powinno być zniesienie wiz dla mieszkańców krajów ENPI.

3-236

Daniel Petru Funeriu (PPE-DE). – Monsieur le Président, honorables collègues, lorsque nous établissons une politique pour les États voisins de l'Union européenne, nous ne devons pas ignorer le déficit démocratique de ces pays. C'est un déficit démocratique qui vient de leur histoire. Eh bien, pour établir une société démocratique, nous avons besoin d'une conscience démocratique de chacun des citoyens de ces pays.

Le rapport parle – et parle à juste titre d'ailleurs – de contacts de citoyens à citoyens, de "people to people contacts", et je voudrais vous demander quelle meilleure manière d'établir ces "people to people contacts" nous avons que de permettre aux citoyens de ces pays de voyager librement vers l'Union européenne.

J'en appelle donc au Conseil pour qu'il permette aux citoyens de la République de Moldavie, qui est d'ailleurs le seul pays à partager une langue officielle de l'Union européenne, de voyager sans visa dans l'Union européenne. Bien sûr, en attendant une telle mesure, je m'adresse à la Commission pour qu'elle fasse tout ce qui est nécessaire pour rendre fonctionnel le "common visa center" de Chisinau. Nous devons vraiment montrer l'exemple.

3-237

Corina Crețu (PSE). – În ultima jumătate de an, Uniunea Europeană s-a confruntat cu o serie de provocări care au ridicat semne de întrebare cu privire la rolul, coeziunea și capacitatea sa de acțiune și de reacție.

Criza georgiană și criza gazelor ne-au demonstrat că ne putem confrunta în continuare cu amenințări dinspre est la adresa stabilității internaționale și a siguranței noastre energetice.

Un parteneriat estic atât de ambițios precum cel propus în acest raport este binevenit, cu atât mai mult cu cât vizează o cooperare mai eficientă și sprijinirea reconstrucției Georgiei, iar în perspectivă propune instituirea unei zone a liberului schimb și liberalizarea regimului vizelor pentru Uniunea Europeană.

Cred însă că trebuie să acordăm mai multă importanță situației din Republica Moldova, de unde vin semnale îngrijorătoare cu privire la libertatea de exprimare și la corectitudinea alegerilor care urmează să aibă loc în această primăvară.

3-238

Călin Cătălin Chiriță (PPE-DE). – Instrumentul european de vecinătate și parteneriat are o însemnătate fundamentală pentru reușita politicii europene de vecinătate și, în special a parteneriatului estic și a cooperării în zona Mării Negre.

Proiectul parteneriatului estic poate avea succes numai dacă dispune de finanțarea necesară pentru realizarea unor obiective clare. Totodată, trebuie să eficientizăm mecanismele de evaluare a impactului acțiunilor și finanțărilor pe care parteneriatul estic le implică, pentru ca asistența europeană să nu fie deturnată și să nu fie folosită în mod abuziv de unele guverne împotriva opoziției politice.

Întotdeauna acțiunile noastre trebuie gândite în așa fel încât cetățenii să poată vedea beneficii concrete. Consider că finanțarea europeană oferită prin Instrumentul european de vecinătate și parteneriat ar trebui să acorde prioritate măsurilor care vizează cooperarea transfrontalieră în spațiul vizat de parteneriatul estic.

Cooperarea transfrontalieră are vocația dovedită de a contribui în mod decisiv atât la dezvoltarea regională, cât și la construirea încrederii între statele vecine și la armonia interetnică, iar facilitatea circulației transfrontaliere a persoanelor și a fluxurilor economice poate avea efecte multiplicatoare deosebit de benefice.

3-239

Alexandru Nazare (PPE-DE). – Instrumentul politicii europene de vecinătate și parteneriat este esențial pentru asigurarea stabilității, democrației și prosperității în zonă. Mai mult, acest instrument transformă noțiunea de graniță, spațiu de limitare, de excludere, într-un spațiu al cooperării și al legăturilor politice.

Recentele evenimente din spațiul estic, care au mai fost amintite aici – mă refer acum la criza gazului sau criza din Georgia – au demonstrat încă o dată necesitatea unei strategii care poate asigura un rol activ al Uniunii Europene în această arie geopolitică. Avem nevoie de o mai mare coerență în abordarea față de spațiul estic, avem nevoie de obiective clare care să corespundă atât intereselor Uniunii, cât și nevoilor specifice ale partenerilor noștri.

Am toată aprecierea pentru inițiative precum sinergia Mării Negre și parteneriatul estic, care consolidează cooperarea cu țările din regiune, în special Republica Moldova și Ucraina, dar și cu statele din Caucaz și Regiunea Caspică. Avem nevoie și de o implicare mai puternică în zona Mării Negre, bază pentru consolidarea relației cu Turcia și Rusia, pentru că acest spațiu se află în vecinătatea Uniunii Europene, a Turciei și a Rusiei.

Parteneriatul este, de asemenea, un stimulent binevenit pentru țările participante, care vor dori să candideze la statutul de stat membru al Uniunii Europene, precum Republica Moldova. Acest parteneriat adâncește semnificativ nivelul de angajare de ambele părți.

De asemenea, aș vrea să vă vorbesc puțin și despre inițiativa EURONEST care este numai un exemplu de soluție concretă pentru o mai bună aplicare a instrumentului politicii europene de vecinătate și parteneriat în state precum Armenia, Azerbaidjan, Georgia, Moldova, Ucraina sau Belarus.

O mai bună aplicare a acestei politici nu poate fi realizată fără creșterea nivelului de asistență financiară. Pe lângă necesitatea de a mări acest pachet financiar, trebuie de asemenea să acordăm o atenție egală și modului în care sunt cheltuite aceste fonduri.

Consider imperativă asigurarea transparenței în ceea ce privește mecanismele financiare de alocare și, de asemenea, cred că resurse trebuie să fie alocate pentru implicarea societății civile din țările partenere în proiecte comune și pentru sprijinirea mobilității cetățenilor acestor țări, inclusiv prin facilitarea regimului vizelor.

3-240

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I think this discussion on the ENPI has in fact already pre-empted the next Commission communication on the Eastern Partnership. Many of the ideas that you have put forward are in the Eastern Partnership communication and I am sure that when you get this you will, hopefully, be quite satisfied.

Let me just say a few things. I am, of course, very thankful for many of the suggestions. In this Eastern Partnership, the idea is that we want to work with our Eastern partners – Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus – if necessary on democracy and human rights, but also with the three Caucasian countries, on trade, to try to make more profound association agreements, secondly on energy, and thirdly on more mobility. With regard to your suggestions on being visa-free, we will start with visa facilitation, although even that is not easy, as many Member States here are still very reluctant. Then of course there are all kinds of different platforms which I have already mentioned – for instance a platform for civil society, on energy and on transport – or indeed where best practices can be exchanged.

With regard to financing, I can only tell you that, unfortunately, I do not have more funds available. Of course – as I always say as a mother of the neighbourhood policy – I would love to have more. You are a very important budget authority so please give us a chance in the future and really support us on that. This goes for both the Union for the Mediterranean in the south and for the Eastern Partnership and the ENPI in the east.

The funding figures are currently EUR 3.6 per capita per annum to the east and EUR 3.4 per capita per annum to the south. So, as you can see, we are nearly at the same level. But at the same time it is never enough, because there are huge necessities and challenges. Therefore we have also established the idea of a so-called NIF – the Neighbourhood Investment Facility – that can be used for bigger projects.

This is all I can tell you at this stage but perhaps at a later stage, when we start to discuss the Eastern Partnership, we can go into all the details. In any case, thank you for this debate and for your suggestions. They are very much in line with the direction in which we are going.

3-241

Konrad Szymański, *sprawozdawca*. – Panie Przewodniczący! W kilku słowach chciałem odnieść się do tej debaty. Uproszczenie procedur, monitorowanie wdrażania polityki sąsiedztwa, kontrolna rola Parlamentu, to są sprawy, z którymi borykamy się od roku 2005 i wydaje się, że niewiele więcej można tutaj zrobić. Natomiast na pewno dzisiaj istotne jest wypełnienie sąsiedztwa treścią polityczną. Ta treść polityczna to wizy, wspólny rynek, energetyka. Jeśli nie podołamy tym wezwaniom, to możemy stracić okazję do budowania własnego sąsiedztwa na własnych zasadach. Czas działa na naszą niekorzyść. Może się okazać, że kraje, które dzisiaj są naszym sąsiedztwem, będą zsuwały się w kierunku destabilizacji, w kierunku innych zasad budowania porządku regionalnego. Nie będziemy z tego zadowoleni i możemy nigdy takiej szansy od historii nie otrzymać. Będzie to wpływało również na nasze własne bezpieczeństwo, więc powinniśmy myśleć o tym

również i w tych kategoriach – kategoriach całkiem egoistycznych interesów Unii Europejskiej, by nasze sąsiedztwo było obszarem stabilizacji i dostatku.

Jeśli chodzi o budżet, doskonale wiem, że w wielu miejscach tej Izby, w związku z reformą, panuje zgodność, co do finansowania poszczególnych części sąsiedztwa, poszczególnych jego regionów, ale pamiętajmy, że sąsiedztwo to tylko jedna koperta budżetowa i nic się nie zmieni w kolejnej perspektywie finansowej. Jeżeli uda nam się dobrze finansować sąsiedztwo śródziemnomorskie, wschodnie, czarnomorskie, to wszyscy na tym wygramy. Nie można wygrać którejkolwiek części tego sąsiedztwa wbrew innej, bo taka jest konstrukcja budżetu unijnego. Powinniśmy razem skupić się na reformie unijnego budżetu pod tym kątem, tak aby wszystkie te części (śródziemnomorska, czarnomorska i wschodnia) były wygrane w przyszłej perspektywie finansowej.

3-242

Marcin Libicki (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! Ja ubolewam nad tym, że to podsumowanie świetnego sprawozdania zrobione przez pana posła Konrada Szymańskiego niestety nie mogło być wysłuchane przez panią Ferrero-Waldner, bo jest zajęta cały czas innymi sprawami.

3-243

Presidente. – O debate está encerrado.

A votação terá lugar quinta-feira, 19 de Fevereiro de 2009.

Declarações escritas (artigo 142º)

3-244

Alin Lucian Antochi (PSE), în scris. – Susțin în întregime prevederile raportului vizând aprofundarea nivelului de angajare politică a Uniunii Europene cu statele vizate de IPEV și perspectiva încheierii unor acorduri de asociere, care să țină cont de specificul fiecărei țări.

Pentru implementarea eficientă a acestei politici, statele vizate trebuie să se angajeze pe deplin în procesul de reformare democratică a societății. Implementarea eficientă a reformelor, în special a celor ce țin de domeniile democrației, statului de drept, libertății de exprimare rămâne o problemă serioasă pentru aceste state și depinde atât de voința politică a autorităților lor, cât și de gradul de angajare a societății civile și a cetățenilor.

Este important ca populația acestor state să înțeleagă că integrarea europeană oferă mai mult decât posibilitatea plecării legale peste hotare, că reprezintă o șansă reală pentru ieșirea țării din impas. În acest context, proiectele europene trebuie să prevadă clauze mai concrete și fonduri speciale pentru instruirea populației.

Familiarizarea populației atât cu avantajele integrării, cât și cu angajamentele care îi revin odată cu aderarea la UE, va avea drept efect implicarea ei activă în procesul de democratizare a societății și reduce considerabil capacitatea de constrângere, impusă partidelor politice de opoziție și societății civile de către elitele aflate la putere.

3-244-500

Adam Bielan (UEN), na piśmie. – Panie Przewodniczący!

Inicjatywa, którą Polska i Szwecja jeszcze w zaszłym roku forsowały, dziś nie podlega już żadnej dyskusji. Zacieśniona współpraca z sąsiadami za wschodnią granicą nie jest tylko korzystna dla obu stron, ale konieczna i strategiczna dla bezpieczeństwa Europy.

Sytuacja polityczna i gospodarcza za naszą wschodnią granicą ma bezpośrednie przełożenie na sytuację w całej UE, na zachowanie naszej równowagi gospodarczej i bezpieczeństwa. Ostatni rok był też testem wiarygodności Rosji w relacjach z sąsiadami, którego Kreml po prostu nie zdał.

Dlatego rozwijanie EPS wymaga aktywnego zaangażowania w sytuację w regionie Kaukazu Południowego i u naszych najbliższych sąsiadów. To zaangażowanie jest warunkiem tego żebyśmy mogli współpracować w konkretnych dziedzinach, mam tu na myśli wspieranie społeczeństwa obywatelskiego, reform demokratycznych i instytucjonalnych, zagwarantowanie bezpieczeństwa energetycznego Europy. Pokażmy, że możemy być głównym graczem na Wschodzie i nie pozwalamy Rosji na realizację własnego neoimperialnego scenariusza.

3-245

Janusz Lewandowski (PPE-DE), na piśmie. – Finansowanie z Europejskiego Instrumentu Sąsiedztwa i Partnerstwa zarówno inicjatywy południowej, jak i wschodniej europejskiej polityki sąsiedztwa nie powinno się odbywać ze szkodą dla żadnej z nich. W kwestii wykorzystania tych środków szczególne znaczenie ma przejrzystość innych źródeł, w tym finansowania prywatnego.

W czasie negocjacji w sprawie nowego układu pomiędzy Unią Europejską a Rosją powinniśmy skupić się na lepszej współpracy ze strony Rosji w identyfikowaniu wyraźnych priorytetów współpracy finansowej, co doprowadzi do lepszego planowania i wieloletniego programowania pomocy, gwarancji, iż każda pomoc finansowa udzielona władzom rosyjskim przyczynia się do podniesienia demokratycznych standardów w Rosji oraz zwiększenia współwłasności projektów wytypowanych do finansowania.

Chciałbym również podkreślić potrzebę skutecznych uwarunkowań politycznych oraz gwarancji, że pomoc dla Białorusi będzie miała natychmiastowy i bezpośredni wpływ na obywateli i nie będzie wykorzystywana przez władze przeciw ich politycznym oponentom. Unia Europejska powinna skuteczniej wspierać społeczeństwo obywatelskie i partie polityczne stojące w obronie demokracji.

Niedawne wydarzenia geopolityczne u wschodnich sąsiadów Unii Europejskiej podkreślają wagę dalszego rozwoju europejskiej polityki sąsiedztwa poprzez lepsze dostosowanie jej do potrzeb partnerów, co obejmuje zwiększenie zaangażowania UE w regionie Morza Czarnego.

3-246

Marianne Mikko (PSE), kirjalikult. – Euroopa Parlamendi Moldova delegatsiooni juhina olen ma loomulikult huvitatud ENPI idamõõtmise arendamisest.

Mõistan igati ja toetan Euroopa Liidu lõunapoolsete liikmesriikide huvi ENPI lõunamõõtmise edendamise vastu. Samas olen kindlal veendumusel, et me ei saa mõõda vaadata meie idas asuvatest naabritest. Meie ühiskodu turvalisuse ja heaolu seisukohalt on nii ida- kui ka lõunanaabrid meile võrdselt tähtsad.

Tänase korra kohaselt, mis kehtib aastani 2010, on ENPI raha jagatud ebavõrdselt – 70% läheb lõunamõõtmisele ning üksnes 30% idamõõtmise riikidele. Käesoleval aastal algavad uued rahandusarutelud. Ma väga loodan, et nende arutelude käigus muudetakse praegust süsteemi ning edaspidi jaguneb raha õigustatult võrdselt.

Möödunud suviste sündmuste tõttu – ma mõtlen siin Vene–Gruusia konflikti – ootavad meie idanaabrid minu meelest põhjendatult Euroopa Liidu senisest suuremat panust stabiilsuse tagamisel. Ja ELi osalus ei tohi piirduda ainult üldsõnalise poliitilise toetusega, vaid see peab sisaldama väga konkreetset koostööd ja abi reformide läbiviimisel.

Mul on erakordselt hea meel, et Eesti on üks hiljuti asutatud Naabrusrahastu Sihtfondi 15 asutajaliikmest. Praeguse majanduslanguse ajal on ühe miljoni euro eraldamine päris suur tegu. Ja konkreetne tegu.

3-246-500

Toomas Savi (ALDE), in writing. – Mr President, I welcome the notion that that "the Eastern Partnership should not hinder the European Union membership for neighbouring countries wishing to apply", as it was stated in the report. The possible future membership incentive is an integral part of the Eastern Partnership as it forms the basis for a successful conditional approach.

Although the progress towards a completed democratic transition varies from country to country - in Belarus there have been only minor advances, while in Ukraine and Georgia some significant steps have been taken - the European Union should always sustain the possibility for the Eastern Neighbourhood countries to accede to the EU, since the efforts to establish functional democracy, rule of law and respect of human rights can sometimes be exhausting to the point of relapse.

The primary objective of the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument as well as the accession incentive vis-à-vis Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine and Belarus is to ensure continuous progress towards consolidated democracies in those countries.

3-247

23 - Financiamento de acções não relacionadas com a Ajuda Pública ao Desenvolvimento (debate)

3-248

Presidente. – Segue-se o relatório do Deputado Thijs Berman, em nome da Comissão do Desenvolvimento, sobre o financiamento de acções não relacionadas com a Ajuda Pública ao Desenvolvimento nos países abrangidos pelo Regulamento (CE) n.º 1905/2006 (2008/2117(INI) (A6-0036/2009).

3-249

Thijs Berman, Rapporteur. – Ik ben ook blij dat mijnheer Deva is gaan zitten, want nu kan mevrouw Ferrero-Waldner gewoon naar mij luisteren, ik ben echt opgelucht.

De ongekeende economische crisis die om zich heen grijpt, is een nieuwe ramp voor ontwikkelingslanden. De crisis leidt tot dalende grondstoffenprijzen, minder investeringen, minder handelskrediet, minder geld dat door migranten naar huis wordt overgemaakt. Het bruto nationaal product van elk welvarend land holt ondertussen achteruit en daardoor vermindert ook het budget voor ontwikkelingssamenwerking, want dat is 0,7% van het bruto nationaal product, tenminste dat zou het moeten zijn en de meeste landen houden zich niet aan die belofte.

Dit is de context van de discussie over het nieuwe beleidsinstrument dat hier wordt besproken. Als Spaanse studenten een paar maanden met een beurs studeren in Latijns-Amerika en omgekeerd, dan is zo'n uitwisseling nuttig, noodzakelijk en wenselijk, maar zo'n project kan niet uitsluitend gefinancierd worden met geld dat bedoeld is voor armoedebestrijding. Het is prima dat er EU-geld naartoe gaat, maar armoedebestrijding is het niet. Het is frustrerend om dit soort projecten te schrappen enkel omdat er geen wettelijke mogelijkheid is om ze te steunen.

Daarom hebben wij gezocht naar een bescheiden instrument waarmee de EU in ontwikkelingslanden beleid kan uitvoeren dat niet strikt genomen onder de bestrijding van armoede valt. Daarvoor moet een andere geldbron, een andere wettelijke basis gevonden worden dan die van ontwikkelingsbeleid. De wettelijke basis kan dus niet liggen in artikel 179 van het Verdrag van Nice, want dat is nu precies die wettelijke basis van ontwikkelingsbeleid en die moet hier vermeden worden.

Via artikel 179 mogen de belangen van de EU zelf - Europese studenten die studiereizen maken - niet worden gefinancierd. Bovendien moet de EU in de besteding van ontwikkelingsgeld wettelijk voldoen aan de criteria die aan ontwikkelingssamenwerking worden gesteld, namelijk armoedebestrijding.

Met een klein beetje creativiteit zijn er ook andere bronnen. Uitbreiding van het *Industrialised Countries Instrument* is een mogelijkheid die de Commissie buitenlandse zaken voorstelt en die ook door mijn commissie wordt gesteund. Maar wat ook een mogelijkheid is, is een combinatie van de artikelen 150, 151 en 170, onderwijs, cultuur en research. Met deze gecombineerde wettelijke basis houdt het Europees Parlement volledige medezeggenschap (codecisie) over dit instrument en komt het geld, ongeveer 13 miljoen euro op dit moment, niet uit de enveloppe voor het ontwikkelingsbeleid. Het komt dan overigens evenmin uit de enveloppe voor buitenlands beleid.

Ik kan als rapporteur - en de Commissie ontwikkelingssamenwerking steunt mij hierin - niet akkoord gaan met het artikel 179 als wettelijke basis. Dit nieuwe instrument zou daardoor zinloos worden, want het heeft juist tot doel om te vermijden dat ontwikkelingsgeld gebruikt wordt voor andere doeleinden. Dan mag er ook geen wettelijke basis komen voor dit instrument die daartoe zou dwingen.

Om deze reden verzoek ik de EVP-Fractie dringend, zeer dringend, om haar amendement in te trekken. Het is in strijd met ons gedeeld verlangen om het budget voor ontwikkelingssamenwerking te beschermen, zelfs in tijden van economische crisis.

3-250

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, first of all I would like to confirm the undertaking I gave, on behalf of the Commission, to carry out the mid-term review of the financial instruments in 2009. This was in response to Parliament's request during the final negotiations on the instruments.

That review will take the form of a communication, accompanied by legislative proposals where appropriate. The adoption of the communication is foreseen for April 2009 and is included in the Commission's legislative work programme.

The review is about the implementation of the instruments. It should be distinguished from the other mid-term review currently underway – and also foreseen in the regulations – which relates to the programming documents and the strategy papers for 2011-2013. This new programming will give rise to a round of democratic scrutiny, as for the first programming exercise covering 2007-2010.

The two exercises are different, but they are complementary. It is important to fix issues related to instruments before the new programming period. The strategy and programming review will take place during 2009 in order to be ready in 2010 for democratic scrutiny by Parliament.

As regards the Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI), our preliminary reflections confirm an issue that will be at the core of the review: the legislative gap as regards non-ODA activities for countries covered by the DCI.

What are these non-ODA activities? They are of various natures, but the current four preparatory actions initiated by this Parliament give a good outlook on what we are talking about: cooperation with middle-income countries in Asia and Latin America, which is not covered by the DCI, and business and scientific exchanges with China and India.

On these kinds of activities, we agree with you on the need to have legislation to cover measures which promote EU concerns in DCI countries. This could be done either through a new legal instrument or through amending the existing Industrialised Countries Instrument (ICI) Regulation.

When we prepared the new external relations instruments in 2006, we agreed that they should also cover the external dimension of our internal policies. We agreed that this could be done under the legal basis for external actions. This represented a considerable simplification compared to the previous situation.

It will be difficult for the Commission to follow this approach. We consider that the legal basis must reflect the objectives and content of the instrument. We recognise that there is a problem with non-ODA activities. By their nature, such activities do not qualify as development assistance. Therefore, a proposal that deals only with such activities cannot fall under development cooperation – under Article 179, as you mentioned.

Given that we want to cover known ODA activities, it seems likely that Article 181a of the Treaty will be the most appropriate legal basis, since it covers economic, financial and technical cooperation. However, before making any proposal, the Commission will consider the question carefully in the light of the position expressed by Parliament. It would be helpful to have Parliament's position so that we can finalise our proposals before the elections, as we promised.

Finally, I see that the report calls for more resources. We will have to look into it. You know the very tight situation of Heading 4 of the financial framework. One could argue that emerging countries are in transition and that the current assistance envelope should accompany that transition – that is with a gradual shift from the development focus to non-ODA activity. We will examine this as part of the review.

These are the Commission's initial considerations on the report that we are discussing today. We consider it to be a good basis for our common work, and I look forward to hearing what the Members have to say.

3-251

Vicente Miguel Garcés Ramón, *ponente de opinión de la Comisión de Presupuestos*. – Señor Presidente, la Comisión de Presupuestos opina que es de la máxima importancia la acotación clara de cada uno de los instrumentos presupuestarios. Por ello, la opción más realista parece ser la creación de un nuevo instrumento para acciones distintas de la ayuda pública al desarrollo de los países que entran en el ámbito de aplicación de dicho Reglamento.

Desde un punto de vista presupuestario, no parece adecuada la propuesta de financiación procedente de la Comisión de Desarrollo, ya que este dinero no existe, al no contar esas líneas con una cantidad de crédito asignado de manera plurianual; existe un crédito para 2009, pero no para más allá.

En cualquier caso, dado que la financiación de este nuevo instrumento de cooperación ha de ser compatible con el marco financiero 2007-2013, conviene recordar la importancia de la revisión intermedia del marco financiero, que debería permitir un ajuste de los límites máximos de las distintas rúbricas.

3-252

Nirj Deva, *on behalf of the PPE-DE Group*. – Mr President, I welcome very warmly the statement made by Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner just now, and I ask my political group to withdraw its amendment so that this report can go through. If not, I am in a rather difficult position, but I will have to support the Socialist rapporteur on this issue.

I have to say that I believe the development instrument is for development purposes. But if one looks at what the development instrument – particularly Article 179 – gives, even with all the constraints the ODA instrument allows the promotion of museums, libraries, the arts, music in schools, sports training facilities and venues – all these count as ODA. But, of course, sponsoring concert tours or athletes' travel costs does not. Cultural programmes in developing countries, whose main purpose is to promote the cultural values of the donor, are not reportable as ODA. It excludes military aid but it does not exclude peace-keeping. It covers a wide variety of activities – even civil police work to supply and increase the capacity of training of policemen, the demobilisation of soldiers, monitoring of elections, removal of mines and landmines – all this is ODA.

So here we are asking ourselves, in this Parliament, how many angels are dancing on the head of a pin when in fact the main area of the work is covered by the ODA instrument. So, I welcome Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner's statement that Article 181a is there to make it possible to look for the funds to do what some of my colleagues are hoping to do.

3-253

Ana Maria Gomes, *on behalf of the PSE Group*. – Mr President, it is crucial to solve the current legislative gap concerning the financing of non-ODA actions in countries covered by the DCI. This proposal for an instrument to address this gap must preserve the DCI unequivocally as an instrument for ODA and it must allow for a clear separation between financial sources allocated to pure ODA development cooperation and those allocated to other types of non-ODA

development cooperation with developing countries. This separation is a very relevant political message in itself and it would give proper visibility to the EU's development cooperation policy.

The new or revised instrument should also be sufficiently broad to cover a wide range of actions that do not comply with the OECD DAC guidelines but which are crucial for the EU's cooperation with developing countries, for instance the development of the Akkas gas fields in Iraq or cooperation on aviation security with India. This is why I am not in full agreement with the restrictive legal basis proposed. I fully back Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner in finding Article 181a, possibly, a more adequate legal basis, which would provide for these kinds of concerns that I am highlighting. However, I am not convinced either by the alternative presented by the PPE-DE Group amendment that we are supposed to vote on tomorrow.

Therefore, I hope that, under the guidance of our rapporteur, Thijs Berman, we may find more time to have a thorough discussion on this matter and consider what is the best legal basis, namely, the proposal made by Commissioner Ferrero-Waldner.

3-254

Toomas Savi, on behalf of the ALDE Group. – Mr President, I would like to thank Thijs Berman for his report. It points out an important aspect in development aid that the Commission should, in my opinion, seriously consider. Activities such as cultural, scientific and economic exchange programmes, citizen-to-citizen contacts or political dialogue are regrettably not covered by existing European legislation, those being just a few examples.

The European Union has set up numerous programmes and financial instruments under the auspices of different agencies, each covering only certain limited aspects of the problems that the developing countries are currently facing. I find that, without a central European Union agency and a comprehensive and coherent policy, the efforts that we are making to improve the situation in developing countries are not of notable extent.

We all agree that the purpose of the European Union development cooperation policy is to reach as many people in need as possible, but yet we have chosen a rather inconvenient path to that goal. At the moment the European Union is both institutionally fragmented and legally hindered as far as development aid is concerned. This much appreciated report deals with the results of those deficiencies.

The European Union and its Member States have contributed immensely to the official development assistance and it should never be underestimated, but much remains to be done to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the institutional framework as well as congruence of the legislation covering development aid.

3-255

Michael Gahler (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident! Ich sage ganz ehrlich, ich war etwas überrascht, dass der Bericht Berman bereits erstellt ist und ein Vorschlag vorgelegt wird, bevor der eigentliche Bericht vorliegt, der die Erfahrungen mit dem DCI bewerten soll, nämlich der Bericht des Kollegen Mitchell.

In der Sache hat der Kollege mit seinem Vorschlag Recht. Weil das DCI so konzipiert ist, wie es konzipiert ist, war die Regelungslücke vorprogrammiert. Ich unterstütze die Schlussfolgerung, dass man ein anderes Instrument braucht, um die Lücke für nicht ODA-fähige Aktivitäten zu schließen. Ich kann mir da beide Alternativen vorstellen, die er in seiner Ziffer 3 vorschlägt.

Ich möchte aber deutlich machen: Die Entwicklung eines Landes findet auch außerhalb von ODA statt. Streitig ist ja nur die Rechtsgrundlage, die gewählt worden ist. Da steht meiner Ansicht nach der Berichterstatter mit seinem Ausschuss gegen den Rest der Welt. Der Entwicklungsausschuss wählt eine enge Interpretation des Artikels 179 und muss daher als Rechtsgrundlage auf Artikel, die für interne Politiken vorgesehen sind, zurückgreifen. Eine andere Lesart von Artikel 179 haben der Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten, der Rechtsausschuss, der Juristische Dienst des Parlaments, der EuGH sowie Rat und Kommission.

Wir werden daher als EVP-ED-Fraktion – das haben wir heute beschlossen – morgen diesen Antrag nicht zurückziehen, sondern einen Änderungsantrag stellen, der eine Änderung der vorgesehenen Rechtsgrundlage beinhaltet. Wir werden auch nicht der Vertagung zustimmen, denn in der Sache stimmen wir darin überein, dass es nur um die Rechtsgrundlage geht. Daher werden wir morgen wohl schon zu einer Klärung in der Sache kommen.

3-256

Corina Crețu (PSE). – Raportul colegului nostru, dl Berman, oferă o soluție clară pentru eliminarea vidului din structura legislativă privind finanțarea acțiunilor externe fără caracter urgent și care nu intră în categoria acțiunilor de dezvoltare, așa cum sunt ele definite de instrumentul de cooperare pentru dezvoltare.

Finanțarea acestui gen de acțiuni este importantă din punct de vedere politic, ele putând asigura o continuitate a prezenței Uniunii Europene în țările și regiunile care au depășit deja stadiul inițial de dezvoltare. Este însă extrem de important ca

fondurile folosite pentru finanțarea acestor acțiuni să nu provină din surse destinate dezvoltării, ci din linii bugetare diferite.

Scopul propunerii legislative solicitate de prezentul raport este acela de a încuraja dezvoltarea, nu de a o limita prin reducerea fondurilor disponibile pentru politicile de dezvoltare în favoarea altor măsuri și, de aceea, este esențial ca distincția dintre acțiunile prevăzute de sfera de aplicare a instrumentului de cooperare pentru dezvoltare și cele prevăzute de noua dispoziție legislativă să fie oglindită în definirea fondurilor destinate finanțării lor.

3-257

Mairead McGuinness (PPE-DE). – Mr President, firstly I would like to thank the rapporteur for this report. I endorse his first comment about the economic crisis, its particular impact on the developing world and, indeed, the fact that we are not reaching our target of 0.7% in aid. This is very regrettable because, when the developed world shrinks, the developing world really takes the brunt of it.

I came to this debate because I was anxious to hear the arguments about legal bases. It seems to me that, underneath all of this, there is a fear that the budget will be spread too thinly. Let us just call a spade a spade. Let me quote the comments made by an aid agency which contacted me today: 'While we support Parliament's request for a financing instrument for non-ODA activities in developing countries, we strongly believe that it must be established on a legal basis which is appropriate to the activities which it intends to finance. The use of Article 179 as the legal basis for non-development activities is clearly not appropriate and, as such, would contravene both the EC Treaty and the *acquis communautaire*. It also opens the possibility that, in future, non-ODA activities may be financed from budget lines which are intended for genuine development activities. We very much hope that the amendment will be withdrawn.'

So, as a member of the PPE-DE Group, I am here tonight to listen to both sides of this argument, but also to put forward some of the lobbying that I am receiving from very genuine people in the development area, whose concerns I need to address.

I repeat the point that, if we were awash with funds, our legal basis might not cause us so much grief. The difficulty is that we are not. There is concern among those involved with the development agenda – the focus of concern – who are fearful that the money available will be spread over too many activities. However, I remain to be convinced.

3-258

Paul Rübig (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident, sehr geehrte Frau Kommissarin Benita Ferrero-Waldner, meine sehr geehrten Damen und Herren! Ich möchte nicht auf die Rechtsgrundlage eingehen, sondern auf die Lebensgrundlage. Hier spielen die kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen eine ganz besondere Rolle. Gerade in Zeiten der Finanzkrise kommt es auf die Bonität an, damit diese Betriebe noch Mikrokredite erhalten können.

Ich möchte besonders darauf verweisen, dass das Instrument der Mikrokredite sich eigentlich weltweit sehr bewährt hat und dass wir uns überlegen sollten, wie wir gerade auch im Rahmen der WTO-Runde, die ja jetzt hoffentlich bald vor einem Abschluss steht, dementsprechende Handelserleichterungen für die betroffenen Familien in diesen Gebieten erreichen können.

Letztlich entsteht Wohlstand dort, wo man etwas erzeugt, wo man selbst davon leben und seine Familie ernähren kann. Wenn es dann noch gelingt, etwas zu verkaufen, ist der Wohlstand gewährleistet. In diesem Sinne wünsche ich mir, dass die Entwicklungspolitik den richtigen Weg geht.

3-259

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, after hearing all the different contributions, it is clear that the Members' main concern is the choice of the legal basis.

I stated in my introduction the direction in which the Commission seeks to go, but I will certainly be very happy to take up your suggestions also.

You know that we want the best development assistance for all countries, and this is the main thrust of our thinking. So let us work together in order to find the right solution.

3-260

Thijs Berman, rapporteur. – Mr President, I am not a lawyer, and I am not well versed in law, but I know that one should avoid stretching the interpretation of legal texts. That is my fear if we use Article 181a, because it talks about economic and technical cooperation, whereas we are talking about students who go abroad on exchanges between universities. It is a bit hazardous. I am not against this if the Commission sees it as a way out for the non-ODA activities we all deem necessary and important, and I will go along with it. Perhaps I am concerned because I am a journalist. I like texts and I take words seriously, which is the essence of Europe – its humanism, taking texts seriously and taking language seriously. You have to be very careful when using words, so Article 181a is a maybe, but I am not very happy about it.

I was happy, however, with the comment made by Mairead McGuinness, to the effect that she needed to be convinced. She is Irish, she has her convictions and she is firm in her principles, as indeed we all are. If it is impossible tomorrow to reach agreement on the right legal basis, then I would prefer to refer this back to my committee and to take time to decide on a proper legal basis, because we all know that non-ODA actions are necessary.

I thank the Commission for its comment that non-ODA actions will, over time, become more and more important in developing countries and in middle-income countries, etc. We all agree on their necessity, and we all agree on the need to find a legal basis. Some of us agree that Article 179 is not the basis we are looking for.

If I cannot reach agreement with the PPE-DE Group before we vote tomorrow at noon – which will be a pity – I shall ask for a referral back to my committee. I am ready to do that and I will do so when the amendment is voted on tomorrow. I would be very sorry if this is the position of the PPE-DE Group, because we all agree on the need to maintain development aid at the level it is today, and we all know that it is shrinking with the economic crisis.

3-261

Presidente. – O debate está encerrado.

A votação terá lugar quinta-feira, 19 de Fevereiro de 2009.

Declarações escritas (artigo 142º)

3-262

Angelika Beer (Verts/ALE), schriftlich. – Die Überprüfung der neuen außenpolitischen Finanzierungsinstrumente hat ergeben, dass die Zusammenarbeit mit Drittländern Lücken aufweist. Wir schlagen daher die Umgestaltung des Industrieinstruments vor.

Der Ausschuss für auswärtige Angelegenheiten hielt es nicht für sinnvoll, die neue rechtliche Grundlage des Instruments auf einige wenige Bereiche der Zusammenarbeit zu begrenzen. Die jetzt vorgesehenen Politikbereiche (Kultur, Jugend, Forschung) sind auch noch aus der europäischen Innenpolitik entliehen und waren bisher gar nicht dazu gedacht, die Zusammenarbeit mit Drittländern zu definieren. Das ist nur eine der Unwägbarkeiten, die der AFET befürchtet. Was ist zum Beispiel, wenn es demnächst sinnvoll ist, in Klimapolitikfragen mit anderen Ländern zusammenzuarbeiten? Müssen wir dann jedes Mal eine neue rechtliche Grundlage für das Instrument schaffen? Wollen wir das jedes Mal tun, wenn sich das Gebiet der Zusammenarbeit ändert?

Uns allen lag die Reform der Außenpolitikinstrumente am Herzen. Es soll daher klar sein: Wir kämpfen nicht gegeneinander.

Dies ist der einzige Grund, warum die Grünen zusammen mit dem zweiten Berichterstatter aus dem AFET den Änderungsantrag am Montag zurückgezogen haben.

Inhaltlich halten wir unseren Vorschlag für den weitsichtigeren und den, der eine kohärente Außenpolitik möglich macht. Aber dieser Bericht ist lediglich eine Empfehlung an die Kommission. Wir werden sehen, wie sie damit umgeht.

3-262-500

Sirpa Pietikäinen (PPE-DE), kirjallinen. – Arvoisa puhemies, hyvät kollegat, Euroopan unioni on maailman suurin kehitysavun antaja, vastaten 60% kaikista kehitysavun rahoituksesta. Unionin vahvaa roolia kehitysyhteistyön keskeisenä toimijana tulisi tulevaisuudessakin edelleen vahvistaa.

Kehitysmaiden talouden ja rauhan vakauttamiseksi on ensisijaisen tärkeää, että unioni pitäytyy tavoitteessaan nostaa kehitysavun osuus 0,7% BKT:sta vuoteen 2015 mennessä. Tämä yksinään ei kuitenkaan riitä.

Eri instituutioiden välisen yleisen koherenssin saavuttaminen kehitysyhteistyössä on olennaista. Niin taloudelliset investoinnit kuin infrastruktuuria rakentavat ja ihmisoikeuksien parempaan noudattamiseen tarkoitetut projektit tulee toteuttaa niin, että ne tukevat toinen toisiaan. EU:n on rakennettava tarvittavat instrumentit yhtenäisten kehityspoliittisten toimien voimaansaatamiseksi.

Unionin nykyisessä kehitysyhteistyötä koskevassa oikeusperustassa on kuitenkin lainsäädännöllisiä puutteita, jonka takia haluaisinkin kiittää mietinnön laatijaa tärkeän asian esilletuomisesta. Liikenteen, teknologian ja energian alojen sekä tieteellisen yhteistyön ja kansalaisjärjestöjen vuoropuhelun kehittämiseen suunnatut projektit ovat oleellisia kehitysmaiden yhteiskunnallisen toimivuuden kannalta. Kyseisten projektien päätavoitteena ei kuitenkaan ole taloudellisen kehityksen ja kehitysmaiden hyvinvoinnin edistäminen, eivätkä ne siten täytä OECD:n laatimia virallisen kehitysavun kriteerejä. Virallisen kehitysavun tulee tulevaisuudessakin keskittyä nimenomaan köyhyyden poistamiseen ja ihmisten elinolojen parantamiseen.

3-263

24 - Infra-Estruturas de Investigação Europeias (IIE) (debate)

3-264

Presidente. — Segue-se o relatório da Deputada Teresa Riera Madurell, Comissão da Indústria, da Investigação e da Energia, sobre uma proposta de regulamento do Conselho relativo ao quadro jurídico comunitário aplicável às Infra-Estruturas de Investigação Europeias (IIE) [COM(2008)0467 - C6-0306/2008 - 2008/0148(CNS)] (A6-0007/2009).

3-265

Teresa Riera Madurell, Ponente. — Señor Presidente, señor Comisario, ante todo quiero destacar la unanimidad conseguida en la comisión ITRE en torno a este informe. La unanimidad ha sido posible gracias al buen trabajo y a la colaboración de los ponentes alternativos, que además, con sus aportaciones, han contribuido en gran medida a conseguir un informe útil en un tema tan relevante como es el de las infraestructuras de investigación de ámbito europeo.

Tengo que decir que este Parlamento comparte con la Comisión el criterio de que ante la mundialización de la investigación y el surgimiento de nuevas potencias científicas y tecnológicas como China y la India, es urgente acelerar, y para ello incentivar, la construcción de nuestro espacio europeo de investigación.

Es muy importante conseguir cuanto antes que la Unión Europea sea un espacio donde investigadores, tecnologías y conocimientos circulen libremente, donde exista una coordinación efectiva de las actividades de investigación y donde se haga un uso óptimo de los recursos, lo que exige, entre otras cuestiones, disponer de grandes infraestructuras de investigación de ámbito europeo.

Tales infraestructuras pueden proporcionar además una excelente oportunidad de colaboración entre los distintos Estados miembros, con efectos importantes en la formación científica de nuestros jóvenes y un fuerte impacto económico en la industria europea. Son, pues, fundamentales para el progreso de la ciencia en Europa y, en consecuencia, debemos facilitar su desarrollo. Por esto, desde este Parlamento, aplaudimos la iniciativa de la Comisión de proponer un marco legal y las condiciones para ello.

De hecho, desde un principio, consideramos el desarrollo de infraestructuras de investigación de ámbito europeo como uno de los pilares del Espacio Europeo de Investigación, aunque siempre fuimos conscientes de las dificultades que habría que superar, no únicamente porque se requerían importantes recursos económicos —hay que recordar que la hoja de ruta de ESFRI identifica 44 proyectos que deberán desarrollarse en los próximos diez años—, sino también por la propia complejidad técnica y organizativa de la cuestión.

En este punto quiero subrayar una vez más que en una iniciativa de este calibre el Parlamento debería haber tenido un papel mucho más decisivo. Pero la urgencia de estas medidas y la ausencia de una mejor base legal en el Tratado vigente justifican suficientemente el uso del artículo 171, lo que no quita que ésta sea una razón más para proclamar la necesidad de disponer cuanto antes de un nuevo Tratado.

Voy a señalar brevemente algunas de las aportaciones del informe: en primer lugar, clarifica la definición de «infraestructura europea de investigación» para evitar confusiones entre lo que es la entidad legal y la propia infraestructura de investigación; también clarifica y completa los requisitos para que una infraestructura de investigación sea considerada de ámbito europeo, añadiendo cuestiones importantes tales como presentar una evaluación de impacto de la propuesta a nivel europeo, justificar su capacidad de financiación y asegurar una buena política de acceso a toda la comunidad científica europea.

Proponemos también ampliar esta iniciativa a infraestructuras ya existentes y damos todo nuestro apoyo a la propuesta de exención de IVA que hace la Comisión, que nos parece el elemento clave de esta iniciativa.

En este sentido, queremos mandar un mensaje claro al Consejo para que arregle cuanto antes sus problemas sobre esta cuestión y manifestar una vez más que si queremos impulsar la investigación en Europa debemos liberarla de cargas impositivas, algo que ya hemos recomendado en múltiples ocasiones para incentivar la participación de las PYME en tareas de I+D y que ahora debemos apoyar en relación con la creación de grandes infraestructuras de investigación de ámbito europeo, porque son esenciales para el progreso de la ciencia.

Para terminar, quisiera dar nuevamente las gracias a todas y todos los ponentes alternativos, a la Comisión, por su excelente colaboración, y también a los servicios de la comisión ITRE, por la ayuda que me han prestado en la elaboración de su informe.

3-266

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, first and foremost, I wish to express my gratitude to the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) and particularly to the rapporteur, Ms Riera Madurell, for supporting our proposal for the Community legal framework for a European Research Infrastructure. Listening to you was music to my ears!

Let me also thank the ITRE shadow rapporteurs for their constructive support.

Together, we are coming an important step closer to a legal framework which will allow Member States to collaborate for the construction of new large research infrastructures, which are becoming increasingly complex and expensive and can only be built if several European countries work together.

You have discussed the new legal instrument in depth, and you have made many amendments which will help to clarify the text and give it a better structure, notably regarding definition, scope and status, and by introducing references to the European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (ESFRI).

The Commission will make all possible efforts to support the implementation of these amendments by the Council.

We are especially glad to see that we agree on the most vital aspect of the discussions taking place right now in Council, and which risks blocking adoption – I mean the VAT issue.

As you know, all Member States agree that it is necessary to exempt research infrastructures set up by several countries from taxes in the host country.

Many times, for working purposes, it is addressed as a tax exemption issue, which creates some confusion. In reality, it concerns only the implementation of the existing VAT Directive, which has already been agreed and adopted by the Council. The real question is whether European research infrastructure should be given the status of international organisations, as defined in the VAT Directive, and, as such, be exempt from the VAT payment. Therefore, we are not talking about fiscal harmonisation but about setting up the legal entities related to research infrastructures.

Both the legal services of the Commission and of the Council have clearly stated that this is the right place. This is consequently purely a political decision on how important Member States consider the setting-up of new world-class research facilities in Europe to be.

Your unwavering support in this issue could be of great importance!

3-267

PRÉSIDENCE DE M. GÉRARD ONESTA
Vice-président

3-268

Paul Rübig, *im Namen der PPE-DE-Fraktion.* – Herr Präsident, Herr Kommissar, meine sehr verehrten Damen und Herren! Lambert van Nistelrooy hat einmal gesagt, dass es um die Definition der „Fünften Freiheit“ geht. Die „Fünfte Freiheit“ ist ganz einfach die Freiheit der Forscher, und Forscher können nicht an regionale, nationale oder internationale Niveaus gebunden sein.

Es geht ganz einfach darum, den Verbund und den Rechtsrahmen dafür zu schaffen, dass Forscher die Leistung erbringen, die die Gesellschaft auch von ihnen erwartet. Da geht es nicht nur um die Forschung an den Universitäten – die akademische Forschung – oder die Industrie, sondern insbesondere auch um die Forschung in den kleinen und mittleren Betrieben. Letztlich geht es auch darum, diese Forschungsergebnisse auch immer wieder zu präsentieren und zugänglich zu machen.

Wir haben im letzten Jahr hier im Haus den *Energy Club* präsentiert – Vizepräsident Onesta war ja dabei –, wo von der Wissenschaft und den Verantwortlichen eine Begeisterung ausging, dass es Erfindungen gibt, die uns allen sehr großen Nutzen bringen können. Das ist gerade in der derzeitigen Wirtschafts- und Energiekrise die richtige Antwort, dass wir derartige Forschungsinstrumente schaffen, die uns neue Produkte und Dienstleistungen ermöglichen, die dann auch wieder weltweit vermarktet werden können. Deshalb ist die Initiative der Kommission hier ganz besonders zu begrüßen, weil natürlich die Organisation derartiger Vorhaben die internationalen Möglichkeiten stärkt. Gerade die internationale Zusammenarbeit wird für uns in Europa, genauso wie für unsere Partner, immer bedeutender. Letztlich haben wir hier in Europa den kaufkräftigsten Raum der Welt entwickelt, und 500 Millionen Bürger in Europa haben das Recht, die Forschungsergebnisse so schnell und so effizient wie möglich erarbeitet zu bekommen. Danke.

3-269

Adam Gierek, *w imieniu grupy PSE.* – Panie Przewodniczący! Idea europejskiej infrastruktury badawczej (ERI) to tworzenie unikalnych warsztatów badawczych obsługiwanych przez wybitnych specjalistów w zakresie określonych metodyk. Winna je według mnie cechować koncentracja drogiej, unikalnej aparatury wraz z jej naukową obsługą. Ma ona służyć eksperymentalnemu poznawaniu, a więc głównie w drodze indukcji, zjawisk w otaczającym nas świecie, a w efekcie dochodzeniu do rozwiązywania efektów praktycznych. ERI powinna także służyć kształceniu młodych naukowców.

Myślę, że europejskiemu forum ESFRI nie chodzi o powielenie dotychczasowych centrów doskonałości, ale o kreowanie w oparciu o fundusze strukturalne i krajowe odmiennych, uzupełniających w stosunku do tych centrów, jednostek, które stworzą infrastrukturę specjalistycznych jednostek badawczych, obejmującą równomierną siecią całą Unię. Młodzi, ambitni naukowcy europejscy nie będą wtedy musieli szukać realizacji swych idei za oceanem. Warunkiem sprawnego funkcjonowania ERI jest więc, jak sądzę, z jednej strony głęboka specjalizacja, z drugiej zaś ułatwiona mobilność środowiska naukowego. Zapewni to wzrost efektywności organizacji badań poprzez ich koncentrację w czasie i rozdział w miejscu, to jest np. poprzez jednoczesną realizację elementarnych zadań badawczych w różnych wyspecjalizowanych międzynarodowych jednostkach ERI, które nie będąc strukturami gospodarczymi, byłyby zwolnione z podatków.

Dziękując za uwagę, gratuluję pani Madurell, zaś Komisji życzę rychłej realizacji tej ciekawej, choć wymagającej jednak dalszego sprecyzowania, koncepcji rozporządzenia.

3-270

Владко Тодоров Панайотов, от името на групата ALDE. – Бих искал да поздравя Teresa Riera Madurell за този доклад, който ни доближава до успешното изграждане на европейското научноизследователско пространство. Убеден съм, че именно чрез изграждането на мрежа от научноизследователски партньорства между държавите-членки, ще постигнем конкурентна и печеливша икономика, основана на знанието и иновациите. Обменът на знание не би бил възможен без съответната инфраструктура, защото тя има ключова роля в изграждането на ефикасна среда за реализирането на съвременни и изключително необходими научни изследвания.

На този етап цялата дейност е ограничена до рамките на индивидуални научноизследователски сътрудничества. Липсваше досега и съответната правна уредба, която да позволява установяването на подходящо партньорство с участници от различни държави, което всъщност е ключовият момент за нашия успех в тази насока. Липсата на тази правна уредба изключително много забавя процесите на научноизследователска интеграция на новите страни-членки, а тези страни-членки разполагат със значителен научен потенциал, който трябва да бъде инкорпориран в Европейския съюз.

Докладът е не само стъпка към създаването на правни способности за изграждане на научноизследователска инфраструктура. Чрез него би могло да се постигне движението на знания в Европейския съюз, да се повиши престижът и авторитетът на европейските научноизследователски центрове на световно ниво, да се повиши заетостта, а това също е и пътят за намиране на адекватни решения и на новите екологични предизвикателства. Поздравявам още веднъж докладчика г-жа Riera Madurell.

3-271

Nils Lundgren, för IND/DEM-gruppen. – Behövs det en ekonomisk europeisk rättsenhet på forskningsens område eller står vi inför ännu ett exempel på EU:s envetna kamp mot europeisk pluralism? Sanningen är ju att det krävs institutionell konkurrens för framgångsrika institutionella reformer. Tänk om det för 50 år sedan hade lagts fast en internationell juridisk form för forskningsinstitutioner! Då skulle utvecklingen på området ha avstannat. Att ändra internationella fördrag är svårt och går därför långsamt. Framstegen sker genom att länder lätt kan reformera sina nationella institutioner. Lyckade reformer sprider sig sedan till andra länder.

Kommissionens förslag är visserligen inte någon tvångströja. Det erbjuder ett alternativ utöver redan existerande nationella förslag, och innebär i så måtto en förbättring. Men förslaget förstör fullkomligt av att kommissionen också vill reglera beskattningen av denna rättsenhet på EU-nivå. Därför måste förslaget förkastas.

3-272

Erna Hennicot-Schoepges (PPE-DE). – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, je pense qu'il s'agit là d'une avancée très considérable dans la politique européenne de la recherche. C'est un résultat du rapport d'évaluation du sixième programme-cadre, mais c'est aussi une réflexion qui a été faite au cours de l'élaboration du septième.

Vous avez déclaré, Monsieur le Commissaire, que certains États membres sont désormais autorisés à s'associer. C'est pour le moins aberrant de relever qu'il faut une permission spéciale de l'Union européenne pour cela, mais enfin, c'est un progrès. Ce qui me préoccupe, c'est votre constatation que la TVA sera appliquée à son taux minimal et que la situation d'un statut international n'est pas encore tout à fait clarifiée, du moins je l'ai compris comme ça.

L'article 171 a été invoqué pour le vote sur l'entreprise commune SESAR. Nous avons voté deux fois sur ce projet parce que, dans la première version, le statut international n'avait pas été confirmé et, donc, l'entreprise commune n'a pas pu se constituer. Une autre entreprise commune, Galileo, ne s'est pas constituée du tout.

Mes questions sont les suivantes: quelle sera la part du financement communautaire? Un financement sera-t-il prévu pour ceux qui s'associent pour empêcher la dilapidation des moyens pour les infrastructures de recherche et pour encourager celles-ci? Sera-t-il enfin possible de puiser dans les fonds de cohésion pour la recherche, afin d'unir l'excellence et la cohésion?

3-273

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE). – Anul 2009 este Anul creativității și inovării.

Înființarea unei infrastructuri europene de cercetare care să lucreze pe baze necomerciale contribuie la eficientizarea programelor comunitare de cercetare și la diseminarea și optimizarea rezultatelor în materie de cercetare și dezvoltare tehnologică și demonstrativă la nivel comunitar.

Salut faptul că aceste infrastructuri pot primi cofinanțare prin instrumentele financiare ale politicii de coeziune, în conformitate cu regulamentele privind Fondul european de dezvoltare regională, Fondul social și Fondul de coeziune.

Vreau să subliniez că este extrem de important faptul că aceste infrastructuri fac legătura dintre institutele și structurile de cercetare, universități, mediul academic și sectorul privat, fiind în beneficiul utilizării rezultatelor cercetării de către zonele industriale.

Vreau însă să menționez faptul că, mai ales în această perioadă de criză, trebuie să ne asigurăm că cel puțin 1% din produsul intern brut al unui stat membru trebuie să fie dedicat cercetării.

3-274

Dragoș Florin David (PPE-DE). – Ideea unui spațiu european comun de cercetare și a cadrului legal comunitar aplicabil infrastructurilor europene de cercetare a reprezentat principiul de bază pentru atingerea obiectivelor Strategiei de la Lisabona referitor la creșterea economică, crearea de locuri de muncă și realizarea unei economii dinamice bazată pe cunoaștere.

Infrastructurile de cercetare joacă un rol din ce în ce mai important în progresul cunoașterii și al tehnologiei, datorită capacității lor de a regrupa resurse umane și investiții, astfel încât să se atingă masa critică, reușind să contribuie într-un mod determinant la dezvoltarea economică europeană. Ne-am propus să asigurăm cercetării o finanțare competitivă, infrastructuri și reguli de proprietate intelectuală adecvate, precum și mobilitate eficientă pentru cercetători, din dorința ca Uniunea Europeană să fie un partener în cercetarea internațională de vârf.

Astăzi, prin propunerea de Regulament privind cadrul legal comunitar aplicabil infrastructurilor europene de cercetare consolidăm crearea celei de-a cincea libertăți în Europa: libera circulație a cunoașterii. Actualul regulament va constitui pilonul dezvoltării cercetării europene, infrastructura europeană de cercetare fiind garantul excelenței științifice în cercetarea comunitară și competitivitatea economiei comunitare, pe baza prognozelor pe termen mediu și lung și prin sprijinirea eficientă a activităților europene de cercetare.

În contextul actualei crize economice, aplicarea cât mai rapidă a acestui regulament, corelată cu încurajarea și facilitarea investițiilor în cercetare și dezvoltare, realizarea de standarde comune în domeniul cunoașterii și modernizarea sistemelor de educație națională vor fi soluții reale pentru depășirea acesteia.

Consider că în acest moment trebuie să acordăm o atenție sporită diferențelor existente în domeniul dezvoltării infrastructurii pentru inovație și cercetare între statele membre dezvoltate și statele membre cu economie în curs de dezvoltare, astfel încât să nu creăm migrații importante ale cercetătorilor din economiile statelor nou aderate spre statele membre a căror economie se află la vârful economiei mondiale. O distribuție omogenă a acestor infrastructuri în cadrul Uniunii Europene și, totodată, a oportunităților de cercetare, ar fi în beneficiul întregii Uniuni și ar ajuta în combaterea migrației oamenilor de știință de la est către vest.

În încheiere, doresc să o felicit pe raportoarea dna Riera Madurell și colegii din Comisia pentru industrie, cercetare și energie pentru contribuția lor la realizarea acestui raport.

3-275

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Mr President, could you share the five minutes between the two applications that have been made? I would be interested in taking two minutes, if that was in order?

3-275-001

Le Président. – Écoutez, vous me posez un probleme de conscience. Le Reglement dit une minute. Une minute.

3-276

Avril Doyle (PPE-DE). – Mr President, with the greatest respect, we have already wasted two minutes talking about it. There are five minutes from the floor under 'catch the eye'. I have participated in other debates where there were perhaps one, two or three speakers and we share the time. I want just two minutes – I do not know about the other colleagues.

Thank you for allowing me to trespass on your patience, Mr President.

I fully support the establishment of legal status for new European research infrastructures for pan-European research projects and pan-European funding.

I have two quick points. I have in front of me – and I would like to compliment the Commissioner and his staff – a publication entitled ‘A more research-intensive and integrated European Research Area: Science, Technology and Competitiveness key figures report 2008/2009’. I think the figures may be well out of date, given the collapse in GDP across the EU and elsewhere. I particularly pick up the point that public funding of R&D can be counter-cyclical, as happened in Japan and the US in the early 1990s and early noughties respectively. When there were collapses in their GDP, the public sector investment in R&D went up.

Could you extrapolate from what we are experiencing at the moment in the EU, with what we have available in FP7 and from Member States, in view of the collapse of economic growth throughout the EU at the moment – we are not alone globally – whether we will be able to compensate with increased public sector funding in R&D?

My second point concerns the frightening prospect as regards the EU’s world share in patent applications, which has declined by an alarming figure. The high costs of patents in Europe, you say, might possibly explain this. In Europe the costs and corresponding costs for patent applications are over 20% higher than in the US, 13 times higher than in the Japan Patent Office, while the costs of maintaining a patent protection in the 27 Member States is over 60 times higher in the EU than the US – frightening implications. Perhaps you could tell us, Commissioner, how we could resolve this as soon as possible?

I should like to congratulate you once again, Commissioner, on a fascinating publication.

3-277

Mieczysław Edmund Janowski (UEN). – Panie Przewodniczący! Wyrażam uznanie dla pani poseł sprawozdawcy za wykonaną pracę. Nawiążę tutaj do wypowiedzi pani Doyle. W tym czasie, kiedy doświadczamy załamania gospodarczego, nie możemy sobie pozwolić na błąd zaniedbania wobec nauki i badań, wobec ludzi, którzy pracują w tej dziedzinie. Popieram więc działania dotyczące prawnego umocowania europejskiej infrastruktury badawczej ERI.

Musimy mieć świadomość tego, iż dla ERI potrzeba zarówno ram legislacyjnych, jak i adekwatnych pieniędzy, których nie są w stanie wyasygnować ani pojedyncze regiony ani też nawet kraje. Ważna jest tutaj także kwestia właściwego opodatkowania. Uważam też ponadto, że konieczna jest lepsza współpraca między ośrodkami nauki a gospodarką, w tym także małymi i średnimi przedsiębiorstwami. W moim przekonaniu ERI przyczyni się także, jeśli będzie miała miejsce właściwa korelacja z programami ramowymi, do lepszego usytuowania ludzi nauki, zwłaszcza młodzieży - o czym mówił pan Gierek. Może zapobiegnie to również drenazowi mózgów z Europy. Pamiętajmy o tym, że strategia lizbońska zakłada trzyprocentowy udział nakładów na naukę i badania w PKB. Dziś dla Unii Europejskiej - dane za rok 2007 - wskaźnik ten wynosi 1,84. Ufam zatem, że ERI poprawi tę sytuację.

3-278

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, firstly I would like to thank you for your support. I think we all understand how important it is that we talk. I may not follow the order of the questions but will try to respond briefly to what you asked.

Ms Doyle, as regards public funding, the experience of the past has shown that, in times of crisis, private financing most likely goes down. That is why public financing should not make the terrible mistake of following that pattern because that would be the way which, after the crisis, would lead us to a completely improper situation. That is why public financing has to act counter-cyclically and that is why, even in Europe, we have had that kind of example. Finland was the case at the beginning of the 1990s. I think we should do something like that and we should follow that path.

On the cost of patent application, it is very striking. I think there is no simple answer. ‘Better’ would certainly be an answer which would be more horizontal than anything which we could do. Last year we tried to do our best by proposing to clarify this patent picture in relations between private and public institutions, but certainly that is not the answer to the depth of the problem which we are facing in patent application.

Now I turn to the proposal about the questions about the financing from the Seventh Framework Programme. What we have financed until now is the preparatory phase of the projects which are released. It is not intended that we finance institutionally the infrastructure. This will be done by the Member States and also Member States will decide, for example, where this will be located. But when this is finished we will certainly, as for any other infrastructure, finance the grants.

That is really the only way ahead. I can remind you that, when we discussed the issue of the budget of the research infrastructure, this was the budget which in percentage points was really mostly cut for the Seventh Framework Programme. I am, however, quite optimistic. We are well ahead, and I think that legislation is bringing good solutions.

Concerning VAT, I would like to be precise. We do not propose VAT exemption in the legislation. We believe that if more countries are joining in efforts to build a common infrastructure, say between Germany and Slovenia or the United Kingdom or anywhere, then at the end of the day none of the countries will agree to pay VAT in that country. That is the

case also today – but what exactly is the case today? Today the countries are individually negotiating with the host country of that kind of exemption. What we are trying to do, via that legislation, is to guarantee the status of an international organisation which would as a consequence, due to the VAT legislation which exists today, guarantee VAT exemption.

That would, in essence, be the end of story anyway, but time was mentioned. Time is the crucial question here, so we are talking about whether we can speed up and simplify how we are building the research infrastructure together. Unfortunately, today's situation in research infrastructure is so complex that we are losing time and thus money also. In essence, that is the story.

I have forgotten cohesion. The answer is yes.

To finish, that is exactly the point which we have to underline. We need infrastructure. We need it as soon as possible. This is the step to speed up the whole process. I thank you for understanding that and I thank you for your support in that context.

3-278-001

Le Président. – Avant de passer la parole à notre rapporteur, je voudrais préciser quelque chose pour Mme Avril Doyle. Nous avons fait quelques petites recherches sur le plan technique.

Vous avez reçu une communication du Secrétaire général adjoint en date du 8 janvier 2008, il y a un peu plus d'un an, relative à une décision de la Conférence des présidents du 27 octobre 2007. Au point 3, alinéa B, il est bien précisé que le temps du "Catch the eye" est de cinq minutes maximum, et est limité à une minute, maximum, par orateur.

Voici la règle, mais vous étiez tellement délicieuse à écouter que nous avons écouté avec grand plaisir vos propos. Nous en revenons maintenant à notre rapporteur Mme Riera Madurell.

3-279

Teresa Riera Madurell, Ponente. – Señor Presidente, quisiera agradecer a todas las colegas que han participado en este debate sus aportaciones y también al Señor Comisario sus palabras y decirle que estoy totalmente de acuerdo con su explicación, clarísima, en relación con la cuestión del IVA. Para concluir quisiera decir simplemente que la mayoría estamos de acuerdo en lo esencial. El mensaje es claro: la excelencia en investigación precisa de infraestructuras de investigación de alta calidad y, debido básicamente a sus elevados costes de construcción y explotación, es importante compartir gran parte de estas infraestructuras de investigación. Es decir, es más que razonable pensar en crear infraestructuras de ámbito europeo que puedan prestar servicio a toda la comunidad científica europea.

La hoja de ruta elaborada por ESFRI ha supuesto, ciertamente, un paso adelante hacia una mejor planificación de las infraestructuras de investigación de nivel europeo. De lo que se trata ahora es de poner en práctica esta hoja de ruta. Para ello, ciertamente, uno de los problemas principales es la financiación, como han apuntado algunos de los colegas, porque a pesar del aumento de la financiación asignada a infraestructuras en el Séptimo Programa Marco y de las posibilidades de apoyo a las infraestructuras en los programas de política de cohesión, que han mencionado también algunos de mis colegas, el presupuesto de la Unión Europea no basta para financiar todas las infraestructuras necesarias. Por ello es esencial movilizar fuentes de financiación, nacionales y privadas, en la medida de que sea posible, especialmente de la industria, aunque, como ha dicho muy bien el Comisario, no es éste muy buen momento.

Otra dificultad, no menos importante, hasta ahora, era la falta de estructura jurídica. Y éste ha sido el objetivo de la Comisión al presentar esta propuesta: establecer un marco legal y las condiciones que permitan desarrollar infraestructuras de investigación de ámbito europeo. Una buena propuesta que —de eso estamos convencidos— sale reforzada de este Parlamento, como ya ha dicho el Comisario.

Quiero pedirle una vez más al Consejo, pues, que escuche nuestro mensaje.

3-280

Paul Rübig (PPE-DE). – Herr Präsident! Ich möchte bitten, dass man die Heizung bis zum Schluss der Sitzung eingeschaltet lässt, denn es ist zu kalt im Haus.

3-281

Le Président. – Nous notons cette remarque. Peut-être faudrait-il que nos débats du soir soient plus animés, plus chaleureux, pour réchauffer l'atmosphère. Mais c'est vrai que la salle est grande.

Sur ce point fondamental, qui fera beaucoup pour faire avancer la recherche européenne, le débat est clos.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi 19 février 2009.

3-282

Constantin Dumitriu (PPE-DE), în scris. – În perioadele când economia este în declin, tentația autorităților este să reducă fondurile pentru cercetare. Mă bucur însă că prin discutarea acestui raport referitor la propunerea de Regulament al Consiliului privind cadrul legal comunitar aplicabil infrastructurilor europene de cercetare transmitem un semnal important că activitatea de cercetare rămâne o prioritate pentru Uniunea Europeană.

Am convingerea că prin stabilirea acestui cadru instituțional pentru susținerea activității de cercetare vom vedea rezultate care să sprijine economia europeană. Pentru că activitatea de cercetare nu este un moft, ci o necesitate care să asigure competitivitatea economiei europene pe plan global.

Vreau să insist asupra unui aspect extrem de important în care cercetarea poate avea un rol important. În următorii 25 de ani, din cauza procesului de urbanizare, se preconizează că vor fi scoase din circuitul agricol aproape 25% din terenuri. Pentru a compensa reducerea suprafeței avem nevoie de o productivitate mai mare, pe suprafețe mai mici, cu consum redus de apă sau pesticide. Soluțiile pot veni prin cercetare, prin biotehnologii, având în vedere, bineînțeles, principiul siguranței alimentare.

Este un motiv în plus pentru a sprijini mai mult activitatea de cercetare și a asigura un cadru unitar la nivel european.

3-283

Daniel Petru Funeriu (PPE-DE), în scris. – Salut raportul referitor la stabilirea cadrului juridic pentru Infrastructura Europeană de Cercetare (IEC), cât și propunerea Comisiei pentru o reglementare în domeniu.

IEC vine ca răspuns la o necesitate reală a cercetătorilor europeni și va duce fără îndoială la sporirea competitivității științei europene.

Unul dintre elementele importante ale acestei reglementări este posibilitatea Comunității Europene de a participa într-o entitate de tip IEC. Acest fapt dă Comunității capacitatea de participare și orientare a politicilor de cercetare transeuropene.

În virtutea acestui element chem Comisia Europeană să aibă în vedere în momentul susținerii financiare a IEC trei elemente:

- 1) participarea Comunității exclusiv la proiecte cu un potențial științific foarte ridicat
- 2) încurajarea constituirii de IEC în regiuni care tradițional au fost victime ale fenomenului de „brain-drain” intra și extracomunitar
- 3) facilitarea accesului societăților din sectorul privat la IEC.

Politicile comunitare în acest domeniu trebuie să îmbine excelența științifică și crearea unui influx de cercetători și infrastructuri performante înspre țări, precum noii aderanți la Uniunea Europeană din valurile de aderare 2004 și 2007.

3-283-500

Nicolae Vlad Popa (PPE-DE), în scris. – Raportul redactat de Teresa Riera Madurell are o importanță deosebită deoarece crează cadrul juridic necesar pentru dezvoltarea infrastructurilor de cercetare.

Înființarea infrastructurilor europene de cercetare reprezintă garanția că cercetarea se va ridica la un înalt nivel.

În plus, va crea noi oportunități în privința colaborării mai strânse între echipele de cercetători europeni la care se pot alătura numeroși studenți și personal tehnic, fapt ce contribuie la atragerea tinerilor în domeniul cercetării de vârf.

Acest cadru legal trebuie să asigure și o mai bună cooperare între industrie și cercetarea academică pentru a facilita astfel punerea în practică a inovațiilor.

Susțin propunerea raportoarei care cere Comisiei să informeze periodic Parlamentul European cu privire la situația evoluției infrastructurilor europene de cercetare.

Costul înființării unor infrastructuri de cercetare la scară largă impune combinarea eforturilor mai multor țări.

Elaborarea unui cadru juridic comun este absolut necesar pentru a facilita și accelera dezvoltarea acestor infrastructuri.

3-284

25 - Une place spéciale pour les enfants dans l'action extérieure de l'UE (brève présentation)

3-285

Le Président. – L'ordre du jour appelle la brève présentation du rapport de Glenys Kinnock, au nom de la commission du développement, sur une place à part pour les enfants dans l'action extérieure de l'UE (2008/2203(INI)) (A6-0039/2009).

3-286

Glenys Kinnock, rapporteur. – Mr President, I have to say at the outset that I very much welcome the communication which has been prepared by the Commission. I think it is both comprehensive and ambitious.

In my report, Commissioner, I recommend which practical actions, investments and processes are needed if we are to identify that very special place for children in external action. The Commission and the Council communication and conclusions on external action will build upon the external dimension of the EU strategy on the rights of the child. I believe that this is essential work for the European Union.

Commissioner, I now look forward very much to seeing actions intended to match the ambition which I see. We need to see substance backing up the rhetoric. That means that resources must be available and, of course – as I am sure you will agree – there must be no backtracking by the European Union Member States on the commitments they have made to fund the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). What we know is that, for most of the world's two billion children, it is a daily struggle against poverty and vulnerability. As we know, 98% of the children in our world living in extreme poverty are living in developing countries.

Furthermore, it is now clear that the impact of the financial crisis will be severely felt by children and young people, for instance when the budgets are cut back on health and education. That is why I think it is right that we make a political commitment, at the highest level, on behalf of and with children. The EU must see in its partnership with the developing countries the opportunity to influence public policy to save children's lives. Priority actions for children must be promoted when the European Commission negotiates the country strategy papers' regional and thematic strategies, when they are drawn up and subsequently when they are reviewed.

When there is budget support, including MDG budget contracts, specific objectives and indicators on children must and should be included. I welcome the Commission's intention to draw up partner national action plans for children. We need assurances that even the most marginalised children – including children with disabilities and orphans – have access to equitable health, welfare and judicial services.

I believe there needs to be more and better training of Commission staff – both in Brussels and in delegations – particularly in how they manage the participation of children. We need to see a radical rethink in the European Union about how we ensure that we listen to children and invite children to participate, because we understand that it is children themselves who give lives to the values that are enshrined in international law through the Convention on the Rights of the Child agreed in 1989. It is my experience that the children themselves – the young people – have a wealth of understanding and experience – which we must tap into – on how to tackle poverty and environmental degradation.

I welcome the fact that the Commission recognises the importance of consultation during the preparation of the EU strategy on the rights of the child. I also understand that this has been planned for the first half of 2009. Commissioner, would the Commission be able to confirm when this process will begin? I trust there will not be any decision that the public consultation – including with children – will be put on hold until a new Commission and Parliament is in place.

Finally, to quote Kofi Annan, 'There is no trust more sacred than the one the world holds with children. There is no duty more important than ensuring that their rights are respected, that their welfare is protected, that their lives are free from fear and want and that they grow up in peace.' I think all of us would agree that those are fine objectives.

3-287

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, it is a pleasure to be here today to talk about children and also about the report you will adopt shortly.

Let me talk for a few minutes about how we got to where we are today and what will come in the future and about child participation, which is most likely our biggest challenge regarding children.

Today is an important step in a long process that started several years ago internally in the Commission. We recognise that the EU needs a strategy on children. We need a strategy on how we, the European Union, will implement the commitments. We and the rest of the world have signed up to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The first step was the Commission communication 'Towards an EU Strategy on the Rights of the Child' in 2006. This was followed in 2008 by the communication package on children in external actions, which outlined a comprehensive approach to children by the EU using all available instruments in external cooperation.

Let me digress for a moment, since I am convinced that some of you will be asking the question: what about the EU strategy on the rights of the child, which was announced in the above-mentioned communication? I can confirm that the Commission is working on such a strategy, which will be presented under the next Commission.

During the Slovenian presidency in May 2008, the Council adopted conclusions on the promotion and protection of the rights of the child in the European Union's external action – the development of humanitarian dimensions.

The Committee on Development then started drafting a report and we are now at the end of this process and tomorrow you will be voting on this excellent report.

In addition, the EU's policy on children is based on the two EU guidelines – the Guidelines on Children in Armed Conflicts and the Guidelines on the Rights of the Child – both being implemented in a number of selected priority and pilot countries. The Commission welcomes the report – which is an excellent complement to our communication – the Council conclusions and the guidelines. We will surely use it in our work on children.

Let me focus my last comments on what is probably our biggest challenge today: child participation. How do we ensure that we involve children in decisions that concern them? How do we ensure that children have access to pertinent information? How do we ensure equal access for children to express their views? We have to recognise that, amongst everything that we all agreed to in the Convention on the Rights of the Child, this might be the major challenge.

We have to admit that we are still far from achieving anything significant in the area of child participation. In the Commission we are starting to reflect on how to design and implement proper child participation that is not just tokenism. It should be relevant, meaningful and informed child participation. We have also ensured relevant funding for child participation under the thematic programme 'Investing in People'.

Why is this difficult for us adults? Essentially, because it questions what is fundamental to us: the way we behave.

What will the Commission do in its external action to promote this participation? The Commission will make the tools available for our delegations to consult children, but these tools will be used not only by our delegations but also by partner countries. We are also developing a tool kit, together with UNICEF, that should not only address the child participation but also overall child protection, legal reform, child budgeting.

In addition to the tool kit, we are also recasting and strengthening our collaboration with UNICEF in general in order to be able to improve our support to partner countries in their efforts to ensure that children have a voice at country level.

We also cooperate closely with various NGOs to learn from them about possible formats, often involving children and having meaningful child participation. Let me be honest: it is not going to happen tomorrow. This is just the start of a long process.

Let me just make one comment on the report. The report underlines how the Commission should pay attention to child participation, but, colleagues, you will also have to do so, and I can assure you that the Commission will be happy to work with you on advancing this. We should build on the collective force of the two institutions to advance this important issue.

Let me once again express the Commission's appreciation of the report and underline that we will do our utmost to carry out these recommendations. We are counting on the continued support of Parliament in this area.

In answer to Ms Kinnock's question, I am happy to confirm that the position of the Commission has not changed. The idea of using 2009 for consultations was launched in the Commission itself and we are working to put in place the conditions for a process of consultation with children that avails itself of all existing tools.

Let me also underline that the Commission is keen to ensure a process of consultation that fully respects the rights of the child.

Finally, let me thank you, Ms Kinnock, for a very fruitful collaboration on children and child-related issues, not only as regards this report, but also over the years. I know that I was too long, but you can never be too long when you are talking about children's rights.

3-288

Le Président. – Merci infiniment, Monsieur le Commissaire. Effectivement, votre discours était très intéressant sur un sujet également très important.

Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi 19 février 2009.

Déclarations écrites (article. 142)

John Attard-Montalto (PSE), *in writing*. – It is a sad day when we have to acknowledge that every day more than 26 000 children under the age of five die around the world, mostly from preventable causes.

It is tragic that many lives can be saved with the appropriate measures, be they medical or financial, and still the situation is aggravating. Special attention has to be given to the most vulnerable and socially excluded girls and boys, including disabled children, migrant children and children from minorities.

The report is commendable. I only disagree with those aspects which refer to abortion.

The Committee on Development adopted this own-initiative report (drafted by Glenys Kinnock (PES, UK) on a special place of children in EU external action in response to the Commission communication on the subject. The committee welcomed the communication and the four guiding principles of the Commission's Action Plan on Children's Rights in External Action, which include a holistic and coherent child-rights-based approach.

Without losing any more time we must:

- (a) undertake a thorough analysis of children's rights;
- (b) build up existing youth and children's networks as sustainable platforms for consulting children;
- (c) ensure that international agreements between the EU and third countries should contain a legally binding clause on the protection of children's rights.

3-289

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (PSE), *în scris*. – Este de datoria noastră, să ne asigurăm că noi suntem cei care construim un viitor mai bun, nu doar pentru europeni, ci și pentru cei din țări în curs de dezvoltare.

Copiii sunt cei care reprezintă viitorul și trebuie să ne asigurăm că drepturile lor sunt prezente și respectate în țări terțe care primesc finanțare europeană.

Este prioritar ca în relațiile cu țări terțe, Uniunea Europeană să se asigure că dreptul la educație și accesul copiilor la servicii medicale este asigurat.

Este adevărat că traversăm o perioadă de criză financiară, dar nu putem neglija faptul că la nivel mondial, la fiecare 3 secunde, un copil moare și că, la fiecare minut, o femeie își găsește sfârșitul dând naștere.

Având în vedere că jumătate din populația mondială este reprezentată de copii, este necesar să considerăm că drepturile copiilor sunt o prioritate a politicii de dezvoltare a Uniunii Europene.

Fiecare stat membru, în funcție de posibilități, ar trebui să se implice în politicile de cooperare cu țările în curs de dezvoltare, iar Comisia Europeană ar trebui să facă presiuni asupra țărilor în curs de dezvoltare pentru transpunerea în legislația națională a dispozițiilor Convenției Națiunilor Unite cu privire la drepturile copilului.

3-289-500

Anna Záborská (PPE-DE), *písomne*. – Som rada, že som mohla vo výbore pre práva žien k tejto správe napísať stanovisko. Vážne som sa zaoberala otázkou práv dieťaťa v rámci vonkajších vzťahov.

Moje stanovisko bolo prijaté jednomyselne. Predovšetkým sa v ňom pripomína, že vonkajšia stratégia EÚ, pokiaľ ide o práva dieťaťa, by mala byť založená na hodnotách a zásadách, definovaných vo Všeobecnej deklarácii ľudských práv, najmä v článkoch 3, 16, 18, 23, 25, 26 a 29. Tieto sú obzvlášť dôležité pre ľudskú osobu a spoločné dobro. Stanovisko zdôrazňuje, že všetky opatrenia v prospech práv dieťaťa by mali rešpektovať prioritné postavenie rodičov a najbližších príbuzných dieťaťa.

Tým, že EP prijal moje stanovisko, podporuje dôležitosť ochrany ľudského života od jeho počatia a dáva každému dieťaťu jeho vlastnú identitu. Bola som schopná zaviesť ustanovenia, ktoré odsudzujú rodovo špecifickú diskrimináciu na základe dedičných vlastností, ktorá je v niektorých krajinách čoraz bežnejšia. Stanovisko žiada Komisiu, aby v rámci rozvojovej politiky Únie zdôrazňovala význam a potrebu registrácie narodenia každého dieťaťa vo všetkých tretích krajinách a aby prepojila svoje programy pomoci s touto požiadavkou.

Podporujem každú snahu, ktorá napomáha rozvojovej pomoci. Trvám však na tom, že humanitárne organizácie a medzinárodné orgány zodpovedné za pridelenie pomoci zaručia, že primeraná pomoc a potrebné prostriedky sa skutočne dostanú k deťom a nebude sa nimi plytvať.

3-290

26 - Application de la directive 2002/14/CE établissant un cadre général relatif à l'information et la consultation des travailleurs dans la Communauté européenne (brève présentation)

3-291

Le Président. – L'ordre du jour appelle la brève présentation du rapport de Jean Louis Cottigny, au nom de la commission de l'emploi et des affaires sociales, sur l'application de la directive 2002/14/CE établissant un cadre général relatif à l'information et la consultation des travailleurs dans la Communauté européenne (2008/2246(INI)) (A6-0023/2009).

3-292

Jean Louis Cottigny, rapporteur. – Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Commissaire, chers collègues, je souhaite en premier lieu remercier les différents rapporteurs fictifs pour leur travail d'ouverture d'esprit lors de notre collaboration sur ce texte au sein de la commission de l'emploi.

Les États membres devraient améliorer la mise en œuvre de la directive sur l'information et la consultation des travailleurs, en particulier dans le contexte actuel de la crise financière et de ses conséquences en termes de restructurations, de fusions et de délocalisations d'entreprises. Tel est le message que la commission de l'emploi a souhaité communiquer dans ce rapport d'initiative.

L'Union européenne compte 23 millions d'entreprises de moins de 250 salariés. Elles représentent 99 % des entreprises et emploient plus de 100 millions de personnes. Le droit des travailleurs à l'information et à la consultation sont des composantes essentielles de l'économie sociale de marché.

La transposition de la directive 2002/14/CE a pris un retard considérable dans certains États membres. Dans ce rapport d'initiative, nous faisons observer que l'impact de cette directive est évident dans les pays où aucun système général d'information et de consultation des travailleurs n'existait.

J'en appelle à une meilleure transposition de la directive dans les États membres. Nous demandons instamment à la Commission de prendre, dans les plus brefs délais, des mesures permettant d'assurer la bonne transposition de cette directive par les États membres et d'engager des procédures d'infraction contre ceux qui ne l'ont pas transposée, ou pas correctement.

Le rapport souligne également que, dans leurs mesures de transposition, certains États membres n'ont pas tenu compte de certains jeunes travailleurs, des femmes qui travaillent à temps partiel ou des travailleurs employés pour une courte période, sous contrat à durée déterminée.

Nous demandons aux États membres de définir précisément le terme "information" en permettant aux représentants des travailleurs d'examiner les données fournies et de ne pas se borner à attendre la fin de la procédure d'information si les décisions des entreprises ont des conséquences directes sur les travailleurs. Les États membres qui ne disposent pas de sanctions efficaces, proportionnées et dissuasives sont priés d'en instaurer. Enfin, dans une meilleure coordination des différents instruments législatifs, nous invitons aussi la Commission à examiner les exigences de coordination des six directives et du règlement traitant de l'information des travailleurs, afin de procéder à d'éventuelles modifications destinées à éliminer les chevauchements et les contradictions.

Parce que ce type d'avancée dans les droits des travailleurs est plus que salutaire, l'Union se doit de garantir que les États transposent correctement et complètement les obligations de la directive. Il est essentiel que tous les travailleurs européens sachent que l'Europe les soutient dans leur implication dans la vie de leur entreprise, dans leur vie quotidienne de travailleurs, et surtout par les temps qui courent.

3-293

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I take due note of Mr Cottigny's support on what is an important directive which consolidates at European level a fundamental social right of employees. The Commission attaches great importance to informing and consulting employees at both national and transnational level particularly in the current difficult context of the financial crisis.

We proposed the recasting of the directive on European work councils. This has been successfully completed. We are continuing our work on the anticipation and socially responsible management of restructuring and the questions arising at European level from the negotiation of transnational agreements.

As explained in its communication of 17 March 2008 the Commission's prime concern for the implementation of Directive 2002/14/EC is that it should be comprehensive and effective in collaboration with the Member States and the two sides of industry, which have an extremely important role to play, as you know. It should be borne in mind that the directive only establishes a general framework that can be implemented and expanded by the two sides of industry, particularly at company level.

The Commission conducts and supports activities for raising awareness, promoting the exchange of best practices and boosting the capacities of all the parties involved by means of seminars, training courses, studies and financial aid for projects particularly under a specific budget line.

The Commission also monitors the correct application of the directive in its capacity as Guardian of the Treaties: for example, if complaints are made by trade union organisations. So far, however, the Commission has received very few complaints concerning the implementation of this directive.

3-294

Le Président. – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi 19 février 2009.

Déclarations écrites (article 142)

3-294-500

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE), în scris. – Implementarea Directivei 2002/14/CE de stabilire a unui cadru general de informare și consultare a lucrătorilor din Comunitatea Europeană înregistrează o întârziere considerabilă în anumite State Membre.

Consider ca trebuie intensificată implicarea democratică a lucrătorilor în luarea deciziilor care afectează întreprinderea având în vedere caracterul global al crizei financiare actuale ce afectează fără deosebire Statele Membre în rețeaua lor economică și generează temeri privind restructurări, fuziuni sau delocalizări.

Solicit ca în cazul restructurării întreprinderilor, fondurile europene să fie accesibile și pentru asistența lucrătorilor, nu doar a întreprinderilor. De asemenea, consider ca trebuie să devină obligatoriu ca în situația în care o companie multinațională se restructurează, să fie invitați la negocieri și să fie consultați reprezentanții sindicali din toate filialele acelei întreprinderi, nu doar cei din statul membru în care compania își are sediul principal.

Consider importantă actualizarea periodică a legislației referitoare la lucrători în privința drepturilor lor de a fi informați și consultați și includerea acestui aspect pe ordinea de zi a dialogului social european, atât la nivel interprofesional, cât și la nivel sectorial.

3-295

27 - Économie sociale (brève présentation)

3-296

Le Président. – L'ordre du jour appelle la brève présentation du rapport de Patrizia Toia, au nom de la commission de l'emploi et des affaires sociales, sur l'économie sociale (2008/2250(INI)) (A6-0015/2009).

3-297

Patrizia Toia, relatrice. – Signor Presidente, onorevoli colleghi, sono lieta e fiera che il Parlamento europeo esamini il tema dell'economia sociale di mercato e decida delle proposte concrete per dare un sostegno effettivo a questo settore.

Gli scopi del mio rapporto sono tre. Il primo: accendere un faro di attenzione, una luce di interesse per una realtà molto importante e pesante anche nell'ambito economico; il 10% delle imprese europee appartengono a questo settore e anche il 9 e 10% dell'occupazione. E' una realtà fatta di soggetti diversi – cooperative, mutue, fondazioni, imprese sociali, associazioni – che condividono specifici valori e contribuiscono significativamente al PIL. Dunque, dare una visibilità istituzionale più chiara e più limpida.

Secondo scopo: affermare che questo settore non è una marginalità, un'eccezione, ma sta pienamente nell'ambito dell'economia di mercato, con le sue regole che il mercato interno deve anche riconoscere e rispettare. Un modo diverso di fare impresa, di produrre, di consumare e di dare lavoro, un modo diverso ma a pieno titolo nel mercato. Un modo che è caratterizzato da alcuni tratti distintivi che non devono essere appiattiti e che consistono sostanzialmente nel volere associare e conciliare la produzione e il lavoro con i valori della solidarietà, della responsabilità, della dignità della persona anche nel mondo del lavoro.

Qualcuno dice, a mio avviso efficacemente, che queste imprese operano con il capitale ma non per il capitale. Si tratta di concetti che fanno parte del bagaglio ideale dell'Unione europea – basata pensare a Delors – perché spesso noi abbiamo riconosciuto l'economia sociale come chiave di volta del modello sociale europeo, ma poco abbiamo fatto poi concretamente.

Oggi è anche il momento più opportuno per riscoprire l'attualità di queste imprese, perché l'attuale crisi produttiva ha rivelato che molti soggetti economici tradizionali sono molto fragili, molto deboli e qualche volta molto spregiudicati. Questo mondo dell'economia sociale invece è più legato al territorio, all'economia reale, alla persona e dunque è al riparo, e lo è stato, da tentazioni speculative. E' anche un settore che ha soggetti molto diversi, che hanno molto a che fare anche col *welfare*. Si chiama anche il mondo sociale "polo di utilità sociale" e può aiutare credo la sostenibilità dei nostri sistemi sociali in momenti di ristrettezza.

Terzo scopo: decidere cosa possiamo fare concretamente per sostenere questo settore. Faccio solo alcune proposte molto brevemente. Occorre innanzitutto fare chiarezza definitoria per capire accuratamente i profili e le definizioni di questi soggetti così diversi. E' indispensabile anche contabilizzare nella contabilità nazionale di diversi paesi l'apporto di questo settore in modo corretto. Non appartiene all'economia capitalista, né a quella economica pubblica e dunque ha bisogno di una sua definizione. Qualcosa ha fatto la Commissione in questo senso con un manuale, ma va implementata assolutamente l'applicazione. E in questa direzione penso che il mondo dell'accademia, della ricerca, dell'università può dare un contributo.

Infine, quali iniziative legislative, se occorrono. Sono state fatte diverse cose – lo statuto della cooperativa, lo statuto della fondazione – e ho visto che la Commissione ha ripreso una consultazione. Ecco, bisogna capire che cosa serve e se serve continuare lungo questa strada. Noi non vogliamo una burocratizzazione di un settore che vive di idealità, di motivazioni e di libertà. Ma laddove servono, o dove servissero, anche norme comunitarie, sarà bene predisporle.

Una richiesta infine di coinvolgimento nel dialogo sociale di questo mondo. A quale livello e dove collocare una sede di consultazione e di dialogo con la Commissione europea? E infine quale sostegno diretto nei programmi europei: programmi ad hoc per il mondo dell'economia sociale o riserve giustamente nei programmi esistenti di una finalizzazione per questi soggetti? Lasciamo alla valutazione anche della Commissione.

Da ultimo voglio ringraziare le associazioni nazionali, le reti europee che mi hanno molto affiancato in questo lavoro, l'intergruppo del Parlamento che c'è per l'economia sociale e bene lavora, gli *shadows* e anche i Commissari Verheugen e Špidla con cui il dialogo è stato abbastanza franco e intenso.

Affidiamo questo rapporto, che ha visto una grande partecipazione di forze sociali e di associazioni, alla Commissione, nella speranza che anche nella ristrettezza dei tempi per la conclusione della legislatura si possa trovare il tempo, signor Commissario che rappresenta qui l'intera Commissione, per consolidare qualche iniziativa, per dare un segno concreto, perché il prossimo Parlamento, la prossima Commissione, possa non ricominciare daccapo ma da qualche cosa di concreto.

3-298

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, the Commission welcomes Parliament's initiative to formulate an own-initiative opinion on the social economy. Especially in the context of the present financial and economic crisis, this important sector deserves to be promoted more.

Social economy enterprises have a unique way of doing business since they combine economic performance mutually between members, and often also the achievement of social and societal objectives, as a business purpose. Thus, they are well placed to contribute to Community policies and objectives, particularly in the field of employment, social cohesion, regional and rural development, environmental protection, consumer protection and social security. Social economy enterprises are an integral part of the Commission's enterprise policy. Since in the majority they are micro-, small- or medium-sized enterprises, they already benefit from the Small Business Act and all actions targeting small enterprises.

With regard to the social economy, our objective is to create a legal and administrative environment, at European level and in every Member State, in which social economy enterprises of whatever form and size can thrive and meet the challenges posed by globalisation and the economic downturn. More specifically, the Commission's policy aims to guarantee that social economy enterprises can grow and prosper alongside other forms of company. To this end, the Commission pays particular attention to ensuring that all other Community policies in areas such as competition, accounting, company law, public procurement, health, social affairs, agriculture, fisheries, banking, insurance, public and private partnerships and regional development, do take into account the specific needs, particular goals, efforts and working style of this kind of enterprise.

To conclude, the Commission services are currently working on a document which will take stock of the progress made since 2004 on the promotion of cooperatives. It will also assess the situation of other social economy enterprises and propose new actions if necessary.

3-299

Le Président. – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi 19 février 2009.

Déclarations écrites (article. 142)

3-300

Iles Braghetto (PPE-DE), *per iscritto*. – L'agire non lucrativo, l'esperienza del non-profit rappresenta un fenomeno in continua crescita nello spazio europeo.

In periodo di crisi economico finanziaria con forti ricadute sul piano sociale rafforzare un'economia basata sul beneficio sociale e non sul profitto è una scelta strategica che consente di temperarne gli effetti negativi e di proseguire nello sviluppo della strategia di Lisbona, realizzando uno degli obiettivi primari vale a dire la vocazione alla responsabilità sociale.

In secondo luogo l'economia sociale è in grado di attivare azioni a livello locale diventando partner affidabile per le pubbliche amministrazioni che debbono progettare interventi a favore di fasce deboli della popolazione.

Ben venga quindi un intervento del Parlamento europeo fondato sul riconoscimento normativo e statistico di realtà che operano e che sono radicate nel tessuto europeo a partire dalla loro capacità di realizzare obiettivi di natura sociale.

Una visione sussidiaria che rappresenta un contributo fondamentale al modello sociale europeo.

3-301

Gabriela Crețu (PSE), *în scris*. – Economia socială poate juca un rol primordial în economia europeană, ea impunând un nou tip de economie, bazat pe valori democratice, o economie ce pune oamenii pe primul loc și susține dezvoltarea durabilă.

Cu toate acestea, economia socială se confruntă cu un obstacol foarte mare: lipsa de vizibilitate instituțională, cauzată de faptul că nu este recunoscută ca domeniu economic separat de cele două: public și privat.

Cerem Comisiei și statelor membre să dezvolte un cadru legal care să recunoască economia socială ca un al treilea sector, să impună reguli care să stabilească în mod clar ce entități pot opera în acest sector, astfel încât nici un alt tip de organizație să nu poată beneficia de finanțarea sau politicile publice destinate încurajării întreprinderilor din economia socială.

De asemenea, cerem Comisiei și Statelor Membre să ofere suport financiar, instruire și consultanță și să simplifice procedurile de înființare a întreprinderilor din sectorul social.

Astfel, economia socială își va îndeplini eficient rolul său în contextul general al economiei europene ajutând nu numai la combaterea sărăciei, ci și ușurând accesul la resurse, drepturi și servicii necesare cetățenilor pentru participarea în societate.

3-302

Gábor Harangozó (PSE), *in writing*. – First of all, I would like to congratulate our rapporteur, Mrs Patrizia Toia, for the quality of the report she presents today. As a matter of fact, it is important to provide some clarity in defining the concept of social economy and ensuring its legal status through the wide range of national experiences. Social economy indeed requires visibility – through better knowledge of EU-wide data – for better achieving the objectives of solidarity, employment, entrepreneurship, growth, competitiveness social cohesion and social dialogue in the Union as a whole. Social economy is increasingly becoming an important actor at local and regional levels and has now more than ever – due to the serious impacts of the financial crisis – a major role to play in European social and economic development. The Union needs to concentrate its efforts in supporting the social and economic dynamics to overcome the mere separation of public and private sectors if we really want to find new and innovative solutions to provide our citizen with sustainable jobs and a better living environment with quality services of general interest in an inclusive society.

3-303

Magda Kósáné Kovács (PSE), *írásban*. – Hónapok óta próbáljuk az Unió valamennyi intézményét és eszközét mozgósítani az elhatalmasodó válság hatásainak enyhítésére. Szerencse a szerencsétlenségben, hogy Patrizia Toia jelentése most került a plenáris ülés napirendjére, hiszen ebben az időszakban különösen fontosak a szolidaritást, valamint a társadalmi és területi kohéziót zászlajukra tűző kezdeményezések. A szociális gazdaság intézménye márpedig ezt célozza, mivel olyan szervezeti formák konglomerátuma, amelynek nem a profitszerzés a célja, hanem a szolidaritási és gazdasági érdekközösség. Ezeket a formákat semmilyen piacorientált szervezet nem helyettesítheti, hiszen lehetőséget adnak a társadalomból kiszoruló felzárkóztatására, méltó munkát kínálnak és változatos formáikkal az önfoglalkoztatástól a szociális szövetkezetekig képesek az elvégzett munka eredményét újra a közösség érdekében hasznosítani.

A szociális gazdaságról sokat írtunk és beszéltünk, de európai statisztikai bázis nélkül nem lesz látható és nem lesz része mindennapi életünknek. Ha a társadalom nem ismeri, szolidaritásával segíteni sem tud. A részt vevő szervezetek pedig túlságosan kicsik ahhoz, hogy makrogazdasági szinten ismertté válhassanak.

Patrizia Toia jelentése hozzáegíthet ahhoz, hogy a szociális gazdaságban megjelenő pénz és termelés ne a versenyfeltételek betartása alól kilógni akarók gyanús szervezeteiként jelenjenek meg a döntéshozók és a piaci szereplők előtt.

A jelentés itt és most képes lehet arra, hogy a szociális gazdaság a válságkezelésben viszonylag kevés befektetéssel hatékonyan lépjen fel a munkahelyvesztés és a megélhetés ellehetetlenülésével szemben.

3-303-500

Silvia-Adriana Țicău (PSE), în scris. – Economia socială asigură stabilitatea locurilor de muncă, nefiind supusă fenomenului delocalizării. Consider că Uniunea Europeană și Statele Membre ar trebui să încurajeze și sprijine forme de implementare ale economiei sociale - cooperative, societăți mutuale, asociații și fundații - în legislațiile și politicile lor.

Este important ca o serie de măsuri care vizează dezvoltarea microcreditelor, precum și o finanțare europeană adaptată să fie dezvoltate, deoarece valorile economiei sociale corespund obiectivelor europene de integrare socială și contribuie la reconcilierea vieții profesionale cu cea privată, la îmbunătățirea egalității de gen, a calității vieții persoanelor în vârstă sau cu dizabilități. Consider că rolul femeilor în economia socială trebuie consolidat având în vedere implicarea acestora în asociații și voluntariat.

Solicit Comisiei să integreze economia socială în celelalte politici și strategii de dezvoltare socială și economică, în special în contextul Small Business Act, deoarece structurile economiei sociale se adresează cu precădere întreprinderile mici și mijlocii și serviciilor de interes general. Aceste eforturi ar putea fi susținute și prin crearea unui registru statistic al întreprinderilor din economia socială în fiecare Stat Membru al Uniunii Europene și introducerea datelor în sistemul european de statistici EUROSTAT.

3-304

28 - Santé mentale (brève présentation)

3-305

Le Président. – L'ordre du jour appelle la brève présentation du rapport d'Evangelia Tzampazi, au nom de la commission de l'environnement, de la santé publique et de la sécurité alimentaire, sur la santé mentale (2008/2209(INI) (A6-0034/2009).

3-306

Ευαγγελία Τζαμπάζη, Εισηγήτρια. – Κύριε Πρόεδρε, κύριε Επίτροπε, αγαπητοί συνάδελφοι, σήμερα συνειδητοποιούμε ολοένα και περισσότερο ότι δεν υπάρχει υγεία χωρίς ψυχική υγεία. Συνειδητοποιούμε ότι συχνά απαντώνται προβλήματα ψυχικής υγείας τα οποία έχουν αντίκτυπο από ανθρώπινης και οικονομικής σκοπιάς τόσο στην ατομική, οικογενειακή, επαγγελματική και κοινωνική ζωή των ατόμων και των οικογενειών τους όσο και στην ίδια την κοινωνία.

Τα στοιχεία μιλάνε από μόνα τους: ένα στα τέσσερα άτομα θα αντιμετωπίσει κάποια ψυχική διαταραχή· η κατάθλιψη αποτελεί μια από τις πιο συχνές διαταραχές και, έως το 2020, θα αποτελεί τη συχνότερη ασθένεια στον αναπτυσσόμενο κόσμο· κάθε χρόνο, στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση σημειώνονται περίπου 59.000 αυτοκτονίες, εκ των οποίων το 90% οφείλεται σε ψυχικές διαταραχές. Στις ευάλωτες και περιθωριοποιημένες ομάδες, όπως π.χ. στα άτομα με αναπηρία, υπάρχουν μεγαλύτερες πιθανότητες να σημειωθούν προβλήματα ψυχικής υγείας.

Επίσης, σε μια Ευρώπη η οποία γηράσκει, η εμφάνιση νευροεκφυλιστικών διαταραχών γίνεται ολοένα και συχνότερη. Θα συμφωνήσουμε επομένως ότι η από κοινού αντιμετώπιση των προκλήσεων που παρουσιάζει η ψυχική υγεία είναι αναγκαία και μας αφορά όλους. Είναι υποχρέωση όλων να υπερασπιστούμε την ψυχική υγεία, η δε διασφάλιση των δικαιωμάτων των ψυχικά ασθενών και των οικογενειών τους αποτελεί ιδεολογική και πολιτική θέση σύμφωνα με την οποία το κράτος στηρίζει κοινωνικά και προστατεύει αυτούς που έχουν ανάγκη. Το πρώτο βήμα ήταν η Πράσινη Βίβλος της Επιτροπής, το επόμενο βήμα έγινε με τη διοργάνωση της Ευρωπαϊκής Συνδιάσκεψης "Μαζί για την ψυχική υγεία και την ευημερία", η οποία και καθιέρωσε το Ευρωπαϊκό Σύμφωνο για την Ψυχική Υγεία και την Ευημερία.

Σε αυτή την κατεύθυνση, η έκθεση για την ψυχική υγεία, την οποία ενέκρινε ομόφωνα η Επιτροπή Περιβάλλοντος, περιλαμβάνει μια σειρά από συστάσεις για την προώθηση της ψυχικής υγείας και της ευημερίας του πληθυσμού, την καταπολέμηση του στίγματος των διακρίσεων και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού, την ενίσχυση της προληπτικής δράσης και της αυτοβοήθειας και την παροχή υποστήριξης και επαρκούς θεραπείας στα άτομα με προβλήματα ψυχικής υγείας, τις οικογένειες αυτών και τους φροντιστές τους.

Στην έκθεση τονίζουμε την ανάγκη για την παροχή υψηλής ποιότητας προσιτών, προσβάσιμων, αποτελεσματικών και καθολικών υπηρεσιών ψυχικής υγείας καθώς και για την ανάπτυξη σύγχρονης νομοθεσίας. Ζητούμε να δοθεί έμφαση στην κατάρτιση όλων των ατόμων στις θέσεις κλειδιά, αιτούμε τη διασφάλιση της πρόσβασης σε κατάλληλη εκπαίδευση, κατάρτιση και απασχόληση και τη δημιουργία υποστηρικτικού περιβάλλοντος με ιδιαίτερη έμφαση στις ευάλωτες ομάδες. Ζητούμε να δοθεί έμφαση στην πρόληψη των προβλημάτων ψυχικής υγείας μέσα από κοινωνικές παρεμβάσεις, ζητούμε από τα κράτη μέλη την ενδυνάμωση των οργανισμών που εκπροσωπούν τα ίδια τα άτομα με ψυχικά προβλήματα. Προτείνουμε τη θέσπιση μιας πλατφόρμας για την παρακολούθηση, για την εφαρμογή του συμφώνου. Ζητάμε από την Επιτροπή να παρουσιάσει τα συμπεράσματα των θεματικών διασκέψεων. Επισημαίνουμε την ανάγκη για ανάπτυξη κατάλληλων δεικτών για καλύτερη εκτίμηση των αναγκών σε εθνικό και ευρωπαϊκό επίπεδο.

Παράλληλα, διατυπώνουμε προτάσεις στα πλαίσια των πέντε τομέων προτεραιότητας του συμφώνου. Στο πλαίσιο αυτό, τονίζουμε ότι, για την πρόληψη της κατάθλιψης και των αυτοκτονιών, απαιτείται η εφαρμογή πολυτομεακών προγραμμάτων καθώς και η ανάπτυξη δικτύων, η ανάπτυξη ενός υγιούς σχολικού κλίματος, η βελτίωση συνθηκών εργασίας, η ανάληψη μέτρων για τη βελτίωση της ποιότητας της ζωής και, τέλος, σε ό,τι αφορά την αντιμετώπιση του στίγματος και του κοινωνικού αποκλεισμού, τονίζουμε ότι απαιτούνται δράσεις ενημέρωσης και ευαισθητοποίησης. Γι' αυτό, κύριε Πρόεδρε, θα ήθελα να ευχαριστήσω τους συναδέλφους που συνέβαλαν με τις προτάσεις τους και επιθυμώ να στείλουμε το μήνυμα ότι η ψυχική υγεία είναι ύψιστο κοινωνικό αγαθό και ότι οφείλουμε όλοι να εργαστούμε για την προαγωγή της.

3-307

Janez Potočnik, *Member of the Commission*. – Mr President, I congratulate the European Parliament and its rapporteur, Ms Tzampazi, on this own-initiative report on mental health. The report quite rightly underlines the great impact mental health has on general well-being, on education, on learning, and on social cohesion in the European Union.

The fact that Parliament is adopting this report only two years after a resolution responding to the Commission's Green Paper on mental health signals the urgent need for more action in this field.

In my view there is some reason for optimism. There is more awareness of the importance of mental health and well-being across all sectors, compared to a few years ago. This was evident from the great support for the Commission's high-level conference 'Together for mental health and well-being' and the European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being, both of which were mentioned by the rapporteur.

Further positive developments include the fact that many Member States have revised their mental health strategies or are setting up action plans, for example in Finland and Hungary. Socio-economic learning has been included in school curricula. In the United Kingdom, life issues are now a subject in their own right in many schools.

Employers are increasingly aware of the links between well-being and productivity. CSR Europe has even created a toolkit for well-being in the workplace. However, let us be clear, there can certainly be no reason for complacency, and much more remains to be done. There could be new risks for mental health as a result of the current financial and economic crisis. Member States could be tempted to reduce budgets for mental health or to reduce their efforts to build up modern mental health systems with community-based services instead of outdated asylums.

The economic downturn worsens the future prospects of young people, especially school leavers. Job insecurity in the workplace, and its ensuing concerns over the stability of incomes and rising levels of unemployment, create new major threats for mental health.

Over the next two years the Commission will organise a series of thematic conferences on the five priorities of the mental health pact. These will be joint events with Council Presidencies and Member States. A first international conference on stigma and psychiatric care will be organised by the Czech Presidency on 29 May this year. The first thematic conference on mental health in youth and education will take place in Stockholm on 29-30 September, in cooperation with the Swedish Presidency. The second thematic conference on prevention of depression and suicide will be organised with Hungary in December. In the first semester of 2010, the Spanish Presidency will host a thematic conference on the mental health of older people. Furthermore, we are in contact with Member States regarding two further conferences on mental health in workplace settings and on combating stigma and social exclusion.

Parliament's report includes many concrete suggestions, which constitute a valuable contribution to future debates in these conferences. The report not only highlights the relevance of mental health in the European Union, but also demonstrates that there are many opportunities to act in the area of mental health at European Union level.

One of the suggestions in the report is to set up a structure to oversee the implementation of the European Pact for Mental Health and Well-being. I agree that there would be significant added value in periodically reviewing progress against the objectives of the pact.

We will seriously consider how we can best put such an idea into practice. Once again, I would like to thank Parliament and its rapporteur for this very supportive report and its very important recommendations.

3-308

Le Président. – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi 19 février 2009.

Déclarations écrites (article. 142)

3-308-250

Louis Grech (PSE), in writing. – Mental health is a key factor in people's lives and there is increasing evidence of its impact on our social, economic and legal systems. I support this report since it entails a comprehensive approach to the challenges we face in the mental health sector, such as combating stigma, discrimination and social exclusion, but also recognizing the need for preventive programs, public support and adequate treatment of people.

As a relatively new science, mental health is not widely recognized as a priority, but recent technological developments have allowed us to explore more of the human brain, showing the way to new, life-changing treatments for individuals. I believe we should strongly support further research in this area, with special attention to the growing elderly population in Europe, which is hoping for a healthy, dignified and active ageing.

We need accessible structures for care and treatment of mental illnesses, but it is also very important to have a supportive environment such as labour market integration programmes. Mental health is also very relevant in workplace settings where it can severely hamper performance, so we need to promote good practices among employers that reduce unnecessary stress and preserve the mental well-being of their employees.

3-308-500

Eija-Riitta Korhola (PPE-DE), kirjallinen. – Mielenterveydestä

Haluaisin kiittää kollegaani Evangelia Tzampazia mielenterveyttä käsittelevästä mietinnöstä, jonka puolesta äänestin.

Joka neljäs eurooppalainen kärsii mielenterveysongelmista ainakin kerran elämänsä aikana. On myös arvioitu, että masennus nousee vuoteen 2020 mennessä kehittyneen maailman yleisimmäksi sairaudeksi ja toiseksi tärkeimmäksi työkyvyttömyyden syyksi. Ulkoiset tekijät kuten esim. tällä hetkellä finanssikriisin aiheuttamat seuraukset altistavat näiden ongelmien puhkeamiselle. Sen lisäksi että psyykinen pahoinvointi aiheuttaa menoja, jotka kuormittavat terveydenhuoltoalaa, ja koko sosiaalista ja taloudellista järjestelmää, se myös heikentää edelleen tarpeettoman paljon sairastuneiden henkilöiden ja heidän perheidensä elämänlaatua.

Vaikka hoidon taso ja yleinen suhtautuminen on ottanut aimo harppauksia parempaan, mielenterveysongelmista kärsivät henkilöt ja heidän perheensä syrjäytyvät yhä usein. Tasoerot ennaltaehkäisyn ja laadukkaan hoidon takaamisen suhteen ovat liian suuria sekä eri EU-maiden välillä, että alueellisesti maiden sisällä.

Olen tyytyväinen että nuorten mielenterveys on nostettu Tzampazian mietinnössä erityisesti esille, ja siihen puuttumiseen ehdotetaan monialaisia ohjelmia. Meidän ei tule kuitenkaan unohtaa, että vanhempien sekä kodin ulkopuolisten kasvattajien ja tahojen vastuulle jää aina sen tärkeimmän ennaltaehkäisevän mielenterveystyön tekeminen; terveellisten elämäntapojen edistäminen ja lasten ja nuorten kuuntelu ja huomioiminen.

Erityisen tärkeänä Tzampazian mietinnössä pidän yleisten mielenterveyspalveluiden korkealaatuisuuden, helpon saatavuuden ja tehokkuuden peräänkuuluttamista, sekä suurempaa panostusta laadukkaan tutkimuksen rahoittamiseen. Etenkin ennaltaehkäisevän sekä psyykkisten ja fyysisten terveysongelmien välisiin yhteyksiin liittyvän lääketieteellisen tutkimuksen rahoitusta tulisi lisätä.

3-309

Siiri Oviir (ALDE), kirjalikult. – Vaimse tervise häired on rahvatervise probleemiks paljudes riikides, avaldades olulist mõju inimestele endile, nende perekondadele ja kogu ühiskonnale tervikuna. Vaimse tervise häired on tihti ka invaliidsust tekitavad ning võivad seeläbi põhjustada ühiskonnale olulist majanduslikku koormust.

Maailmapanga 1993. aasta arenguraporti kohaselt oli kümne olulisema invaliidsuse põhjustaja seas neli vaimse tervise või/na neuroloogilist häiret. Kui 1993. aastal oli depressioon invaliidsust tekitavate haiguste hulgas neljandal kohal, siis samade tendentside jätkudes võib depressioon 2020. aastaks osutuda kogurahvastikus olulisuselt teiseks ning naistel koguni esimeseks invaliidsuse põhjuseks.

Hoolimata vaimse tervise häiretest tingitud tagajärgede suurusest ja tõsidusest, leidub maailmas ja ka Euroopas tänagi veel riike, kus probleemile pole adekvaatsed tähelepanu pööratud. Tihti põhjustab sellist olukorda ühiskonnas valitsev osaliselt negatiivne avalik ja poliitiline suhtumine ning psühhiaatriliste haiguste ja haigete stigmatiseerimine. See omakorda tingib vaimse tervise alatahtsustamist, teenuste vähest kättesaadavust, alternatiivsete ravimeetodite vähesust ja puudulikku informeeritust ravivõimalusest.

Vaatamata asjaolule, et vaimse tervise probleemide lahendamine kuulub liikmesriikide kompetentsi, on siinjuures oluline suurendada ELi poolt liikmesriikidele täiendavalt antavate rahalise ja teadmispõhise abi mahtu, et aidata neil arendada ja parandada vajalikke tervishoiu-, sotsiaal-, hooldus- ja haridusteenuseid ning ennetavaid meetmeid.

Leian, et Euroopa Liidus peab inimeste vaimse tervise ja heaolu edendamise muutuma kõigis liikmesriikides prioriteetseks eesmärgiks, sest inimeste vaimne tervis mõjutab ju kõige otsemalt liikmesriikide majanduslikku produktiivsust ja tööhõivet.

3-310

Zdzisław Zbigniew Podkański (UEN), *na piśmie*. – Jak wiadomo, zdrowie psychiczne jest dla każdego człowieka jedną z podstawowych wartości, o której my, jako przedstawiciele narodów europejskich nie możemy zapomnieć. Myślę, że dobrze stało się, że dzisiaj zajmujemy się tą kwestią na forum Parlamentu Europejskiego. Choroby psychiczne, plaga samobójstw i depresje stały się zagrożeniem współczesnych społeczeństw i dotyczą nie tylko osoby żyjące w ciągłym stresie, ale również dzieci, osoby młode i ludzi starszych. Uważam, że powinniśmy podjąć daleko idące kroki w celu pokonania tych chorób cywilizacyjnych. Dlatego też popieram pomysł badań, wolny dostęp do ich wyników, jak i specjalistów.

Dziękując za sprawozdanie na temat zdrowia psychicznego, wyrażam równocześnie pewne zaniepokojenie, czy pomysł objęcia pomocą zarówno osób starszych, całkowite zwalczenie stygmatyzacji i wykluczenia społecznego, a także dojście do osób, z tzw. marginesu społecznego jest możliwe. Osoby takie charakteryzują się bardzo często niechęcią do innych, wyobcowaniem oraz strachem przed napiętnowaniem w społeczeństwie. Moim zdaniem pierwszym z problemów, na którym powinniśmy się skupić, jest szeroko zakrojona edukacja, aby każdy potrzebujący wiedział, gdzie powinien się zwrócić, jakiego rodzaju pomoc może tam uzyskać i, co najważniejsze, że może wrócić do normalnego życia.

3-311

Daciana Octavia Sârbu (PSE), *în scris*. – Sănătatea mintală și bunăstarea reprezintă o mare provocarea a secolului în care trăim, Organizația Mondială a Sănătății estimând că tulburările mintale vor reprezenta 15% din totalul bolilor până în anul 2020.

Mă îngrijorează în mod deosebit viitorul adolescenților și al copiilor, motiv pentru care am propus sensibilizarea cetățenilor cu privire la deteriorarea situației în privința sănătății mintale a copiilor care au părinți emigranți și introducerea de programe în școli menite să ajute acești tineri să facă față problemelor psihologice legate de absența părinților.

Am insistat asupra acestui fapt datorită numărului mare de copii abandonați de părinții plecați la muncă în străinătate, fenomen tot mai des întâlnit în Europa Centrală și de Est. Tot în sprijinul tinerilor, am propus promovarea înființării funcțiilor de consilier în fiecare școală secundară și oferirea de alternative care sunt confidențiale și nu stigmatizează, pentru a răspunde nevoilor socio-emoționale ale acestora.

Având în vedere că sănătatea mintală determină calitatea vieții cetățenilor din Uniunea Europeană, aceasta trebuie abordată cu aceeași seriozitate ca și sănătatea fizică, iar un plan de acțiune european în acest sens este necesar pentru a răspunde provocărilor pe care le ridică tulburările mintale.

3-312

Richard Seeber (PPE-DE), *schriftlich*. – Wenn wir über Gesundheit sprechen, bezieht sich dies meist auf das körperliche Wohlbefinden. Psychische Krankheiten können jedoch den Alltag der Betroffenen ebenso erschweren und haben gesellschaftlich betrachtet weitreichende negative Auswirkungen. Die Initiative des Parlaments zur besseren Aufklärung über psychische Gesundheit ist daher ein sehr positiver Schritt. Der Umgang mit psychischen Störungen sollte in der Bevölkerung stärker diskutiert werden, aber auch Methoden, psychischen Krankheiten vorzubeugen, sollten einer breiten Öffentlichkeit zugänglich gemacht werden.

Besonders hervorzuheben ist in diesem Zusammenhang das Umfeld Arbeitsplatz. Da berufstätige Menschen sehr viel Zeit an ihrem Arbeitsplatz verbringen und im Zusammenhang mit ihrer Tätigkeit Stress ausgesetzt sind, gilt es, die seelische Gesundheit gerade dort zu fördern. Nur motivierte und ausgeglichene Arbeitnehmer sind in der Lage, den an sie gestellten Anforderungen gerecht zu werden.

Unternehmen und öffentliche Einrichtungen sollten daher für dieses Thema sensibilisiert werden. Insgesamt setzt das Parlament mit der Anerkennung seelischer Störungen ein Zeichen für ein modernes Gesundheitsverständnis und bietet auf lange Sicht vielen Betroffenen eine positive Perspektive.

3-313

29 - Suivi des plans d'action nationaux en matière d'efficacité énergétique: première évaluation (brève présentation)

3-314

Le Président. – Vous avez remarqué que nous avons un petit peu diminué l'ambiance lumineuse de la salle. J'imagine que c'est pour faire des économies d'énergie.

Ça tombe bien, puisque l'ordre du jour appelle la brève présentation du rapport d'András Gyürk, au nom de la commission de l'industrie, de la recherche et de l'énergie, sur le suivi des plans d'action nationaux en matière d'efficacité énergétique: première évaluation (2008/2214(INI)) (A6-0030/2009).

3-315

András Gyürk, előadó. – Köszönöm a szót elnök úr, tisztelt biztos úr! A januári gázválságnak egy pozitív következménye mindenképpen volt. Minden tagállamban felélénkült ugyanis az energiapolitikával kapcsolatos párbeszéd.

Itt, az Európai Parlamentben is sok szó esett különféle alternatív szállítási útvonalokról, a tárolókapacitások bővítéséről, vagy éppen az atomenergia jövőbeni szerepéről. Az energiahatékonyság ügyének azonban méltatlanul kevés figyelmet szenteltünk. Ezért is örülök annak, hogy a nemzeti energiahatékonysági cselekvési tervekről szóló jelentés révén az elmúlt hetekben lehetőségünk nyílt arra, hogy megvitassuk ezt a kérdést.

Az energiahatékonyság jelentősége abban rejlik, hogy segítségével minden más eszközknél gyorsabban érhetünk el látványos eredményeket. Amint arra nemrégiben Andris Piebalgs energetikai biztos is rámutatott, csupán a műszaki berendezések készenléti állapotának uniós szabályozásával Magyarország éves fogyasztásának megfelelő energiát lehetne megtermelni.

Nem lehet elégszer hangsúlyoznunk, hogy az energiahatékonyság minden energiapolitikát érintő problémánkra gyógyírt jelenthet. Segítségével mindenekelőtt mérsékelhető Európa harmadik országoktól való energetikai függősége. Az energiahatékonyság mindemellett jótékony hatással lehet az európai versenyképességre és mérsékelheti a környezeti terhelést. Nem feledkezhetünk meg arról sem, hogy az energiahatékonyság javítása csökkentheti a leginkább kiszolgáltatott rétegek energiaszámlájával kapcsolatos terheit.

Az egyes tagországok adottságai és lehetőségei, valamint az általuk meghozott intézkedések között természetesen nagy különbség van. Ezért jó döntésnek tartjuk, hogy a 2006-ban született szabályozás értelmében minden tagállamnak nemzeti cselekvési tervekben kell összefoglalnia az energiahatékonyság ügyében tervezett intézkedéseket.

Az előttünk fekvő jelentésben igyekeztünk általános következtetéseket levonni az említett akciótervekkel kapcsolatban. Egyúttal célunk volt az is, hogy meghatározzuk, milyen jövőbeni lépésekre van szükség az uniós jogalkotásban. Engedjék meg, hogy ezek után kiemeljem a jelentés pár fontosabb elemét.

Először is, az Európai Bizottságnak erélyesebben kell fellépnie a nemzeti cselekvési tervek késedelmes elkészítése ellen. Egyúttal tüzetesen meg kell vizsgálni, hogy az egyes dokumentumokban szereplő tervek megfelelnek-e a tagállamok gyakorlati lépéseinek. Több cselekvési terv alapvető hiányossága ugyanis, hogy köszönő viszonyban sincs az adott kormányzat politikájával.

Másodszorban, meg kell erősíteni az energiahatékonyságra elkülönített pénzügyi forrásokat, uniós és tagállami szinten egyaránt. A gazdasági válság következményeként ma csak kevés európai állampolgár engedheti meg magának, hogy energiahatékonysági beruházásba kezdjen, éppen ezért mihamarabb ki kell terjeszteni a létező energiahatékonysági támogatási programokat. Ezzel összefüggésben a következő 7 éves közösségi költségvetésben sokkal hangsúlyosabb szerepet kell kapnia az energiahatékonyságnak, és az érdemi előrelépést szolgálhatják az adókedvezmények is.

Harmadszorban, az Európai Uniónak folytatnia kell az energiahatékonysággal kapcsolatos jogszabályalkotást. Úgy vélem, hogy az Európai Bizottság javaslatai jó irányokat jelöltek ki ezen a téren. Az épületek energiahatékonyságára vonatkozó szabályozás szigorítása jelentős megtakarítást eredményezhet például.

Negyedjére, a tagországok kormányainak úttörő szerepet kell vállalniuk az energiahatékonyság fejlesztésében. Ennek a törekvésnek egyrészt kiterjedt tájékoztató kampányokban kell tükröződnie, hiszen a fogyasztók csak akkor fognak energiahatékonysági beruházásokba kezdeni, ha tisztában vannak az általuk nyerhető előnyökkel.

Befejezésül még egy gondolat. Úgy vélem, hogy az energiahatékonyság ügyét a gazdasági válság idején sem szabad másodrendű kérdésként kezelnünk. Már csak azért sem, mivel az energiahatékonysági beruházások új munkahelyek százait teremthetik meg Európában. Márpedig a tömeges elbocsátások évében azt hiszem, hogy ez korántsem mellékes szempont.

3-316

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I welcome the opportunity to address this part-session of the European Parliament covering, inter alia, the subject of the Commission's assessment of the National Energy Efficiency Action Plans (NEEAPs), which was presented in the Second Strategic Energy Review package in November 2008 and the earlier Commission communication of January 2008.

A more detailed technical synthesis of the Commission's assessment of the NEEAPs will be presented in the Commission's NEEAP document this spring.

I would, therefore, like to take this opportunity to thank the rapporteur, Mr Gyürk, on his work, as well as the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (ITRE) for its valuable discussions and comments.

In the past few years, the Commission has stated very clearly that energy efficiency is the first priority of the European Union energy policy and a very important cornerstone to meeting the 2020 by 2020 targets, and National Energy Efficiency Action Plans play a central role in this respect. The Directive on energy end-use efficiency and energy services sets an obligation, as you know, for the Member States to present these, and to show how in practice they are going to achieve their national targets for energy efficiency.

The original deadline for their submission by the Member States was 30 June 2007 but, as you know, many Member States unfortunately were late. The last NEEAPs arrived at the Commission in June 2008.

At this stage, the Commission has completed all the individual assessments and sent letters with the results of those assessments to all the Member States. As a follow-up, a number of bilateral meetings took place, and a number of Member States declared they would themselves like to improve their NEEAPs in the coming few months. As has been noted by the members of the ITRE Committee, the first National Energy Efficiency Action Plans have proved to be a really useful exercise. Indeed, many Member States have, for the first time, prepared comprehensive plans of action on energy savings. Many of them confirmed that they found the cross-sectoral effort needed to prepare them very useful.

Under the Energy Services Directive, NEEAPs have only a limited role. However, the Commission, in its communication of November 2008, and in other recent statements has always encouraged Member States to broaden their role.

The Commission will prepare a new European Union Energy Savings Action Plan that will strengthen and better focus European Union actions, helping EU Member States and EU businesses and EU citizens to save energy in a cost-effective way.

In your report you urged the Commission to propose a binding target for energy savings. The current energy savings objective of 20% of primary energy saving in 2020 today represents a non-binding target, as you know. However, the Commission believes that, with the climate and energy package, as well as the proposals in the Second Strategic Energy Review, we can reach 20%.

Mr Gyürk's report also rightly indicated that financial support must be increased. Financial issues relating to energy savings were recognised by the Commission in the European Economic Recovery Plan of 26 November 2008, and in other coordinated efforts which aim to help create jobs, which are often in small- and medium-sized companies, since investments in energy efficiency, and especially in buildings, are mostly related to small-scale renovation projects.

In conclusion, I would like to recall that during the mandate of this Commission, EU leaders have given a real commitment to promoting energy efficiency. Boosting investment in energy efficiency and related new technologies offers an essential contribution to sustainable development and also to security of supply. Energy efficiency has a wider impact, far beyond energy policy. It has a positive effect on the European Union economy in general: increasing efficiency helps create new jobs, stimulates economic growth and improves competitiveness. As you rightly mentioned, that is exactly what we should be doing in these difficult and challenging times.

3-317

Le Président. – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi 19 février 2009.

Déclarations écrites (article. 142)

3-318

Šarūnas Birutis (ALDE), raštu. – Akivaizdu, kad naftos kainos krinta, tačiau pasibaigus dabartinei ekonominei krizei kainos vėl išaugs; todėl primenu, jog svarbu labiau diversifikuoti ES energijos šaltinius ir tiekimo kelius siekiant sušvelninti neigiamus ateityje galinčios kilti naftos krizės padarinius.

ES valstybių narių, ypač ES „energetinių salų“ priklausomybė nuo energetinių resursų importo ir turima infrastruktūrą yra nevienoda. Ar mes galime kalbėti apie vieningą energetikos rinką, kai, pavyzdžiui, Baltijos valstybės, tarp kurių yra Lietuva, yra energetinės salos? Europos nesugebėjimas kalbėti vienu balsu su pagrindiniais energijos tiekėjais taip pat yra ryški problema. Mes popieriuje kuriame ambicingą Europos energetikos politiką, tačiau praktiškai ir toliau vyrauja dvišalė energetikos politika. Mielieji, energetikos sektoriaus politizavimas neprisideda prie stabilumo. Turėtume ir galėtume bandyti pakeisti situaciją diversifikacijos ir solidarumo pagalba. Reikia sukurti trūkstamas energetikos jungtis, sukurti ES koordinavimo mechanizmą, skirtą reaguoti į panašias krizes. Būtina, kad valstybėse narėse, kurios yra labiausiai priklausomos nuo energetinių resursų, būtų pakankamai šių resursų atsargų. Reikia atsižvelgti ne tik į trumpalaikes

energijos tiekimo saugumo priemonės, bet ir į ilgalaikę perspektyvą. Europa savo ruožtu turi diversifikuoti energetinius šaltinius ir pagerinti tiekimo saugumą.

3-318-500

Cristian Silviu Bușoi (ALDE), în scris. – Eficienta energetică este cu atât mai importantă în prezent cu cât ne confruntăm cu reale provocări privind aprovizionarea UE cu energie și cu cât trebuie să facem eforturi mai consistente pentru reducerea emisiilor de dioxid de carbon. Susțin o abordare a problematicei eficienței energetice coerentă cu celelalte politici ale UE, în special cu pachetul pentru combaterea schimbărilor climatice și cu imperativul de diversificare a surselor de energie.

Cred cu tărie că trebuie susținut sectorul R&D întrucât acesta poate avea o contribuție semnificativă la creșterea eficienței energetice. Comisia și guvernele S.M. ar trebui să sprijine mai puternic proiectele menite să sporească eficiența energetică, fie că vorbim de investiții pentru un transport public cât mai eficient, de izolare a imobilelor ș.a. Cred că resursele guvernelor ar trebui să se canalizeze mai degrabă în această direcție decât înspre subvenționarea pretului la energie, întrucât aceste proiecte vin totodată în sprijinul consumatorilor vulnerabili față de creșterea pretului la energie.

Solicit, asadar, S.M. să vină cu planuri de acțiune eficiente și realiste, să informeze cât mai bine cetățenii privitor la eficiența energetică și să coopereze prin schimburi de bune practici, iar Comisiei, să vină în sprijinul autorităților naționale în special prin asistență tehnică.

3-319

Daniel Petru Funeriu (PPE-DE), în scris. – Eficiența energetică a clădirilor este o preocupare deosebit de relevantă pentru țări care au moștenit un mare număr de clădiri construite după standarde joase în perioada comunistă.

Chem, cu această ocazie, Comisia să stabilească instrumente de finanțare și proceduri eficiente pentru reabilitarea termică a acestor clădiri, în acord cu ținta de creștere a eficienței energetice în UE cu 20% până în 2020.

3-319-500

Iosif Matula (PPE-DE), în scris. – Eficiența energetică reprezintă unul dintre obiectivele majore ale Uniunii Europene, îndeplinirea acestuia fiind un pas important realizarea dezvoltării durabile. De aceea, alături de efortul statelor membre de a se implica activ în promovarea politicilor de eficientizare a consumului energetic, trebuie să existe și o coordonare la nivel comunitar pentru a se obține rezultate mult mai bune.

O modalitate de realizare a eficienței energetice constă în izolarea termică a locuințelor. Un studiu arată că la nivel comunitar există posibilitatea de reducere a pierderilor de energie cu aproximativ 27%, ceea ce implică înseamnă o reducere a cheltuielilor pe care cetățenii sunt nevoiți să le suporte.

O problemă cu care se confruntă comunitățile locale ce își propun realizarea unui proiect de reabilitare a locuințelor constă în demersul complex pe care acestea trebuie să îl urmeze. De aceea, măsurile ce vor fi luate în viitor trebuie să aibă în vedere simplificarea acestor proceduri. Eficientizarea utilizării energiei prin izolarea clădirilor trebuie să vizeze și categoriile sociale defavorizate și astfel să ducă la consolidarea principiului solidarității în Europa.

3-320

Αννυ Ποδηματά (PSE), γραπτώς. – Η εμπειρία από την πρώτη αξιολόγηση των εθνικών σχεδίων δράσης δείχνει έμπρακτα ότι οι συνθήκες στην ΕΕ είναι ακόμα ανώριμες για την υποστήριξη μέτρων προώθησης της ενεργειακής αποδοτικότητας. Σημαντική αδυναμία των πρώτων ΕΣΔΕΑ αποτελεί, πέρα από τις μεγάλες καθυστερήσεις υποβολής τους από κάποια κράτη μέλη μεταξύ των οποίων και η Ελλάδα, το γεγονός ότι τα φιλόδοξα σχέδια δεν συνοδεύονται από σαφώς οριοθετημένες και με προστιθέμενη αξία πρακτικές προτάσεις. Κι αυτό παρόλο που σύμφωνα με πρόσφατα στοιχεία της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής, εάν επιτυγχανόταν ο στόχος της εξοικονόμησης ενέργειας κατά 20%, η ΕΕ θα χρησιμοποιούσε περίπου 400 Mtoe λιγότερη πρωτογενή ενέργεια και οι εκπομπές CO₂ θα μειώνονταν κατά 860 Mt.

Δεν έχει γίνει, συνεπώς, πλήρως κατανοητό το μέγεθος των δυνατοτήτων που μας δίνει η προώθηση της ενεργειακής αποδοτικότητας, ιδιαίτερα σε μία περίοδο οικονομικής ύφεσης όπως αυτή που διανύουμε. Θα πρέπει λοιπόν, η ΕΕ να προχωρήσει χωρίς άλλη καθυστέρηση στη συμπερίληψη της ενεργειακής αποδοτικότητας σε όλες τις τομεακές πολιτικές με σαφείς προτάσεις και μέτρα υποστήριξης, και να αυξήσει τις κοινοτικές ενισχύσεις προς αυτή την κατεύθυνση. Η ενεργειακή αποδοτικότητα αποτελεί σημείο κλειδί μετά και την ψήφιση του Κλιματικού Πακέτου, και μπορεί να εγγυηθεί την ενεργειακή ασφάλεια, τον περιορισμό των εκπομπών αερίων του θερμοκηπίου, καθώς και την τόνωση της οικονομίας της Ευρώπης.

3-321

30 - La recherche appliquée dans le domaine de la politique commune de la pêche (brève présentation)

3-322

Le Président. – L'ordre du jour appelle la brève présentation du rapport de Rosa Miguélez Ramos, au nom de la commission de la pêche, sur la recherche appliquée dans le domaine de la politique commune de la pêche (2008/2222(INI)) (A6-0016/2009).

3-323

Rosa Miguélez Ramos, ponente. – Señor Comisario, estimados colegas, señor Presidente, compatibilizar el correcto mantenimiento de los ecosistemas con la explotación sostenible de los recursos marinos, evitar y controlar los impactos de las actividades humanas sobre el medio ambiente, mejorar el conocimiento, el desarrollo tecnológico y la innovación son tareas imposibles de asumir si no contamos con el apoyo de la comunidad científica europea.

La investigación pesquera es también imprescindible a la hora de formular recomendaciones y prestar asesoramiento a los legisladores. Una mayor inversión en investigación y desarrollo, así como en la recogida y en el tratamiento de datos fidedignos, redundaría en una política común de pesca más sólida y sostenible.

Pero, aunque la frase que he escuchado de boca de un científico (*«Not money, but human resources are the problem»*) retrata bien la situación, no seré yo quien diga que la investigación en el ámbito de la pesca está sobrada de recursos financieros, sino que tenemos un doble problema.

Por una parte, señor Comisario, los montantes inscritos en el Séptimo Programa Marco para investigación marina, que debería haber sido un tema transversal, parecen insuficientes para el enfoque integrado que se le quiere dar en este momento a esta cuestión.

Además, señor Comisario, los científicos —y le aseguro que he hablado con muchos para elaborar este informe, antes y durante su elaboración— se encuentran con problemas a la hora de presentar proyectos al Séptimo Programa Marco: problemas achacables, en parte, al diferente enfoque que precisa, por un lado, la acuicultura, de carácter básicamente industrial, y, por otro, la investigación sobre pesca y ciencias marinas, que tiene un carácter multidisciplinar y que es a más largo plazo.

Hasta el Séptimo Programa Marco estos campos —los dos— estaban cubiertos por los mismos fondos y dependían de la DG Pesca, lo que permitía su complementariedad. En la actualidad es la DG Investigación quien se encarga y el resultado es que está resultando difícil para la comunidad científica hacer llegar a los funcionarios que elaboran las directrices de las convocatorias las preocupaciones y las necesidades del sector.

Por otra parte, en la comunidad científica hay una cierta percepción de que esta Dirección General parece haber optado por priorizar la investigación básica sin dar cabida a la investigación enfocada a las políticas públicas. Y le pongo un ejemplo: para enriquecer, desde el punto de vista científico, la estrategia marítima comunitaria o para investigar la relación entre pesca y cambio climático.

En resumen, el objetivo de la política marítima de la Unión Europea de conseguir una pesca productiva en un medio marino limpio necesita del acceso de los científicos que trabajan en este campo a mecanismos horizontales de financiación en el Séptimo Programa Marco.

Me gustaría, para concluir, referirme al segundo problema: el preocupante déficit de científicos jóvenes en la investigación en el ámbito de la pesca, algo que parece ser el fruto de unas carreras profesionales poco atractivas en comparación con otras ciencias básicas.

Parece indispensable instaurar cursos universitarios interesantes y gratificantes que ofrezcan buenas salidas profesionales. Y parece asimismo necesario homogeneizar los diferentes modelos de investigación aplicada vigentes en los distintos Estados miembros, a fin de poder comparar mejor los resultados y facilitar la agregación de datos, así como intensificar la cooperación entre los institutos de investigación nacionales. Y, desde luego, me parece imprescindible integrar mejor la experiencia y la pericia de los pescadores en el proceso de elaboración de dictámenes científicos sobre los que fundamentar las decisiones políticas en el marco de la PPC.

3-324

Janez Potočnik, Member of the Commission. – Mr President, I appreciate being able to talk about my own area of responsibility. The Commission welcomes Parliament's report on applied research relating to the common fisheries policy and would also like to thank the rapporteur, Ms Rosa Miguélez Ramos, and the Committee on Fisheries for their excellent work.

The report comes at the right moment with the preparation of the joint call on marine and maritime research under way. It also coincides with the work programme 2010 for FP7 and the launching of the Green Paper on the reform of the Common Fisheries Policy, which includes a chapter on research. The Commission agrees in principle with the main elements of the report.

We welcome the support expressed for the European strategy for marine and maritime research, where priorities are given to increasing capacity building, new infrastructure, new skills and education initiatives, developing integration across established marine and maritime research disciplines, promoting synergy between Member States and the Commission and new research governance.

The Commission acknowledges the importance of ensuring that a sufficient budget is allocated to fisheries and aquaculture research in FP7, while maintaining a good balance with the other research sectors, particularly in agriculture, forestry and biotechnology: Theme 2 – KBBE, and Theme 6 – environment. The annual budget for FP7 will progressively increase during the last three years of the programme and both the fisheries and aquaculture sectors will certainly benefit from this increase.

The Commission will pursue its effort to support research in line with the report by giving more visibility to fisheries and aquaculture research in FP7, securing a good balance between research in support of policy and more basic research, reinforcing social science in the work programmes, promoting dissemination of results and encouraging more coordination between national research programmes.

Finally, the Commission will facilitate the integration of fisheries and aquaculture research in the broader context of its strategic research agenda, the European Research Area and the new European Union strategy for marine and maritime research.

Bearing in mind the initiatives I have just described, I feel that there is now a solid base upon which we can improve our fisheries and aquaculture sectors through innovative research within the framework programme. They in turn will also benefit from improved cooperation and coordination of national research, through the different European Research Area initiatives and within the direction of the common fisheries policy.

If I can add a sentence of my own, I can guarantee to you that it is not more complicated than it was before, simply because the same people are working on it and the cooperation which we have with my colleague, Mr Borg, is really excellent. I think that is how research should be done in the future. We are cooperating across sectors and this is really bringing better results, which could hardly have been the case if this were done in a more sectoral way. I honestly thank you for the great work you have done.

3-325

Le Président. – Le point est clos.

Le vote aura lieu jeudi 19 février 2009.

3-326

31 - Ordre du jour de la prochaine séance: voir procès-verbal

3-327

32 - Levée de la séance

3-328

(La séance est levée à 23 h 30)